Centers for Disease Control
National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health
Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health
Work Group on Sandia
Monday, August 13, 2018

The Work Group convened telephonically at 2:00 p.m., Eastern Time, Henry Anderson, Chair, presiding.

Members Present:

Henry Anderson, Chair
Josie Beach, Member
Genevieve S. Roessler, Member

Also Present:

Ted Katz, Designated Federal Official
Ron Buchanan, SC&A
Chris Corwin, DCAS
Joe Fitzgerald, SC&A
Rose Gogliotti, SC&A
Kurt Grimes
Joe Guido, ORAU Team
Chuck Nelson, DCAS
Jim Neton, DCAS
Lavon Rutherford, DCAS

Contents

Proceedings

(2:01 p.m.)

Roll Call/Welcome

Mr. Katz: Welcome everyone to the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health. This is the Sandia Work Group, and today is a pretty simple agenda. We have a presentation by NIOSH on an addendum to the Evaluation Report that's been done on Sandia for the SEC petition, that's been continuing work over a quite a number of years now.

And so we'll have a presentation on that and an opportunity also for the petitioner, if the petitioner is on the line, to comment. We'll have questions and that's it for the agenda, but if you want, the presentation that Chuck Nelson is going to provide for NIOSH on this addendum, it's published on the NIOSH website so folks can follow along on the NIOSH website if they want. And that's the NIOSH website for this program, and you go under scheduled meeting, today's date, and you can pull that presentation up and see the -- Chuck's slides.

Also, I just would remind everyone on the call to please keep your phones muted except when you're addressing the group. And if you don't have a mute button, press *6 to mute your phone and then press *6 again to take your phone off of mute. That would be much appreciated.

Okay then. So my -- the new chair for this Work Group is Dr. Henry Anderson, and he's present, and I also have Members Ms. Josie Beach and Dr. Gen Roessler, they're on the line, so all present for the Work Group. There are no conflicts of interest for Work Group Members from among the Board for any of the Work Groups including this one, so we don't need to address that. But, program people, please address conflict of interest as we go through roll call.

(Roll call.)

Mr. Katz: Okay. So then that takes care of all of the preliminaries. Again, in case anyone joined us late, please mute the phone while you are listening. You press *6 to mute your phone if you don't have a mute button on your phone. And you press *6 again to take your phone off of mute.

And, Andy, it's your meeting.

Chair Anderson: So, thank you. As a new chair, I've been taking a bit of time to get up to speed on this site. As mentioned, it's been underway for quite some time, and it's had several steps to it, and now we're looking at additional information and NIOSH review on expanding the SEC petition here, and I'll turn it over to Charles, Dr. Nelson, to give us an update on where we stand on the '95 and '96 period. And that still leaves outstanding the remainder of the original evaluation, a period of '97 through 2011.

Member Beach: Hey, Henry, this is Josie. This is officially our first Work Group meeting, I believe.

Isn't it, Ted?

Mr. Katz: Yes, that's absolutely true.

Chair Anderson: Oh, what happened?

Member Beach: I didn't know if you knew that.

Mr. Katz: Yes, just a bit of history. The Work Group was formed upon the receipt of the petition, but so far -- NIOSH has presented several times to the full Board because the Evaluation Report initially was presented first to the full Board and then subsequently in establishing parts of the Class, that there was really no matter to dig into in those earlier actions, so the Work Group never -- never needed to been convened yet and we're completely convening this Work Group today because -- just because we have the opportunity to, and it's helpful for the Board.

This is also a recommendation to add from the

program, and it's helpful to the Board if there's already a recommendation from the Work Group associated with NIOSH's recommendation --

Chair Anderson: Okay. I remember -- I went through my prior meetings, and I noticed it was presented several times. I just assumed I was -- you know, I wasn't on any other calls. So, okay. Well --

Mr. Katz: Right, right.

Chair Anderson: Sorry about that, but --

Mr. Katz: No, no. That's all good. That's all good.

