

1 different sites -- SRS, Hanford and Oak Ridge are
2 the ones that I've dealt with mostly -- is that
3 DOE says it does not have the records for workers
4 who have presented Social Security records, W-2
5 forms, affidavits from fellow workers saying that
6 they worked at the site. I've just really been
7 appalled at DOE's lack of thoroughness in getting
8 records, particularly when they -- they have
9 duPont, Westinghouse or Bechtel that they're
10 dealing with. They know these people have the
11 records and all DOE has been doing is just simply
12 asking them and then saying okay, well, if you
13 don't have them, that's it, and workers claims
14 then getting denied.

15 I think by continuing to be persistent in
16 asking for the records, NIOSH can at least
17 document that they are asking for the records over
18 and over again. What I've had in several cases is
19 they say there's no records, and then finally when
20 it gets up to Workers Advocacy in Washington,
21 suddenly all the records are there. And by that
22 time NIOSH has already done the dose
23 reconstruction on a very abbreviated work history
24 and they've lost. And so we get up -- all the way
25 up there.

1 I would point out that the status report sent
2 out by NIOSH that you send out normally really
3 doesn't help much when a dose reconstruction is
4 started and then the status report comes out every
5 month just showing that the dose reconstruction
6 started on the same date, with no changes. I have
7 about a half a dozen clients who have been waiting
8 for more than 180 days for a dose reconstruction
9 and all they get every month is a call saying -- I
10 mean a report, then they call me -- well, all this
11 says is the same thing last month. If it was some
12 kind of expectation or estimate of when the dose
13 reconstruction was going to be completed, then
14 that would give you useful information, I think.

15 Now in light of the testimony of the two
16 ladies last night, I also want to know -- want you
17 to know about several other women who had worked
18 in this administration building at SRS. They
19 worked as secretaries and then had breast cancer.
20 One client of mine with breast cancer was denied
21 benefits because the NIOSH dose reconstruction
22 procedure was based upon her 30 millirems of
23 exposure over seven years, and it was based
24 supposedly on the most favorable dose. But if --
25 as you heard last night, if they were working next

1 to a radiation zone that wasn't separated by any -
2 - any lead or anything else, then there's
3 something that could have happened to these
4 workers. I know of two other workers who were
5 secretaries and they were diagnosed with different
6 cancers. One died in the forties, the other one
7 died in her thirties. And these cases are just
8 the ones I know about or the ones you know about
9 and I know about from last night.

10 I would join David (sic) Miller in asking
11 that the members of this panel look into this
12 situation and do a -- some type of cancer
13 screening of administrative personnel who were
14 almost 100 percent women and who worked in the 700
15 areas at SRS.

16 The last point I would make is that I hope
17 some of you on this committee will also use your
18 expertise to -- with NIOSH's help, to actually
19 perform a dose reconstruction on workers who had
20 lymphomas, leukemia or thyroid cancer. I don't
21 think it's a secret in the scientific community
22 that if you have large numbers of people exposed
23 to radiation that the expected result would be
24 thyroid cancers, lymphomas and leukemias. Somehow
25 the NIOSH dose reconstruction process is not

1 finding that there is at least a 50 percent
2 probability of causation in these particular
3 cases, at least from the cases I've seen. Please
4 look into this problem because I think something
5 is very wrong with the NIOSH procedures for this
6 particular type cancers, the thyroid, the
7 leukemias and the lymphomas.

8 Thank you very much. Any questions?

9 **MR. ELLIOTT:** Questions for Mr. Warren?

10 (No responses)

11 **MR. ELLIOTT:** Last person we have on the
12 sign-up list is Howard Lawson.

13 **MR. LAWSON:** Good afternoon. I guess --
14 yeah, it's afternoon already. I am Howard Lawson.
15 I'm electrician by trade and a union health and
16 safety representative for the atomic trades and
17 labor council at the Y-12 plant in Oak Ridge. And
18 I've got a couple of issues to lay on you, a
19 couple of bricks -- more bricks for your load.
20 But first, on behalf of the ATLC in Oak Ridge, let
21 me thank the Board, each of you, for the work that
22 you do.

