THE ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIATION AND WORKER HEALTH
NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH
CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION

Summary Minutes of the Fifty-first Meeting Held Telephonically on November 27, 2007

The Fifty-first Meeting of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health (ABRWH or the Board) was held telephonically on November 27, 2007. The meeting was called by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), the agency charged with administering the ABRWH. These summary minutes, as well as a verbatim transcript certified by a court reporter, are available on the Internet on the NIOSH/Office of Compensation Analysis and Support (OCAS) web site located at www.cdc.gov/niosh/ocas.

Those identifying themselves as present included the following:

Board Members:

Dr. Paul Ziemer, Chair; Ms. Josie Beach, Mr. Bradley Clawson, Mr. Michael Gibson, Mr. Mark Griffon, Dr. James Melius, Ms. Wanda Munn, Mr. Robert Presley, Dr. Genevieve Roessler, and Mr. Phillip Schofield.

Designated Federal Official: Dr. Lewis Wade, Executive Secretary.

Federal Agency Attendees:

Department of Health and Human Services:

Ms. Flo Black, Dr. Christine Branche, Mr. Jason Broehm, Mr. Larry Elliott, Ms. Liz Homoki-Titus, Ms. Emily Howell, Dr. James Neton, Mr. Mark Rolfes, Mr. LaVon Rutherford, Mr. David Staudt, Mr. Dave Sundin.

Department of Energy:

Ms. Regina Cano, Mr. Greg Lewis, Mr. Jeff Tack.

Department of Labor: Mr. Jeff Kotsch

Contractors:

Dr. Hans Behling, Ms. Kathy Behling, Dr. Arjun Makhijani, Dr. John Mauro, Dr. Steve Ostrow.

Other Participants:

Ms. Terrie Barrie, ANWAG; Dr. Dan McKeel, SINEW.

* * * * *

The Fifty-first meeting of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health commenced with a roll call by **Dr. Lewis Wade**, Designated Federal Official, confirming a quorum was present. He noted that, due to family illness, **Dr. James Lockey** would not be joining. For reasons of conflict with his academic schedule, **Dr. John Poston** would not be joining. **Mr. Phillip Schofield** would join within the hour.

Dr. Paul Ziemer, Board Chairman, officially called the meeting to order, noting the agenda had been distributed to the Board members and was available on the NIOSH/OCAS web site for any members of the public who wished to access the document.

When it became apparent that a recent change to the agenda had not been updated on the web site, **Dr. Wade** read the agenda into the record.

* * * * *

Chapman Valve SEC Petition Issues
Department of Energy Update

Ms. Regina Cano indicated that **Dr. Pat Worthington** was unable to be on the call today and that she would be speaking on her behalf. **Ms. Cano** expressed appreciation for the modification of the agenda in order to accommodate the travel schedule of the DOE participants.

Ms. Cano reported that early in September NIOSH had requested DOE clarify whether any sources of radioactive material were identified for work which took place at the Dean Street facility. DOE had done considerable research, including going to Y-12 for that purpose. They obtained drawings substantiating Chapman Valve produced valves and manifolds during that time frame on behalf of Y-12. They also contacted Savannah River Site to see if they had any information on Chapman Valve. Springfield Economic Development Center was also contacted for information or records pertaining to the Dean Street facility.

Ms. Cano explained their research indicated the street was still there, but the building had been torn down in the late '40s, and state archives had no record about the mission at that location. As a result, DOE is still unclear as to what kind of work the Dean Street

facility performed.

Mr. Jeff Tack added that documents indicated a reference to purchases by Stone and Webster for the Y-12 facility, acting as an agent for DOE. He contacted S&W for additional information on the site, their role, et cetera, and they were surprised to have heard from him, noting that government records would have gone back to the government. They no longer had anything in their control or possession.

DOE had also been requested to take a look at the potential of responsive information in the basement of Western Massachusetts Committee on Occupational Safety and Health. Their response was that the information in their possession was specific to employees and did not contain information that would change DOE's opinion on the site.