Chair Anderson: So, Charles, let's go ahead then.

Evaluation Report Addendum for SEC Petition 188 (1995-1996)

Presentation

Mr. Nelson: Thank you, Dr. Anderson. My name is Chuck Nelson. I'm the Lead Health Physicist for Sandia National Lab. Can everybody hear me okay out there?

Mr. Katz: Yes, you're very clear. Thank you.

Mr. Nelson: Okay. Well, I took over from Dr. Sam Glover in 1996. So I'll just go through this presentation. Incidentally, this same presentation or something very similar will be used at the Advisory Board meeting next week. So this will be good practice for me.

Okay. So let me give you a little history about SEC-188. It qualified back in October 21st, 2011 with an 83.13, and the petitioner proposed a Class that basically included security folks, police, and firemen that worked in any area of Sandia for the period of -- that was Sandia Albuquerque for the period of January 1, 1963 to May 21st, 2011. And based on that, NIOSH proposed a Class to be added to the SEC on February 21st, 2012. And in which case, they

recommended all personnel -- not just the security, police, and firemen, but all personnel that worked in any area of Sandia National Lab in Albuquerque from the period of January 1, '49 through December 31, 1994.

Okay. The basis for that particular Class, the '49 to '94 Class, was insufficient monitoring data and information to reconstruct internal doses, that was all lacking. And it was basically due to internal monitoring program documentation, internal monitoring data, and the lack of process information.

However, it was concluded that external doses, including medical x-rays can be reconstructed through May 21st, 2011. So at this point I'm on Slide 4 now. If that helps you all follow along.

So after that last SEC Class in '49 to '94 that was added, NIOSH did commit to following up and evaluating the monitoring program -- the internal monitoring program and look at the completeness, how sufficient it was, and how appropriate it was for the entire Sandia Albuquerque population. So starting in January 1st, 1995 and it would conclude all the way through, as the petitioner requested, May 21st, 2011.

And we committed to providing that in an addendum which we have done, and we have submitted it to the Advisory Board. With regard to the remainder of the period, '97 through 2011, we'll talk a little bit about it at the end of the presentation, or we could maybe go in sequential order if you all want. I can hold off on the last couple of slides and just get those slides afterwards depending on how you all want to conduct that. Okay.

So for this particular time period, we're talking -- our focus now is 1995 and 1996, we looked at many data sources. We interviewed 17 -- there were actually 17 interviews, there were 15 people. There were five security personnel interviewed, there was seven total health physicists who had -- staff type individuals that interviewed an industrial hygienist, a database

manager, and a researcher. And that's all since the last SEC designation.

And also, along with that, we reviewed over 800 documents that we captured, and they included stuff like internal memos, radiation work permits, radiological surveys, incident reports, air samples, internal dosimetry records as well as breathing zone monitoring. So your personal air sampling. Then to go along with personal air sampling. I still am not used to saying DAC hour but it's Derived Air Concentration hour tracking. So we looked at some of those, some documentation associated with that.

Okay. So I'm on Slide 6. Okay. And let's acknowledge we're looking at the fitness of the monitoring program, how well the data was collected, can we get the data, is it available, and what the program compliance, how well they were in compliance with their written procedures. And along with that, we looked at the Noncompliance Tracking System which is a common thing that we do when we look at the sites in this time period.

And the Occurrence Reporting System as well as the site's internal assessments and procedures. So after looking at all of this information and data for these -- this time period, '95 to '96, we came up with the following proposed Class extension and it is as written.

All employees that worked in any area at Sandia National Lab in Albuquerque, New Mexico, during the period of January 1, 1995 through December 31st, 1996. And there were two bases -- or reasons for this with many subparts, and this is Slide 8.

And so, our basis for this proposed Class was internal monitoring program concerns as well as air monitoring data deficiencies. And I'll go into detail about each of those subparts and what we saw, what our concerns and deficiencies were. But first let's just talk a little bit about the history of Sandia, their internal monitoring program development.