23 And one of the issues that I have is the one
24 that we've heard a lot about, and that's the
25 Special Exposure Cohort. But before I get into

1 it, let me remind you just a little bit about Oak
2 Ridge site. And it is one site with three
3 individual plants. We've got the K-25 plant or
4 the gaseous diffusion plant or the -- I guess it's
5 the ETPP now, East Tennessee Technology Plant or
6 something. And of course we have the Y-12 weapons
7 plant where I work, and the X-10 national lab.

8 Let me find my place here. A lot of things
9 I've lost; I miss my mind more than anything a lot
10 of times.

11 Though all three plants are different, and
12 basically all the exposures were the same and the
13 monitoring was the same, is one reason that I
14 think that all plants should be in the special
15 cohort. But like I say, there's three plants on
16 one site and of course K-25 is in the special
17 cohort by virtue of being a gaseous diffusion
18 plant. But the ATLC, if you have a opportunity to
19 advise the powers that be on inclusion of people
20 in the special cohort, the ATLC would like to have
21 the current and former workers at Y-12 and X-10
22 who are affected or have been affected by one of
23 the specific cancers be included in the special
24 cohort as a class of people. Justification for
25 the SEC for X and Y worker is that, like the

1 gentleman that spoke first, talked about the
2 construction workers moving from site to site, the
3 Oak Ridge workers -- maintenance workers routinely
4 went from one site to the other, for training or
5 one reason or another. Another justification for
6 the SEC classification is workers at X-10
7 developed and tested many of the diffusion
8 processes that are used around -- around the
9 country. And in bygone years, accident and
10 exposures happened, especially at the Y-12 plant.
11 We've all read about those that -- in those days -
12 - well, not the criticality one, but the others
13 were considered normal or everyday occurrences.
14 And today they're not, they're considered off-
15 normal occurrences and incidents and they're --
16 just aren't acceptable today, where in days gone
17 by, they were. And I mention that because I want
18 to know if NIOSH can or has taken that into
19 consideration when they're doing the dose
20 reconstruction, or is it possible to -- to
21 estimate those things.

22 The second issue and final issue that I need
23 your help with is the health screening program.
24 Here again, there's a difference among the three
25 plants on the same site. K-25 has the screening,

1 and also they have the scat can -- CAT scan truck
2 that is used for early lung detection. And from
3 what I've heard of the people at K-25, it's -- it
4 does work. It's a good thing. The ATLC would
5 like to see that same process come to -- for the
6 current and former workers at Y-12 and X-10.

7 Now we worked on a screening process with
8 Mark and some more of them on the needs assessment
9 for the screening program, and the last I found
10 out that the medical screening program was in the
11 works and probably will happen. But the CAT scan
12 truck and the early detection system was not going
13 to be part of it. And the ATLC would like to see
14 that -- you know, whatever we can do, whether we
15 borrow it from PACE, which is an outstanding
16 organization, or get a CAT scan truck of our own
17 for the workers at X-10 and Y-12.

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** Thank you very much. Are there
19 any -- those are the four commenters that have
20 signed up. Are there any others here who didn't
21 get a chance to sign up that wish to make public
22 comment?

23 **MS. GANTZ:** Hello. I'm Julie Gantz. I'm a
24 former employee of Savannah River Site. Like I
25 stated last night, I worked in 773-A on D wing and

1 I have been told that the office that I worked in
2 at one time was a contaminated lab that was
3 supposedly cleaned up. It backed up to a fab lab,
4 which was in RCA, and there were several times
5 that they would melt the -- I knew that they were
6 melting circuit boards to get the precious metals
7 and fumes would come over into my office and I
8 would get headaches and my eyes would burn
9 immediately. I never knew when they were down
10 there or what they were doing. I never -- did not
11 know until several incidents went by when they
12 were forced to stop and build a retaining wall.
13 There was no retaining wall in between my office
14 and that RCA, and I have since been -- the
15 recommended decision from NIOSH is to deny my
16 claim, and in my report it says that the dose
17 reconstruction likely overestimates my actual
18 exposure. Well, where's the documentation for
19 that? You know, most of this stuff doesn't really
20 tell you a whole lot, just you know, that... I'm
21 getting nervous. I just wanted to know what
22 documentation that, you know, they used to get all
23 this.