Mr. Tack explained that the drawings at Y-12 made it clear Chapman produced certain products for the Y-12 facility during its construction. There was no indication those products would have been produced from anything other than common materials; i.e., iron, bronze, cast iron, low carbon steel, stainless steel. Nothing indicated in the drawings would have requested products manufactured from radioactive materials, nor could there be determined any other source of radioactive material going back and forth at the time.

Discussion Points:

- The workgroup issue includes the fact that valves had gone to Y-12 and part of the process had been that they were brought back to be repaired or refurbished at the Dean Street facility;
- There is no documentation available to indicate there were such transfers back and forth;
- Petitioners contend that valves and manifolds were returned for rebuild and refurbishing at the Dean Street facility and shipped back to Y-12;
- DOE conversations with some of the Chapman Valve retirees indicate they're not clear, other than that they also had a significant mission relative to providing valves and manifolds to the military, which could very well have been at the same period the Navy Nuclear Program started, in the late '40s;
- There is no way to determine otherwise, and Y-12 has done extensive searches;
- Documentation indicates the Dean Street facility was no longer owned by Chapman Valve after 1947, and through the 1948-1950 City Registers it appears the building was dismantled;
- Petitioners contend the Dean Street facility still exists and currently contains an auto body shop, but the main Chapman Valve

facility has been dismantled;

- DOE will be traveling to Massachusetts shortly to interview one of the former Chapman Valve employees to see if any additional leads or information can be provided;
- Currently there is no information that would change the DOE classification;
- Department of Labor will await information from DOE;
- DOE was unable to find any shipping records from Y-12 back to Chapman Valve;
- Pre-remediation and post-remediation documents indicate that the one enriched sample that was found resulted in no change in the remediation approach;
- There is a 785-page remediation certification docket available to the Board on the O drive;
- DOE is in the process of responding to the letter from Senator Kennedy's office relative to contract numbers;
- The formal letter in which DOE will give a final response to the NIOSH request for further investigation on this site will also be provided to the Board.

*** * * * ***

Dow Madison SEC Petition Issues Update

Ms. Regina Cano from DOE reported DOE had gone to the NNSA side of the agency and requested information from them. The information has been received and DOE is in the process of reviewing it. They also have received results from the FBI on their request for help in deciphering the text of the five purchase orders in question. There were difficulties in the way the FBI characterized their report, and DOE has asked them to re-write the report to clarify some of the issues. FBI wasn't thorough enough in their evaluation. FBI has accommodated DOE on that request and been very cooperative, and the new information will be reviewed as soon as possible.

Additionally, DOE has received information from the Livermore lab, and that information is also being reviewed.

*** * ***

Petitioner Response

Dr. Dan McKeel spoke on behalf of the petitioners, thanking the DOE for its investigations. He indicated he had also had conversations with the FBI, and reported on what he had learned. The FBI has recently been requested to interpret what they found, and that is part of the

clarification mentioned earlier.

Dr. McKeel reported on a conversation with a former employee of Dow and her recollection of the thorium/magnesium alloy, and did not recall shipments from Dow Madison to Rocky Flats, as had been suggested.

Dr. McKeel went on to describe his FOIA requests based on a set of 14 questions to NIOSH, eight of which were converted into FOIA requests. A response has not been received and he expressed his discontent with that process. He indicated he had sent a series of questions to **Ms. Regina Cano** and **Dr. Pat Worthington** at DOE, and hoped that they would be able to provide some answers.

Dr. McKeel further expressed a hope that there would soon be dose reconstructions commenced on the people who fall outside the approved SEC class for Dow.

*** * ***

Discussion Points:

- When will the FBI come back to DOE with a revised report;
- **Dr. McKeel**'s FOIA requests are far ranging and require extensive searches, and they are being worked through currently, with a partial response expected within 30 days.

*** * * * ***

Fiscal Year '08 Tasks for SC&A
Including Site Profiles, Procedures and DR Reviews

Dr. Ziemer noted that **Dr. Wade** had circulated some recommendations based at least partly on the fact that funds set aside for the coming year may not be adequate to do all the tasks the Board had hoped for.