In the early years in Sandia as we concluded in the previous SEC prior to '94, that their internal monitoring program was really performed on an ad hoc basis, and it had been done that way for decades -- several decades prior. And we didn't start seeing some formalization to the program until about 1993. In fact, their first interim internal dosimetry policy was established in December of '93. Then you start seeing some hiring of internal monitoring, internal dosimetrist people with, you know, some good experience and what a health physics program should have.

And so along with that we started seeing very obviously that the internal dosimetry program began undergoing continual development and improvement. We start seeing all these procedures being developed, a lot of internal memos discussing the program and how to come in compliance with the upcoming rules and how they were going to do that. And you start seeing procedures being developed.

Then in '95, '96; our time period that we're focusing on for this addendum, work included monitoring approach changes which I'll talk about in a little while, procedure development, data collection, and review and retention formalization of that data.

So now I'm on Slide 10. And although we saw the internal monitoring program was improving and evolving, we had some concerns in the '95 and '96 time period such as documented program assessments, internal memos, interviews conducted by NIOSH revealed that there appear to be some insufficient radiological internal dosimetry staff -- staffing levels.

You know, they were gearing up with all of this program elements, and there was some discussion about shortage of these personnel. When we dug in further and we found out in the previous evaluations, they had this database called WebDose, and we found a lot of issues with WebDose. It was -- in summary, it was a lack of a fully functional internal

monitoring database which made it really tough to get reliable records.

And we also found some questionable things with retention and retrieval. We also noted we interviewed the internal dosimetry manager at that time, and we also had some internal memos from the same individual, and he stated that there were some data entry errors due to hand entry and the lack of adequate personnel to enter this data in the database.

So as we see this program developing, we also saw that, you know, there were behind the eight ball a little bit, trying to get caught up. And it was a lot of effort there but we're seeing some holes that, you know, led us to have some concerns during this time period.

Okay. I'm on Slide 11. Now, regarding air monitoring data availability, before they were doing pretty much bioassay monitoring and they started merging over to personal and area monitoring in the form, generally, of breathing zone samplers, little personal air samplers. And what we found out is we found those documents when we did site data captures that I'll talk about a little later that when we ask for a record that we couldn't find them in those time periods.

Also during the '95 and '96 time period, the procedure requirements for air sampling records, review and retention, we just didn't find a whole lot of evidence of those. And also going back to talk about personal air samples, 3D zone or BZ samplers, when you do those type -- use those type of samplers you generally accrue DAC hours and you track those to determine if an individual might need further internal monitoring. Well, we didn't see good procedures for that until about June of 1996.

So continuing on with the air monitoring data availability on Slide 12. We were also looking for evidence of those DAC-hour tracking and accrual records for '95 and '96 but we did find procedures in

'97 for that, and that led us to these concerns. Let's see. Also, we also noted personal air sampling monitoring wasn't stored in the WebDose database.

So based on all of this, it led us to make the following conclusions for the '95 to '96 time period. And this is all regarding internal dose reconstruction feasibility. NIOSH has uncertainties and concerns associated with the transitional and developmental nature of the Sandia internal monitoring program in '95 and '96. And although the -- while the site was making several improvements during this time period including the increase in the use of personal and area air monitoring, it seemed to be lacking the formalization, and NIOSH did not find adequate evidence that some key implementing procedures were fully in place during this time period.

Until really, we saw some of it coming in '96 and '97. That's why we added the -- these couple of years where we were having these issues. So a conclusion, continuing on to Slide 14, air monitoring data has been judged insufficient due to lack of required retention, record retention and review procedures during '95 and through December 1, 1996.

So for both '95 and '96. Again, we didn't see a fully functioning internal monitoring database which allowed us for efficient and reliable record retrieval, and seeing a lack of retention of some of these records. So based on this lack of data availability and the internal monitoring program concerns that I discussed, we basically determined that dose reconstructs for internal doses for '95 and '96 period is not feasible.

