

1 original? Several do, okay. We'll get those run
2 off. Okay.

3 BOARD DISCUSSION/WORKING SESSION FOR
4 SANFORD COHEN AND ASSOCIATES

5 Now we will be discussing the task order
6 proposal in closed session this afternoon. This
7 morning we're discussing issues relating
8 specifically to the tasks that have already been
9 awarded and general issues. John Mauro is here.
10 Joe Fitzgerald is here. And John and Joe, I'm
11 wondering if it would be useful for you to maybe
12 pull around to the front here and -- do we have a
13 mike that they can use? Maybe -- maybe this one.
14 Do we have a portable mike that could be used by
15 these gentlemen? Yes, we do.

16 Yeah, Joe and John, why don't you just pull a
17 couple of chairs in the front there and you can
18 share that portable mike. You don't necessarily
19 have to stand -- huh? He's going to give you a
20 mike. He's going to give you a mike. Do you need
21 a podium?

22 DR. MAURO: (Off microphone) I could use the
23 tabletop.

24 DR. ZIEMER: You're welcome to use the
25 podium, if you wish. Is that easier?

1 DR. MAURO: (Off microphone) (Inaudible)

2 DR. ZIEMER: Yeah, we'll pull the podium
3 over.

4 (Pause)

5 DR. ZIEMER: John, I believe it would be in
6 order if you would like to begin the discussion
7 with points and issues that -- and concerns or
8 questions that you might have, and I'll kind of
9 let you take the lead here at this point.

10 DR. MAURO: Fine, thank you. I appreciate
11 that. Joe and I --

12 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm not getting a feed.

13 DR. MAURO: (Off microphone) -- had a chance
14 to --

15 UNIDENTIFIED: (Off microphone) That mike's
16 not working.

17 DR. MAURO: (Off microphone) Hold it closer
18 or --

19 DR. ZIEMER: Hold it closer or put it in the
20 stand and raise the stand up a little bit. Oh, it
21 won't fit.

22 DR. MAURO: (Off microphone) It's not
23 working?

24 (Pause)

25 DR. MAURO: We got it. Okay, thank you. I

1 sat through yesterday's meeting and also the day
2 before yesterday SC&A did receive official
3 authorization to begin work on task two, which is
4 the site profile reviews, and task four, which is
5 the -- I guess the tracking system relational
6 database. As a point of confusion, I have been
7 informed by contracts that it turns out that those
8 two tasks, which we have all been calling task two
9 and task four, administratively -- according to --
10 when we put in our progress reports -- are
11 actually going to be called tasks one and two
12 because they came in first and second -- just to
13 avoid confusion. But I'm going to continue, since
14 I see everyone is comfortable with the two and
15 four reference, we'll continue with the tasks two
16 and four.

17 Now let's first talk a little bit about --
18 I'm going to talk more, as the program manager for
19 SC&A, on some high level or global issues. And
20 Joe certainly is here, who is our task manager for
21 task two on site profiles, and we'll get down a
22 little bit into the more of the specific issues
23 with Joe. So -- and I have a few notes that I
24 took yesterday -- a little scrambled, so it's
25 almost like a little freewheeling thoughts that

1 have gone through my head -- spinning through my
2 head, but I -- I'm going to sort of unload them a
3 little bit.

4 First let's talk about our first deliverable,
5 which is a report that's going to be due to you --
6 or really two reports -- one month from the day
7 before yesterday. The first deliverable is going
8 to be our proposed plan or procedure for
9 performing our review of the site profiles. The
10 other one is going to be a description of the
11 relational database for tracking information and
12 querying to support you in evaluating the degree
13 to which your stratified sampling is meeting your
14 needs. I'll talk about both of those briefly.

15 With regard to the first deliverable, which
16 is this procedure, in our proposal we laid out our
17 approach for performing site profile reviews. And
18 in fact, we identified -- in about seven or eight
19 pages -- our plan for doing that work. And it's a
20 generic plan. It identifies in effect four areas
21 that we're going to explore. It's almost like
22 sub-tasks on the things that we plan to do. I'm
23 sure you've all had a chance to look them over.