Dr. Wade explained the Board had tasked SC&A with general work for the current fiscal year, and that included the start and completion of four new site profile reviews under Task I; the beginning and completion of 30 new procedures reviews, including review of a PER, under Task III; the review of 60 new dose reconstruction reports and two blind DR reviews under Task IV; and under Task V was set up the mechanism for SC&A to undertake six SEC petition evaluation report reviews, as instructed by the Board. Those are the general parameters for this year's work. SC&A has not been tasked with specific reviews in all categories.

Dr. John Mauro from SC&A had provided a report on November 15 outlining

where SC&A stood in terms of the contract tasks they both had and were expecting, and what that means in terms of their ability to complete all work relative to available monies. The report was earlier provided to Board members and included **Dr. Mauro**'s indication that, to begin and finish everything previously on SC&A's plate and what will be put on their plate this year, there is a potential shortfall of approximately $1.2 million.

Dr. Wade explained that his interpretation is that the situation is not as alarming as one might think, in that the review process has been constantly expanded by the steps that have been gone through, and it is unlikely that in a given fiscal year work would be begun and finished. It almost always carries over. This information is intended just as a heads-up.

Dr. Wade went on to explain that he had taken the information and shared with the Board his recommendations as to how to proceed. He remarked he would like to give SC&A some work to begin, and preserve the need to proceed with caution relative to the money. **Dr. Wade** had also asked **Dr. Mauro** to provide the Board members with his thoughts on new work assignments, which was circulated via e-mail. Additionally, **Dr. Wade** had requested the Board be provided a list of all site profiles completed by NIOSH but which have not yet been reviewed by the Board. That list has been sent by **Mr. Stuart Hinnefeld** from NIOSH.

With those materials before the Board, **Dr. Wade** proposed consideration of assignment of a site profile or two for SC&A to begin in January, with a suggestion that it be discussed now.

Relative to the procedures reviews, **Dr. Wade** suggested that since there is a workgroup on procedures, and new procedures to be reviewed are coming up, perhaps the Board not assign 30 at this time but hold open the fact that they would be assigned to SC&A as the Board or workgroup felt appropriate. **Dr. Wade** went on to remark that he felt it would be appropriate to consider the assignment of one PER for SC&A review since these Program Evaluation Reports are a new wrinkle in the mix.

As to the individual DRs, he noted **Dr. Mauro** has suggested the Board go into the January meeting prepared to select the next 60 cases to be reviewed. **Dr. Wade** commented that serious thought should be given to tasking SC&A with from two to four blind reviews.

On the SEC task **Dr. Wade** discussed the fact that it's always been the process to assign these reviews to SC&A as they became topical with the Board. There are a couple looming, and the Board may want to ask SC&A to begin to review those now. **Dr. Wade** explained he's not trying to rush the Board to any sort of judgment, but a discussion is appropriate

at this point, and coming to closure on these issues in January would be a good idea.

Dr. Mauro added that **Dr. Wade**'s characterization of the budget status and the need to move forward was accurate, but he would suggest, relative to his projection of a shortfall in resources on the site profile reviews, that it is something associated primarily with the closeout process. There are 18 complete site profiles, and some of those have not yet even begun the closeout process. That led him to project that at some time in the future, toward the end of the fiscal year, SC&A is likely to run into resource problems. This coincides with the end of their contract.

Discussion Points:

- Who sent what e-mails when and to whom;
- It might be beneficial to select a couple of site profiles for review and have them in line, and they could be coordinated with questions arising from the DR reviews;
- Two cases were selected for blind review and one those is no longer available for some reason so a replacement case will have to be selected;
- There was a general consensus earlier to do two blind reviews to ensure that the Board is getting out of the process what they expect before they ask SC&A to do more of that type review;
- From the perspective of the procedures workgroup, it makes sense to assign procedures for review as issues arise as a result of other activities rather than trying to develop a list;
- SC&A has delivered to NIOSH and the Board its review of TBD 6000, and Appendix BB to that document will be deliverable the week of December 3;
- Of the various site-specific Appendices, the only one tasked for SC&A review is Appendix BB emphasizing the concerns relative to Betatron exposures;
- The procedures workgroup is leaning towards having SC&A review TBD 6001 as well;
- Considering the new site profiles for review, there was a clear consensus for Sandia National Lab and Argonne East National Lab, with two additional site profile suggestions to be discussed at the January meeting.