So on to Slide 15, moving on to talk about the number of claims affected by this proposed Class extension. There were 243 total claims for workers with employment during the '95 and '96 period. Out of those, five claims had internal dosimetry data and 95 had external dosimetry data.

Then at the end of Slide 16, one of the standard tables that you all like to see, certainly at the

Advisory Board meeting, is the feasibility findings. So, this is just a summary of kind of what we talked about. First for internal doses, we determined for '95 and '96, dose reconstructions are not feasible. Then as indicated in the previous SEC evaluation, external doses are able to be reconstructed for beta and gamma, neutron, and occupational medical x-rays.

So viewing all that together in summary, NIOSH has determined that workplace monitoring data and documentation are insufficient to reconstruct internal doses from January 1, 1995 through December 31st, 1996. And then -- so the Class definition, again, would be all employees that worked in any area of Sandia National Lab Albuquerque, New Mexico during the period of January 1, 1995 through December 31, 1996.

And as always, Slide 18, although we found we weren't able to reconstruct internal doses for '95 and '96, we will only use any available internal monitoring data that becomes available for an individual claim.

Then I guess I will skip the last two slides to go in line with the agenda because the agenda just says presentation for '95 and '96. Then Item Number 2 is updating the '97 through 2011 period. So that would be the end of this presentation for '95 and '96.

Discussion

Chair Anderson: Okay, thank you. Are there -- of the other two Board Members, are there any questions you have?

Member Beach: Yes, this is Josie. I have one back on Slide -- let's see. I think it's 11. I only numbered these haphazardly. Give me a second.

Chair Anderson: Sure. The only thing that I would add is it would be helpful if on the slides we would put --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Chair Anderson: -- the number on the corners.

Member Beach: So, you guys, you cut it off at the end of '96. I understand that. You talked about the procedures improved in June, but that one bullet that says they seemed to lack formalization and that NIOSH didn't find adequate evidence of implementing the procedures until '96, '97 that's pretty loose. I guess I'm wondering how -- why you came to the cutoff at the end of '96 and not into '97 a little bit.

Did you find that the WebDose ---

Mr. Nelson: Well --

Member Beach: -- was up and running by the first of the -- '97?

Mr. Nelson: Yes, that's what we -- we felt more comfortable about the use of breathing zone air monitoring and the tracking of the DAC hours.

Member Beach: So you saw a lot more in there? More ---

Mr. Nelson: Yes. Well, yes. '97 seemed to be a defined year when that got better then we wanted to -- we'll go on and talk about '97 through 2011 and where we are with that.

Member Beach: Yes, I was just interested in the cut-off.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Member Beach: Okay.

Mr. Rutherford: I will add, Josie, this is Bomber -- Lavon. We clearly saw the '95, '96 period definitely lacked DAC-hour tracking and it was proceduralized in June of '96, I believe.

Mr. Nelson: Yes.

Mr. Rutherford: And we did see that tracking starting

in 1997. So that's where we stopped at this point. But there are still other issues that we're working on, and we'll get into that later.

Member Beach: Okay. And the external, are you going to go -- do you have documentation for that or coworker modeling?

Mr. Nelson: Yes, that was covered in the last SEC, and it trickled all the way through 2011 that showed that it was feasible.

Member Beach: Right. Okay.

Mr. Nelson: So this --

Chair Anderson: Can we talk about what the years -- so, maybe review that determination or at least a descriptor of what data was available via -- the group here is pretty broad when it's all employees and the question is if at some point they're going to be able to do dose reconstruction. The question is then which employees and who's covered by what.

I mean, the internal -- inadequate and that sort of means you don't necessarily have to describe or discuss who was internally monitored and what the procedures were at the time, but at some point we're really going to need to know, you know, is it going to be feasible or not. If it is going to be feasible, it's feasible for who? Which employees?

Mr. Rutherford: Yes, it -- Dr. Anderson, you're talking about the internal monitoring. I think that's what you just said. And the internal monitoring, we would discuss that later for the '97 to 2011 period in the final addendum.