24 What dawned on me yesterday -- or day before
25 yesterday -- is I read through the -- just

1 randomly select -- not randomly. I selected the
2 site profile for Savannah River, which appears to
3 be a fairly complete document and I believe one of
4 the documents that is very mature, and went
5 through it. And one of the things that struck me
6 was that it was not -- it was a little different
7 than I thought it would be. And one of the things
8 that struck me regarding our deliverable -- now I
9 sort of married that knowledge I gained from
10 reading the site profile with our plan to -- for
11 our first deliverable, and it struck me that I
12 think we're going to have to write plans. And I'm
13 throwing this onto the table and to Joe, also, for
14 consideration. I think our plans for performing
15 site profiles need, to some degree, be site-
16 specific. Each site, it would appear, is very --
17 most sites -- many of the sites, very complex.
18 The amount of technical information of potential
19 importance and potential not importance is not
20 immediately apparent of course until you go
21 through the process of evaluating how important
22 the information is. So we're -- we are going to
23 have to be efficient in zeroing in and delving
24 into aspects of each of these site profiles in a
25 way that is very focused.

1 So my first thought is that our plans that
2 we'll be submitting to you -- I'd like them, as
3 the project manager, to keep control and keep
4 focused and hold onto budget and schedule, is to
5 write a plan that's of a generic nature, almost
6 like an umbrella plan, but have an attachment to
7 it that would specifically identify the strategies
8 we currently think are the best strategies for
9 coming at, for example, the site profile for
10 Savannah River 'cause it contains certain
11 information, when I look at it, that says where I
12 think -- and this becomes a judgment call based on
13 experience -- where the most important information
14 lies, the places where -- it's almost like within
15 our mandate and the time scale and the budget, we
16 can't do an exhaustive evaluation of every aspect
17 that might be of importance.

18 Now I'm looking for reaction to this. I
19 think we have to be judicious in where we invest
20 our resources so that we go after those things
21 that we believe are -- are prioritized.

22 Now here's one of my concerns. My experience
23 in doing work like this is it's a very iterative
24 process. You dig. You step back, you look at
25 what you have. You speak to your client, this is

1 what I'm seeing. And I think, based on what I'm
2 seeing, we're going to move a little more in this
3 direction versus that direction. And you step
4 back and it's an -- it's an iterative process.
5 It's not a linear process because you're growing
6 as you proceed and you're realizing where your
7 resources need to be focused.

8 Now one of my concerns is that -- I think Joe
9 and I need the flexibility to make those judgments
10 as we mature and move through the process. So
11 though we will write a plan that we will deliver
12 to you at the end of the month that will lay out,
13 on a general approach, how we plan to do it, but
14 also -- and I'd like to propose this -- we plan to
15 try to make it tailored to the site profiles that
16 you folks identify you would like us to take on
17 initially. Okay? As best we can. But at the
18 same time, I beg your indulgence that as we move
19 through it and as we learn and get smarter, we
20 will keep you apprised of the directions that --
21 that the information is taking us. So it's going
22 to be a living process.

23 However, I think it's important that we have
24 the freedom and flexibility to move down the paths
25 that we consider to be important. We will

1 certainly keep you apprised of it. And if at any
2 point in the process you feel that it's -- we're
3 taking a path that perhaps the Board is
4 uncomfortable with, you think that maybe it's not
5 the best path to take or you're (sic) ignoring a
6 path that you feel might be important -- here's
7 where a collegial relationship is important to us,
8 but I also realize that we have a very formal
9 process here whereby approvals need to go through
10 a process. So I'm at a little bit of a -- a
11 little bit off-balance here because I like the
12 idea of the interactive, but I also don't want to
13 have hold points unnecessarily.

14 So I think I'd like -- I guess my first point
15 to be made is that we have to learn together where
16 the hold points are important, where we have to
17 stop until you folks have a chance to deliberate,
18 but where we're allowed to continue based on our
19 judgment. We will always inform you of any
20 direction we're taking that might be substantively
21 different than what we originally laid out in the
22 plan that you'll receive a month from now. I
23 guess that's the first point I wanted to make.