As to Task III, there was Board consensus that PER 009 would be authorized for SC&A review, as well as TBD 6001 is under serious consideration. However, authorization is pending workgroup review since a meeting is scheduled for the very near future.

As to Task IV, two blind reviews are close to being underway as soon as the subcommittee passes on the material to SC&A. And in January the subcommittee will look to identify 60 cases for review.

With Task V SEC review assignments being made as appropriate, **Dr. Wade** noted that **Dr. Mauro** had suggested the possibility of Mound, Rocketdyne, the underground test phase at Nevada Test Site, and Lawrence Livermore National Lab as potential reviews. Hanford has been assigned under the 2008 assignments and Fernald is being reviewed as a 2007 assignment. **Dr. Mauro** observed that six SECs for Fiscal Year 2008 can be authorized, and there are three unspecified still for 2007, which in theory leaves nine in scope. He noted that realistically, in terms of the budget, they would probably only be able to do six. Of those six, Hanford is the one that has already been assigned.

After discussion of moving items around, it was concluded that six SEC petition reviews can be assigned to SC&A, with sufficient budget and resources to handle the work.

A motion was made and seconded to task Sanford Cohen & Associates to proceed with the SEC Petition evaluation report review process for the Nevada Test Site.

The motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

*** * * * ***

Procedure for Selection of Board Support Contractor

Dr. Wade reminded the Board that the SC&A contract will run out this year and there will be a recompetition. He observed the two possibilities: That SC&A will be back serving the Board; and that they may not. **Dr. Wade** commented that if SC&A is not selected, there will likely be work left to be done in some of the closeout, which would require the government to extend the performance period of the current contract to see that the work was brought to completion. The period of performance for each task could be extended, as appropriate, without extending the entire contract. The possibility also exists that the government could decide not to task SC&A to bring that to completion, but rather have that done by a new contractor.

Discussion Points:

- An observation that it would be difficult and awkward to work through issues, particularly closeout matrices, that are findings from SC&A when a new contractor has no input;
- SC&A would have to be present to defend their positions, elaborate or

clarify on issues;

- If it's necessary to start with a new contractor, it would be better to start from scratch;
- By the time a new contractor gets up to speed, a lot of valuable time will have been lost;
- There are site profile reviews on which the resolution process hasn't begun;
- It would be awkward for a new contractor to close out a review done by somebody else.

Dr. Wade reminded the Board members that prior to the last face-to-face Board meeting he had shared a draft statement of work, evaluation criteria, et cetera, and there had been a discussion of the possible formation of a technical evaluation committee. The Board members have had time to look at the documents and can now react during this phone call. He noted that nothing has to be finalized, but things should be resolved during the January meeting.

Mr. David Staudt from the Procurement Office commented that the goal is to come out of the January meeting with a final statement of work and evaluation criteria to be incorporated into the solicitation scheduled to go out in late January or February. He explained it would take several months for proposals to be received, and the goal would be an award in mid summer. That would allow a couple of months until another contractor is selected to get ready for SC&A's assistance in any turnover.

Dr. Ziemer observed that this draft is a good overview of what the contractor is doing. And although it's broad in general, it does seem to cover all the tasks. It was agreed that any suggestions or comments from Board members could be e-mailed to **Mr. Staudt** prior to the January Board meeting. **Dr. Wade** remarked that they would like to hear from Board members on any adjustments they would like to see in the evaluation criteria and point values being proposed which had been sent to Board members earlier.

It was suggested that as part of the agenda for the discussion at the January meeting that the budget issues related to the contract be included. **Dr. Wade** commented that another thing for Board members to consider is their involvement in the technical evaluation panel, how many Board members and who they might be. Nothing has to be done today, but in January it would be good to get started on that.

*** * * * ***

Update on Sandia SEC Petition

Mr. LaVon Rutherford from NIOSH provided an introduction into the issues of the Sandia petition, and commented that at the previous Board meeting, after the petitioner's presentation, the petitioner had requested their materials be provided to Board members for review in preparation for this teleconference or the January meeting. **Mr. Rutherford** explained NIOSH has made that information available, it is now on the O drive, and access is available to all Board members. Information includes e-mails received from the petitioner. That notification was by an earlier e-mail to Board members.