The external data -- external dose determination from NIOSH was issued in the original SEC-188 Evaluation Report. SC&A can review that as part of, you know, if the Work Group wants them to review that but they're -- again, that Class was already included, and our determination was in that.

Chair Anderson: No, I am just kind of trying to set up the kind of information we need because all of the subsequent determinations aren't to add them, and it's really is there sufficient information to do dose reconstruction.

So a group shouldn't be added to the SEC but if the -- there's deficiencies that continue into the -- up to 2011, you know, then that becomes a bit of a moot issue. But I don't remember us reviewing -- or, SEC reviewing the external dose where it's like on the slide here you say it was determined that it was feasible to do dose reconstruction.

And I don't know how thoroughly that was reviewed by the Board Members at the time.

Mr. Rutherford: Well, I don't think it was very thoroughly reviewed at the time.

Chair Anderson: Right.

Mr. Rutherford: I think -- what I would -- I mean, just, you know, my thoughts are since this recommendation is for an addition as you pointed out, that the Board may want to consider the '97 through 2011 period. If we determine dose reconstruction is feasible, internal and external, during that time period, that may be the time when the Board and -- you know, would want to look at that a little closer. That's just my thoughts.

Chair Anderson: I -- I mean, that's kind of where I was headed. I just don't want a it's feasible determination to now having two different groups to be added, have that and assume that that's been thoroughly vetted, that it is, in fact, feasible for the external radiation.

Mr. Katz: Right. This is Ted. Bomber, so I think the bottom line, I think, of what Andy is getting at is should the next DR report find that internal is feasible for the final period of the Class -- and I think that report comes out later this year, the end of the year. But then it probably would be helpful for that report

to go thoroughly into the external matter if the original report didn't, just so that the Board is -- you know, as much of that work has been done as possible.

Mr. Rutherford: Okay. I understand now.

Mr. Katz: Yes.

Mr. Rutherford: I -- okay.

Mr. Katz: I think that's the point.

Mr. Rutherford: Yes. I think what we could do is go back and we'll look at our evaluation again on the external, and we can even include that somewhat as an additional information in the addendum and in the presentation as well.

Mr. Katz: Yes, that -- I think just to be fine if their -- that's light on the detail that normally gets -- is needed when we come to a potential denial and that's when it would be -- and it would be good to make it robust.

Chair Anderson: I mean, I -- looking at this, I'm supportive of adding this group to it, but in doing so, I don't want it to be implied that because you're able to -- can't be done for the external doses that we're signing off on that as well.

Mr. Katz: Right. And that's the -- Andy --

Chair Anderson: I mean, that's my -- and I think external people looking at it and reading things could well come to the assumption, oh well, the only problem here to address going forward is the internal dose and as now you're saying, that program is moving forward. I don't want us to just review at what point are we comfortable that the internal dosimetry information can be used.

Member Beach: It sounds like a follow-up would be a Work Group meeting for the -- for what's left. I mean, once this one is done then we'll have to figure out where we're heading. Right?

Mr. Katz: Well, we -- Josie, we don't need to wait for them to see --

Member Beach: Yes -- I know.

Mr. Katz: -- the final ER report and then that's what we're trying to set up in what--

Member Beach: Right.

Mr. Katz: -- in all of what Andy's trying to say.

Member Beach: Yes. No, I agree.

Mr. Katz: Getting as much work done on that in advance of when that report gets presented so that we don't have a long tail end digging into it.

Member Beach: Okay.

Mr. Katz: Okay.

Member Roessler: This is Gen. I have a comment.

Mr. Katz: Go ahead, Gen. You're a little bit light, your volume.

Member Roessler: Okay. I'll try speak a little more into the phone. And actually on this period I have a question later, but I didn't remember much about this site. So I thank you for a nice, clear presentation and concisely putting a picture together. My comment is on Page -- on Slide 16, you have a couple of typos and maybe you want to look at those before you present this to the Board.