24 DR. ZIEMER: John, do you want the Board to
25 comment or react as you proceed here?

1 DR. MAURO: I very much would like --

2 DR. ZIEMER: Or ask questions -- okay. Let's
3 -- on that point -- Tony.

4 DR. ANDRADE: John, and also for the members
5 of the Board, based on your comments and my own
6 thinking as of yesterday, I wholeheartedly agree
7 with the general direction in which you'd like to
8 push forward on. I don't think the criteria like
9 the numbers of employees that have filed are
10 necessarily -- I don't believe that that
11 particular criterion is necessarily a good one at
12 this particular point in time. I believe that
13 you, contractor, would perhaps feel better getting
14 on board that learning curve with addressing
15 perhaps a site that had a limited number of
16 functions -- perhaps a manufacturing function or
17 something like that -- rather than jumping into
18 say Los Alamos, that has everything from
19 theoretical physics to plutonium work. So it's my
20 belief that the Board should consider something
21 like that for a site that we believe is important.

22 DR. ZIEMER: As we proceed here, you're
23 simply hearing comments that do not constitute
24 official direction from the Board. Your task is
25 (off microphone) your task. You are to come with

1 us -- to us in one month with a proposal. You are
2 reflecting some thoughts about that right now --

3 **THE COURT REPORTER:** Okay, he's off-mike.

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** (Off microphone) -- about the
5 nature of what that will look like. I don't think
6 that we can, in any definitive --

7 Oh, I lost the contact. I don't think, in
8 any definitive way, that we can comment beyond
9 some sort of general reactions and so on.
10 Certainly the plan, if it's to be a plan that
11 covers, conceptually, the whole gamut of site
12 profiles, has to be a generic umbrella thing. And
13 I think we understand that there may be specifics
14 that would apply to one facility that might not
15 apply to other facilities. And I presume the plan
16 would spell out how you would get at what those
17 would be for a Savannah River versus a Bethlehem
18 Steel or something like that.

19 **DR. MAURO:** Well, that's -- that brings me --
20 in order for us to take the approach that I'd like
21 to take, namely have an over-arching plan but have
22 an addendum to it that explicitly addresses our
23 plan for a particular facility, it would mean that
24 very shortly you would need to provide us with
25 direction on which ones you'd like us to begin

1 with. I realize we have a list. There's a
2 potential for as many as I believe ten to 12 DOE
3 and two to four AWEs. The sooner -- in light of
4 my thinking now, the sooner we have an initial
5 list of the two, three, four, five that would --
6 you'd like us to begin with, the -- it will -- it
7 will allow us in our next -- in our first
8 deliverable, to address those specific ones so
9 that -- 'cause that's where the rubber meets the
10 road. If that's possible, that would be very
11 helpful. Otherwise what we're going to deliver to
12 you is going to be, quite frankly, of limited -- I
13 hate to say this, but -- it will give you a
14 general idea of how we're going to come at the
15 problem, but I think more importantly is we need
16 specific ideas on how we're going to come at the
17 problem because we're on a track that we're trying
18 to be highly efficient. And how we see efficiency
19 and how we apply our resources is going to be
20 unique to each facility. So I'd like to request a
21 --

22 DR. ZIEMER: I think based on our discussion
23 yesterday, it was our hope that we would have some
24 of those yet identified at this meeting, as I
25 recall.

1 Mark, comment?

2 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, I think the general
3 approach that you described is consistent with
4 what we were thinking and the over-arching plan I
5 think is the deliverable. The only thing I would
6 say is that the site-specific plan -- I tend to
7 agree with you in that I think the site-specific
8 plans -- you can get more specific, but I think
9 there is going to be some iterative, you know,
10 actions as you move through the process, so I'm
11 not sure -- I guess -- I guess what I'm sort of
12 saying is I'd hate to see a lot of time and man-
13 hours spent on those site-specific plans,
14 especially if there's going to be a lot of
15 iterative, you know -- as you move along through
16 the process. So -- but I think the deliverable,
17 as we laid it out, is that first sort of umbrella,
18 generic plan that would give you the flexibility
19 to adapt on different sites as you need to -- you
20 know, as you see fit.