Dr. Ziemer commented that there is actually no action before the Board at this time. The evaluation report has been presented and action has already been taken. The materials were provided to NIOSH, whose position is that all issues raised therein were considered in their evaluation report. The only issue would be if Board members believe there is information in the petitioner's information to propose something different from what has already occurred. Since some of the materials were recently received, all members may not have had an opportunity to review everything. The Board could then ask for this matter to appear on the agenda for the January meeting.

There was Board consensus that the materials would be reviewed and the issue would be placed on the agenda for discussion at the January meeting.

*** * * * ***

Board Procedure on Interviews

Dr. Wade explained that SC&A, in their review of Procedure 92, had interviewed some individuals relative to effectiveness of the interview process, closeout interview, et cetera. SC&A had recommended the Board re-interview some of the people because they felt the information would be valuable in terms of the Board's review of procedures. That recommendation triggered a question as to whether it is appropriate for the Board to interview individual claimants, and **Dr. Wade** had been asked to investigate and report on what he had learned.

Referring to the Board's charter, **Dr. Wade** noted that part of the Board's function is to advise the Secretary of HHS on the scientific validity and quality of dose reconstruction efforts performed by this program. To that end, the Board has taken the appropriate step of reviewing procedures. Therefore, if the Board wished to interview people or gather data that goes to the efficacy of procedures, those interviews would be legitimate.

Dr. Wade cautioned that the Board is not an appeals board and should not be reviewing individual cases as such. HHS has previously advised the Board that when it does engage with claimants it should engage only on adjudicated cases. It is a legitimate undertaking for the Board to speak to individuals for the purpose of commenting on the efficacy of procedures, but it must be very clear in the interview, both the setup for and conduct of, that it is not a function of an appeals board.

It is now for the Board to decide if it wants to interview the individuals suggested by SC&A. The first question will be whether they are adjudicated cases. And if the Board chooses to continue, there is a path forward, although the Board doesn't have to proceed down it.

*** * * * ***

Update on Tracking Matrices

Dr. Wade reminded the Board that when last they met he had been asked to consider committing to the Board when transcripts of Board meetings could be posted on the web site. There was talk of 30 days and talk of 45 days. At this point, **Dr. Wade** remarked, he believes it is possible for transcripts of Board meetings, deliberations at Board meetings, to be posted 45 days after the meeting, although there is work yet to be done to accomplish that.

Explaining there are two parts to this effort, one of which is getting the court reporter to provide the material within a 30-day time frame, **Dr. Wade** observed this has been done and all previous Board meeting transcripts have been delivered. The second part is the Privacy Act issue, particularly as it relates to redacting names of individuals who speak during the public comment session or during Board meetings. This is a laborious and time-consuming process which jeopardizes the ability to post transcripts in a timely manner. **Dr. Wade** reported he had met with the appropriate attorneys and other people and looked at the redaction policy. They have come up with a new policy, a copy of which was provided to Board members a few days ago. **Dr. Wade** read the proposed policy into the record. He observed this is a proposed policy and, absent Board members' comments, is a policy that will be followed.

Ms. Liz Homoki-Titus from the Office of General Counsel emphasized that this policy applies to transcripts, as opposed to documents provided through some other means. **Dr. Wade** commented that it is assumed the policy would apply to workgroup meetings as well as full Board and subcommittee meetings.

Discussion Points:

- It would help to have an interim transcript of the Board meeting, with the affected portions redacted while those Privacy Act issues are being worked out, rather than hold up the entire transcript;
- If a person discloses medical information about himself, it doesn't have to be redacted;
- In general, the procedure would not be to redact information an individual provides about himself, but the Privacy Office has asked that that door not be closed completely;
- The Privacy Act issue does not address classified information, they're not reviewing for classified information, and Privacy Act people don't get involved in that;
- Policy has just been announced today and, although it has not been circulated yet, it will be made public;
- The policy covers all the public portions of the Board meetings or workgroup deliberations;
- A suggestion that Item 4 of the policy stating that all disclosure of information regarding third parties would be redacted be presented in bold letters wherever displayed.