Mr. Nelson: Okay. I appreciate that.

Member Roessler: Yes, in the heading it should be SEC and then in one of the column headings there's a space missing. And that's all I have to say at this point.

Mr. Nelson: I want to make sure I captured that. You said the heading, SEC?

Member Roessler: It looks like SEG on my slide.

Mr. Nelson: Oh, really? Okay.

Chair Anderson: -- see on mine.

Mr. Nelson: Okay. I'll check and make sure on that.

Member Roessler: And then the second column heading, I think you need a space. See, I'm kind of an editor. So --

Mr. Nelson: Well, I appreciate it.

Member Roessler: -- dose reconstruction space and then the I-S.

Mr. Nelson: Is? Okay. Okay, thank you.

Dr. Neton: That's interesting. This is Jim. My slide clearly says SEC on it.

Member Roessler: And mine clearly -- this -- and that's --

Dr. Neton: Are you looking on the Skype or are you looking on the --

Member Roessler: No, I'm looking at the one that was posted on the website.

Dr. Neton: Okay. That's the difference then, I'll bet.

Member Roessler: Okay. Maybe that was corrected.

Chair Anderson: It looks fine to me.

Member Roessler: Well, I need new glasses, but this one's pretty clear. So --

Mr. Nelson: I'll definitely make sure it's -- before it went over to the Advisory Board that that's taken care of.

Member Roessler: Thank you.

Mr. Nelson: I appreciate it.

Chair Anderson: Are there any other comments?

Do we want to hear from the petitioner?

Mr. Katz: Let's check and see did -- first of all, do we -- has the petitioner joined us? That's the question.

Okay. Not hearing the petitioner. Mr. Grimes, Kurt Grimes, you -- would you also -- do you have any comments or questions you want to raise at this point about this addition?

Mr. Grimes: No. Any comments or questions I would have would be related to -- from 1997 through 2011.

Mr. Katz: Okay. Well, maybe -- how about if let them discuss this then and then if you want, if you have any comments or questions you could ask them after they talk about that.

Mr. Grimes: Sure.

Mr. Katz: Is that good with you? Okay. Andy?

Motion to Approve Proposal

Chair Anderson: So my sense of some of the questions is that I think we need to move forward as the -- and as Chair I don't know if I can do that. If one of you want to propose that we vote to support the addition of this group to the SEC.

Member Beach: Sure, Andy. I'll make that proposal -- this is Josie -- that we agree with this proposal.

Member Roessler: And I second it.

Chair Anderson: Is that okay, Ted?

Member Roessler: Yes, I second it.

Chair Anderson: Okay. Now we've got it. So, with that -- and I also support it so I think we can indicate that we voted unanimously to add this to the SEC-188 Class.

Mr. Katz: Right. Thanks, Andy.

Chair Anderson: So we can do that out in Providence

after the update for everybody.

Member Roessler: Right.

Chair Anderson: And then we'll move on to talking about '97 to 2011.

Presentation Update of the Evaluation of Remaining SEC Period (1997-2011)

Mr. Nelson: Okay, Dr. Anderson. Thank you. This is Chuck Nelson again. I'll go ahead and cover these last two slides, 19 and 20. And, you know, as we mentioned, we went through '96, December 31st, '96 made the cut-off. So from the period of '97 through 2011, we were in the middle of -- well, what we did is we got a -- let me follow my slides here before I get out of order. Okay.

We did an extensive evaluation of the whole entire period, '95 through '97. However, when we received the last version, we got many versions of WebDose. Every time we comment, we get a new version. When we got the last version of WebDose, we had some issues with some of the internal monitoring data within the WebDose. So we've been in communication with the site exchanging data requests and requests to clarify things. And they have promised to get us that information in September.

So that's the current plan there. We also had -- and we got that latest version in May of 2018. There was no way that we were going to get that in time for this next Board meeting. So we went forward with the '95 to '96. We also got -- Chris Corwin, do you remember the number of air samples that we got?