24 DR. ZIEMER: Again, I think in this case we
25 can ask NIOSH staff to individually provide that

1 documentation since that is protected information
2 that probably wouldn't be in public record, but
3 maybe one of the staff can talk with Ms. --

4 MS. GANTZ: 'Cause there are two other women
5 besides me and -- plus my boss, we all had cancer
6 and my boss has died, so you can't exactly talk to
7 him.

8 DR. ZIEMER: It appears that this could also
9 be a case where there were some chemical
10 implications if they were doing circuit board
11 melting, as you described. Unfortunately, this
12 program doesn't address the issue of chemical
13 exposures and health effects of that, but the
14 documentation at least on the radiation dose
15 reconstruction I think -- whatever is needed can
16 probably be provided. Is that -- is that -- I
17 don't think we need to necessarily do that here,
18 but we could have the staff work with -- with you
19 on that.

20 MS. GANTZ: Okay. Thank you.

21 DR. ZIEMER: Thank you very much.

22 MR. ANFIELD: I have one more question.
23 Reflect back to just one small question. I have
24 one -- they was talking about how can they lose
25 the record, I got my check stubs right here to

1 document it, so would that be -- would that
2 recognize my record from E.I. duPont, my check
3 stubs? Just a copy of my check stubs, you know,
4 like they're saying they can't find the records
5 for some of the employees.

6 DR. ZIEMER: I don't know the answer to that.
7 Again, can we ask you to work individually with
8 one of the staff and maybe --

9 MR. ANFIELD: Well, who is the staff?

10 MR. ELLIOTT: (Off microphone) Labor's not
11 here right now (Inaudible) clarification.

12 DR. ZIEMER: That's a -- oh, that's a
13 Department of Labor employment verification issue.

14 MR. ANFIELD: Yes.

15 DR. ZIEMER: Can we provide this gentleman
16 with the person he should contact?

17 MR. ELLIOTT: (Off microphone) Maybe
18 (Inaudible) resource center can help (Inaudible).

19 DR. ZIEMER: We'll try to help you, sir.

20 MR. ANFIELD: Okay. Thank you very much.

21 DR. ZIEMER: This then concludes our open
22 session of the Board meeting. Let me ask if there
23 are any other announcements or issues that need to
24 come before us in open session today.

25 (No responses)

1 If not, we are going to recess for lunch, and
2 the Board will reconvene at 1:30 p.m., at which --
3 which is a closed session. I want to announce to
4 members of the public that that session will be
5 confined to discussion and review of the task
6 order proposal and independent government cost
7 estimate for the Board's contractor, and no other
8 business will be conducted. Thank you very much.

9 (Whereupon, the public portion of the meeting
10 was adjourned, 12:30 p.m.)

11

12

13

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF GEORGIA)
)
COUNTY OF FULTON)

I, STEVEN RAY GREEN, being a Certified Merit Court Reporter in and for the State of Georgia, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript was reduced to typewriting by me personally or under my direct supervision, and is a true, complete, and correct transcript of the aforesaid proceedings reported by me.

I further certify that I am not related to, employed by, counsel to, or attorney for any parties, attorneys, or counsel involved herein; nor am I financially interested in this matter.

WITNESS MY HAND AND OFFICIAL SEAL this 29th day of February, 2004.

Steven R. Green

STEVEN RAY GREEN, CVR-CM
GA CCR No. A-2102