Dr. Wade added they were trying to work on a procedure to shortcut the need to wait for a full transcript in order to catch those third-party issues. That plan will be tried out over the next few workgroup meetings to see how it goes.

* * * * *

Subcommittee Update

Mr. Mark Griffon, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Dose Reconstruction Reviews, updated the Board on the status of the review of the fourth and fifth sets of cases. There has been a technical phone call meeting with SC&A and NIOSH to resolve some issues, and those are closer now to completion. It is hoped that the fourth and fifth set matrices will be closed out in the January meeting.

Mr. Griffon reported that he has started drafting the summary report on the first 100 cases reviewed, and hopes to bring a draft to the January subcommittee meeting for discussion.

* * * * *

Workgroup Updates

Rocky Flats Workgroup Chairman **Mr. Mark Griffon** reported the group had met the previous day based on articles recently published in the *Rocky Mountain News* questioning implementation of the SEC class. **Mr. Griffon**

described the types of questions raised in the articles and that the phone call meeting had been a follow up. Actions as a result of the meeting included a talk with the reporter. **Mr. Griffon** also suggested a technical phone call meeting with NIOSH and with the reporter's source of information for the articles, which is a University of Colorado study. He plans to contact **Margaret Ruttenber**, one of the researchers on the study, and she has agreed to work with NIOSH on the phone call, with an eye toward seeking understanding on apparent differences in the newspaper articles to determine if it affects implementation of the class.

Ms. Liz Homoki-Titus clarified that the Department of Labor will also be included in those conversations since that is the agency implementing the class.

*** * ***

Nevada Test Site Workgroup Chairman **Mr. Robert Presley** reported the workgroup is going through two summaries on responses to SC&A's latest comments. A conference call is scheduled to be held very shortly to discuss the findings before going to Las Vegas in January. There is still the possibility of a face-to-face workgroup meeting in Las Vegas before the meeting of the full Board. If a consensus can be reached during the conference call on what action needs to be taken, there will be no need for a face-to-face meeting in January.

*** * ***

Hanford Site Profile and SEC Petition Workgroup Chairman **Dr. James Melius** reported that SC&A had just provided him a draft memo regarding the procedure for reviewing the SEC petition evaluation report and related issues in the site profile, outlining the issues SC&A sees with the evaluation report. He indicated he planned to meet briefly with **Dr. Arjun Makhijani** from SC&A, **Dr. Sam Glover** and **Dr. Jim Neton** from NIOSH in a few days for a brief discussion and to come up with a schedule of how to deal with the Hanford SEC. He noted it was a big petition with a lot of issues, and was further complicated by the federal budget issues which made it difficult to access records. That will also be discussed at their meeting.

Dr. Melius indicated that he hoped by the January meeting to be able to move on with some parts of the SEC review.

*** * ***

Savannah River Site Site Profile Workgroup Chairman **Mr. Mark Griffon** indicated that the group has not met recently. There was one meeting

some time ago, but this workgroup has been on the back burner due to other priorities.

*** * ***

SEC Issues, Including 250-day Issue and Preliminary Review of 85.14 Petitions, Workgroup Chairman **Dr. James Melius** reported that this group is meeting later this week in Cincinnati and will be reviewing two reports from SC&A on these matters. He will have something to report at the January meeting.

*** * ***

Procedures Review Workgroup Chairman **Ms. Wanda Munn** reported that this is a complex and convoluted process in reviewing procedures, but they are doing well with respect to resolution of the significant number of issues with which they were initially faced. She noted a major effort is completely redoing their method of reporting and tracking individual findings because the matrices have become so complex and terminology has become unclear. SC&A, primarily **Ms. Kathy Behling**, has been very helpful in laying out suggestions for an entirely new format. They hope to be able to get that in place within the next few weeks. A face-to-face meeting is coming up very shortly in Cincinnati and the group will be looking at some of the new formats for the first time.

Also to be addressed are the issues surrounding Procedure 92, and there is a matrix devised for that procedure. That will be another item of work when they next meet.