We requested many, many air samples and we had a lot of data to look at so we could get a look at the air monitoring program.

Ms. Corwin: I can't remember the exact number, but it was at least hundreds.

Mr. Nelson: How much -- hundreds, wasn't it?

Ms. Corwin: At least, yes.

Mr. Guido: This is Joe. It's like 6,000 pages.

Ms. Corwin: Yes.

Mr. Nelson: About --

Mr. Guido: A page, you know -- a page may or may not represent an air sample because sometimes they're spread across a couple of pages and sometimes a page has multiple air samples on it.

So, we're -- that's a -- to what we're doing right now but that's one of the things we're looking at when we get that air sample data. But I think it was, you know, thousands of pages.

Mr. Nelson: So we felt we needed to go through some air sample data also. So that's really what's holding us up on these final years right here.

So just to put that in a summary; Slide 20. Analysis is ongoing, and we really need to look at this data to accurately assess and present the availability of the internal monitoring data and how sufficient it is for that time period.

We expect to be done with that Evaluation Report by the end of 2018, and when that does occur then it will be a separate report -- Evaluation Report from January 1, '97 through May 21st, 2011.

Chair Anderson: Okay. Then we are making some progress.

Mr. Katz: You know, and, Chuck, can I just ask in terms of the time line. Just -- I know it's hard to forecast this very precisely, how long it's going to take to analyze a bunch of data, organize it and so on. But we have a Board meeting in December, a couple of weeks into December. So when you say late, are you thinking sometime in November, sometime in December? It's just -- it will help us to

know planning forward.

Mr. Nelson: I think I'll let Lavon Rutherford answer that one.

Mr. Rutherford: All right. You know, Ted, it's -- right now we're right -- you know, if everything fell perfectly, we'd be right at the cusp of, you know, the first -- end of November, first of December of having it.

So I doubt if it's going to be ready for that meeting. But, you know, I -- we're going to shoot -- that's what we're shooting for. Okay?

Mr. Katz: Okay.

Mr. Rutherford: We're shooting to try to get that addendum done and -- so we can present at that meeting.

Mr. Katz: Okay.

Mr. Rutherford: There are definitely a lot of obstacles in the way.

Mr. Katz: I completely understand. I just -- but it's still helpful. Thanks.

Chair Anderson: Yes, it sounds like we can get an update presentation there, but, depending what the conclusion is, I think the committee probably will want SC&A to take a look at that as well.

So I don't think we can -- unless it's to add the whole group, that we would be prepared to do something that, you know, in the last few weeks or something before the Board meeting.

Mr. Katz: Have courage, Dr. ---

Chair Anderson: No, well -- I was just trying to -- I -- you know, I just want to be sure we have reviewed all of the information very rigorously if, in fact, it's -- as we get closer to kind of the current day period and this better monitoring and things going on. The

activities that are ongoing today, one would hope that there would be, you know, good solid data available to -- at some point here.

Mr. Katz: Right.

Chair Anderson: To become feasible, but we need to then be sure that we --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Mr. Katz: You know, I think for -- I think could be probably -- in part to help the people at the site understand how this process works and --

Chair Anderson: Right, that's --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Chair Anderson: -- get something down in the minutes and notes of the meeting --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Chair Anderson: -- still quite a bit of review work to be done.

Mr. Katz: For -- right, for claimants' benefit. If they end up recommending against adding more Class at the end then pretty certainly there won't be a final action on the SEC at the December meeting even if the report is ready in time. That's the bottom line.

Member Roessler: Henry, I have a question.

Chair Anderson: Sure.

Member Roessler: Yes, this is Gen. And I looked at this on the website, and maybe I didn't take enough time, but there's a really defined end date of May 21st, 2011 for this period.

What is the reason for that?

Chair Anderson: I have no idea. I saw that. I --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Mr. Nelson: Yes. Well, what I was going to say is that was the date that the petitioner specified. And I'm not sure what the driver was, quite honestly, for that date.

