

## CONCLUSION

Mathieson Chemical Company, Pasadena, Texas is a "Covered Facility" under the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act (EEOICPA).

For the time period 1951 – 1953, Mathieson Chemical Company had a Government contract to extract uranium oxides out of phosphoric acid compounds in a pilot study for the Atomic Energy Commission. No records were kept of this. This was at a time when uranium was in demand due to weapons and the war, and a government contract could be quite lucrative. No one really knows what was going on at Mathieson. No one can find a contract. I have documentation that Company officials say no contract can be found. Contracts were either lost or destroyed. Correspondence that I have found also indicates that Government officials can not find a contract. It seems apparent that no one has a copy of the contract or contracts. Some documentation mentions that Mathieson Chemical had "at least one contract", and reference is made to "no copies of contracts". No records were kept. No one knows.

No monitoring was done. This is documented in correspondence between company officials and Government officials. Affidavits of Mathieson employees also confirm this. Employees, in their affidavits, also state that no safety precautions were taken, no warning signs were posted, no monitoring devices were worn and they did not know that they or anyone else was in danger of exposure to hazardous materials. In an affidavit from a gentleman who was an International Representative of the Oil Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union at that time and worked to organize the employees of Mathieson Chemical Company into Local 4-367, he also states that he did not know of the presence of uranium in the plant.

The sudden death of \_\_\_\_\_ an employee in the Lab at Mathieson Chemical, has raised many questions that have not been answered. In 1953, at the time of this death, other employees did not know of the presence of uranium in the plant. No one would have suspected at that time that his death could have been caused by his working conditions. We still do not know. It seemed unusual for Government officials and

officials of Mathieson Chemical to visit his widow at her home.  
died later of cancer and one of the daughters died due to  
a brain tumor.

In the first Dose Reconstruction Report made for my claim, monitoring was said to have been done. However, this was at the time when my was believed to have been an employee of Blockson Chemical Company in Joliet, Illinois. It is unclear to me what was used in the second Dose Reconstruction Report that was made. Confusion exists about the timing as well as other things on that report. This one was made from a "one-size-fits-all- when- we-don't- know" Technical Bulletin. Records from the Mathieson Chemical Company in Pasadena, Texas were not used. There were no records. No records were kept. This lack of records is verified in correspondence between Company officials and Government officials.

No credible information from the Mathieson Chemical Company worksite could have been used. This work was top secret. Any information coming from the company at any time should be discredited because these were people who gave only information that would perpetuate their unconscionable secret. No monitoring was done. No records were kept. No information from this worksite was used in the Dose Reconstruction Report because there was no information. The earliest record of information from this worksite was of a survey made in 1977, approximately 25 years later, and this was not documented until 1980. No one knows how much uranium was actually in the plant and no one knows the extent of the danger from residual contamination over the years. According to Appendix A-1 Residual Radioactive Contamination – Summary of All Sites (As of October 31, 2008), Page 8 of 13, the Revised Period of Potential Residual Contamination for Mathieson Chemical Co. worksite is 1954-present.

When I heard that a law had been passed to compensate victims of this type of situation, I thought that now "they" knew what caused my husband's cancers. I was mistaken. Although correspondence implies that Dose Reconstruction Reports are "claimant friendly", how can I and my friends believe that? I have had my doubts as to whether the EEOICPA was made for people like us. Mathieson Chemical Company is the "forgotten" plant. No records were kept.

Government agencies do not agree. One agency believes that sufficient information is not available to determine responsibility for cleanup of this

huge (240 acre) pile of toxic, radioactive waste materials. Yet another agency believes that sufficient information is available for making a Dose Reconstruction Report. How can this worksite be compared to other worksites when there is nothing to compare? How could the making of a Dose Reconstruction Report possibly be feasible?

What we do know is that many former employees have died of cancer. The employees at Mathieson did not know about this uranium. How can anyone say, with credibility, that these cancers were not caused by radiation exposure at this worksite. These employees were placed in harms way without their knowledge or consent. Mathieson Chemical kept this secret, not only for the period of 1951 – 1953, but for decades. I thought the EEOICPA was passed to compensate the victims of companies like this.

My \_\_\_\_\_ was diagnosed with cancer \_\_\_\_\_ in 1986 and was diagnosed with cancer \_\_\_\_\_ in 1994. In 1969, at age 40, he was diagnosed with \_\_\_\_\_; and his \_\_\_\_\_ r was removed. In 1994 shortly before \_\_\_\_\_ died, his doctor told me that my \_\_\_\_\_ was cancerous. The cancer of the \_\_\_\_\_ are both shown on \_\_\_\_\_ death certificate. I have very little information about the \_\_\_\_\_ because this was so long ago. This is mentioned on doctor's reports which I have submitted. I do not know if it was cancer. I also have very little information about the \_\_\_\_\_ cancer. We did not request an autopsy. At that time we still did not know about the presence of uranium at Mathieson Chemical Company. These four diseases are among the "22 specified cancers" listed in the EEOICPA.

When \_\_\_\_\_ became an employee at Mathieson, he worked in the Labor Pool. Later he became an operator, a pipefitter, and then a supervisor of the pipefitters. For more on this, see Exhibit D. He was a very active person and could be called frequently to almost any part of the plant. He was a Union Steward and for some years he was Chairman of the Workmen's Committee for the Union. In that capacity, he could be called to any part of the plant where anyone had a grievance or potential problem. His job duties as well as his volunteer employee activities could have placed him in all areas of the plant frequently.

I filed a survivor claim on August 19, 2002. I was denied. The last action taken on my claim was in 2005.

I believe this claim should be considered under the Special Exposure Cohort Section of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act (EEOICPA). I respectfully ask that you consider the information and documents I am submitting and make the favorable decision to award designation as a Special Exposure Cohort.

If you should wish to have more information or clarification of these things I am submitting, I welcome the opportunity to comply.

Sincerely,