*** * ***

Blockson Chemical SEC Petition Workgroup Chairman **Ms. Wanda Munn** reported that every issue brought forward has now been addressed. All issues have been resolved. White papers substantiating the findings have been produced in each of those cases and will be available for all who want to review them in advance of the Las Vegas meeting. **Ms. Munn** indicated it is the group's intent to declare at that meeting that issues have been adequately resolved, and express a willingness to dissolve the workgroup after hearing recommendations with respect to the site.

*** * ***

Fernald Site Profile and SEC Petition Workgroup Chairman **Mr. Brad Clawson** reported the group had met earlier in the month. They have been working with SC&A and have gone through the complete matrix, and currently NIOSH is developing a white paper. The group is also

awaiting a report on a tiger team interview from the site handled by Chew & Associates. There has been no time set for the group's next meeting.

*** * ***

Workgroup on Use of Surrogate Data Chairman **Dr. James Melius** reported there had been a conference call a week or so ago with the workgroup discussing some information prepared by SC&A. It had been a helpful meeting, and next step will be to get reactions from workgroup members to some of the ideas discussed. **Dr. Melius** indicated he took on the responsibility of drafting a report to be used as guidelines for review of the surrogate data and a fast exit dose reconstruction and SEC evaluation. He hopes to have a draft of that circulating within the workgroup within the next few weeks, and likely another conference call just before the Board meeting in Nevada, with a goal of having something to discuss with the full Board at that meeting.

*** * ***

Workgroup on Worker Outreach Chairman **Mr. Mike Gibson** reported that over the past couple of months he and some other members of the group had attended various types of worker outreach meetings produced by NIOSH to get a feel for the differences in various meetings, how they're conducted, et cetera. The workgroup is trying to work through their schedules to arrive at a time they can have a face-to-face meeting sometime in January.

*** * ***

Linde Ceramics Site Profile Workgroup Chairman **Dr. Genevieve Roessler** reported their first and only meeting had been in March of 2007, transcript of which is on the OCAS web site. Tasks were assigned to NIOSH, the primary one of which was to look further into bioassay data. **Dr. Roessler** indicated she had just learned that they will be receiving the report from NIOSH in a few days, and that will give time for the workgroup and SC&A to review it and be prepared for another workgroup meeting in Las Vegas.

*** * ***

Los Alamos National Laboratory Site Profile and SEC Petition Workgroup Chairman **Mr. Mark Griffon** reported this group has not yet met. There is an outstanding question on the later time period described in the SEC petition and evaluation report, and the workgroup has held off on their meeting until NIOSH has done further work on that issue.

Mr. LaVon Rutherford from NIOSH reported that the issue has not been settled, but will be upon issuance of the revised site profile, which has been slowed by resource issues.

* * * * *

Board Working Time

Dr. Wade announced the only item, which was broached earlier by **Dr. Melius**, was the issue about DOE's funding shortfall and the impact on their ability to procure Hanford data. **Dr. Melius** commented there was no need for further discussion at this time, but possibly at the next workgroup meeting some effort can be made to figure out how to deal with the problem.

Mr. Larry Elliott, Director of the Office of Compensation Analysis and Support, added that a week earlier his office had spoken with people from DOE and the Hanford point of contact, with SC&A people also a party to the conversation. NIOSH agreed to provide SC&A a list of their search indices and keywords so that they could avail themselves of that. Some of the OCAS staff will travel to Hanford and look at some of the boxes that have been retrieved. They have extended an invitation for SC&A to participate in any review that goes on that day.

Mr. Elliott commented that they're in constant communication with DOE in trying to prioritize the work for them so that both the NIOSH effort and the SC&A review effort move forward as quickly as possible.

* * * * *

With an agreement that the calendar of scheduled meetings through February 2009 and the *Rocky Mountain News* articles will be distributed to the Board members, and with no further business to come before the Board, the meeting officially adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

End of Summary Minutes

♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦

I hereby confirm these Summary Minutes are accurate, to the best of my knowledge.

_____
Paul L. Ziemer, Ph.D., Chair

_____

Date