Member Roessler: That would be something I think we'd need to know.

Mr. Nelson: Okay.

Mr. Rutherford: That's something we can look into -- or we can verify and we'll make sure we have an understanding of that.

Member Roessler: Thank you.

Chair Anderson: Any other comments or issues?

Mr. Rutherford: I will say, most likely, it's tied to an employment date, but I need to verify that. So -- because usually what happens with petitioners is petitioners will define a Class based on employment dates. I don't know about that in this case. I don't know if that's true or not. So --

Chair Anderson: Okay. We'll just have to keep that in mind.

Any other comments? We got an update. We've got a semi-time line on the -- moving forward. I think we've got what we need for presentation and discussion with the Board in Providence.

So, Ted, we have anything else to cover now?

Mr. Katz: I just would give Kurt the opportunity, if you do want to say something about what you've heard now or ask any other questions, that would be helpful to you now since you're on the line, you're welcome to.

Mr. Grimes: Oh, okay. No, what it sounded like is that additional information is being compiled and then that will be discussed, if possible, at the next meeting, the one you were talking about in December. But, potentially, that's not going to

happen. It may not be done, as Mr. Rutherford said, by that time, so it would have to be considered later on.

Was I correct on that?

Mr. Katz: Yes. I think you got that all straight.

Mr. Grimes: Yes, okay. Yes, the only thing, and we'll probably be calling in anyway the next time you meet and giving our official, on the record, you might say, comments. But probably what it's going to center around is the internal measurements because I know that's been part of the difficulty there is getting those, and it sounds like maybe from -- at some point in 1997 on that the program became more structured, more accurate, and more reliable. But that's only as good as if they are actually doing those internal measurements.

And I'm -- that's one of the concerns we have in our occupation is that -- and I believe the Chairman brought it up before is the fact that at some point in time during that time period, we may have to look at whether or not all classifications of employees at Sandia would be covered by dose reconstruction due to them being monitored internally, or whether or not -- or they would not be able to do dose reconstruction on all employees.

As of right now, the petition has included all employees of Sandia, but I do foresee at some point in time where it's going to come where we're going to have to start looking at employee populations as far as whether or not they were actually monitored. Because I know in our employee population, we were not, unless there was some type of serious incident that took place that, you know, required that, then we were not monitored.

I know there are probably others at Sandia who were. Maybe some of the health physicists, some of those occupations, they were probably more monitored than we were, obviously. The thing is though, is we worked around them. It wasn't like they worked in

isolation. We were actually there with them.

I mean, I worked around it from 1991 until 2006, and I don't believe I ever had any internal measurement done on me.

So that's -- the Chairman, I believe, brought that up earlier, and I think that is going to be something that somewhere down the road we'll have to sort of start looking at that. It's not necessarily for the entire population of the labs which is what we -- what had been covered so far under the SEC, but we're not -- we'd have to break that down into specific populations of employees.

Mr. Katz: Thanks, Kurt. So, you know we have a meeting next week, right, of the full Board, Kurt, so that will be an opportunity during public comment session and certainly the petitioner during the SEC discussions that --discussion of this petition, those are options to talk about these things too.

Mr. Grimes: Exactly. That's why I mentioned we would be following up with it in a more formal basis later on, but since you did give me the opportunity to say something, I went ahead.

Mr. Katz: Yes. Thank you.

Chair Anderson: Okay. You stated it more concisely than I did. So thank you.

Okay. Any other comments?

Ted?

Adjourn

Mr. Katz: I think we are ready to adjourn. Thank you, everybody.

Chair Anderson: I'll entertain a unanimous motion to end --

Mr. Katz: We're usually not that formal, but ---

Member Roessler: I'm good.

Mr. Katz: The meeting is adjourned.

Chair Anderson: Okay. Thank you very much.

Mr. Katz: Thanks everybody.

Member Beach: Bye.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 2:49 p.m.)