21 DR. MAURO: That being the case -- that being
22 the case, what I'm hearing is -- at least an
23 initial impression -- is that our first
24 deliverable will be a generic plan. But then as
25 we are authorized to proceed with particular

1 profiles, particular sites, it probably would be a
2 good idea for us to -- when we have our internal
3 meetings, to lay out -- to draw upon our
4 resources, our people. How we're going to break
5 it up -- I could -- right now I have a very clear
6 idea in my mind, for example, on Savannah River,
7 how would I come -- how I would do that. When we
8 get to that point, we'd probably want to inform
9 you of that and may-- and how -- and we will
10 deliver something to you to say this is our plan.
11 Now whether that would be considered a deliverable
12 as part of our initial plan procedure or just
13 something that's part of a monthly progress report
14 or -- or some interim reports, just to keep you
15 apprised -- perhaps that's the best way to go. It
16 keeps it simpler. Anyway, those are some
17 thoughts.

18 I move on to my second thought. When we --
19 and I'm not too sure of the extent that we should
20 talk about budget here, and when I say "budget", I
21 mean work hour allocation and the way we do our
22 work. We have gone through a negotiation process
23 as -- and we're at a point where that process is
24 fairly mature. And one of the things is the
25 relationship between the four tasks. Though we

1 proposed each task as a separate item and they are
2 being authorized independently, I see them as
3 fully integrated activities. And I'm going to
4 give you a very important perspective, in my
5 opinion, in terms of having -- in having effects
6 on efficiency, cost and schedule.

7 Let's say we receive a batch of cases that
8 need to be processed, either basic, advanced or
9 one of the two blind dose reconstructions. Let's
10 say we get approval next week and a batch shows
11 up. Okay? Now, visualize we're going to assign
12 the appropriate people, either strong internal
13 dosimetrists, neutron dosimetry, external
14 dosimetry, whatever the needs are, we will have a
15 team of people. And whether it's an advanced
16 review or a basic review, we'll have a team of
17 people working the problem. But I'm starting to
18 realize from conversations during breaks and
19 during -- with individual members of the Board,
20 that a lot -- a lot of the dose reconstruction for
21 the individual cases is drawing from the site
22 profiles. That is, the site profiles are becoming
23 very important documents.

24 Now what this means to me is that I envision
25 -- let's say it's me doing a review of a case, and

1 I realize that I'm going to have to draw upon
2 information that's in the site profile. Now
3 here's the -- here's the -- the catch-22. Let's
4 say for the moment that that site profile is not
5 one of the site profiles that Joe is reviewing.
6 Okay, here I am doing a case -- I'll use Savannah
7 River as an example -- and I'm working it, but I
8 say I need help from Joe on the site profile. And
9 the way in which we budgeted our program was
10 that's going to be available to me. That is, I'm
11 going to be able to go say Joe, I'm looking at
12 this person that worked at this location at this
13 time. I have this bioassay data, or I don't; help
14 me out a little bit here regarding the mix of
15 radionuclides, chemical forms, any -- any
16 information you have on CAMs and RAMs --
17 continuous air monitors and radiation area
18 monitors -- data that might be available in the
19 database because that's going to help me validate,
20 check or fill out my ability to review the dose
21 reconstruction. So there's a presumption here.
22 The presumption is while I'm working out a case at
23 Savannah River, Joe is going to be working on the
24 site profile, Savannah River. If that's not the
25 case, I'm at a loss. So one of the criteria when

1 you select your cases and you select your site
2 profiles, as an operational -- from my -- from an
3 operational perspective, they should be coupled so
4 that I could draw upon that in an efficient way.
5 Because the alternative is then me, as the
6 reviewer of a case, I will have to do my own
7 review of the site profile, independent of Joe,
8 which is an inefficient way to do it. That is, I
9 would -- it -- certainly what I do will be -- add
10 value eventually when Joe gets to that, or when
11 he's authorized to do that, but I see that as
12 being an efficient way to run it.

13 Similarly, though task three has not yet been
14 approved -- task three, by the way, is the review
15 of the procedures, OCAS-1 and two and all the
16 other procedures that ORAU has developed. Now,
17 again, there's going to be a process where we're
18 reviewing -- from a generic point of view, not as
19 they apply to a particular case -- those
20 procedures. The degree to which those reviews are
21 ongoing while I'm doing my case review -- there is
22 a synergy that will occur. I'm envisioning a
23 synergy where we have several minds simultaneously
24 working different aspects of a problem, one group
25 looking at the procedures that are being use--