U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL 1 NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

+ + + + +

ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIATION AND WORKER HEALTH

+ + + + +

WORK GROUP ON SAVANNAH RIVER

+ + + + +

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2013

+ + + + +

The Work Group convened telephonically at 1:00 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, MARK GRIFFON, Chairman, presiding.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

MARK GRIFFON, Chairman BRADLEY P. CLAWSON JAMES E. LOCKEY

NEAL R. GROSS

ALSO PRESENT:

2

THEODORE M. KATZ, Designated Federal
Official
DAVID ANDERSON
MATT ARNO, ORAU Team
ELIZABETH BRACKETT, ORAU Team
JOE FITZGERALD, SC&A
STU HINNEFELD, DCAS
MIKE MAHATHY, ORAU Team
ARJUN MAKHIJANI, SC&A
PAT McCLOSKEY, ORAU Team
JIM NETON, DCAS
KNUT RINGEN
LAVON RUTHERFORD, DCAS
TIM TAULBEE, DCAS

NEAL R. GROSS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM	3 PAGE
Welcome and roll call	4
1. Update of NIOSH actions	6
a. OTIB-81b. Np urinalysis data availability post 1990	6 9
c. Status of whole body scan issues discussed on technical call	s 13
d. Example DRs	14
2. Update of SCA actions	24
a. Status of site visitb. Status of review of Addendum 3, regarding thorium dose reconstruction	24 27
<pre>c. Status of review of ORAUT-RPRT-56 on Np (Matrix issue 5)</pre>	27
d. Status of review of other ORAUT reports issued last year: trivalent actinides, tritium, fission products, exotic radionuclides	29

NEAL R. GROSS

3. Other matrix issues

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(1:00 p.m.)

WELCOME AND ROLL CALL

MR. KATZ: Why don't we do the roll call and remind Board Members and agency-related staff to keep the conflict of interest since we are speaking about specific sites. And we'll get going beginning with Board Members.

(Roll call.)

MR. KATZ: Okay. Very good. The agenda is on the website, NIOSH website, under the Board section, under Meetings. There is an agenda. I don't believe there are any other documents associated with the agenda or they certainly are not posted.

And let me just ask everyone who is not speaking, not speaking, mute your phones. Press *6 if you don't have a mute button to mute your phone. And then press *6 again to come off of mute. That will make the

NEAL R. GROSS

audio better.

5

And, Mark, it's your agenda.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. Thanks,

Ted. And thanks, everyone, for making this

5 call.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I had put together a brief Yes. And it falls primarily in two agenda. sections, the first section being NIOSH actions, the second being SC&A updates and actions. And then last is other matrix items that we may have not covered. So, as NIOSH and SC&A are doing these two items, I would also say it might be useful to, if I missed anything, you know, elaborate on other work that you are working on. But I think I hit the primary ones that we want to discuss. And some of this is follow-up from a technical call that we had. So I hope this will be useful in that regard as well.

So I think I can turn it over to, probably Tim if you are going to be addressing

NEAL R. GROSS

these to start with OTIB-81. And maybe you can just describe this just so everyone knows what OTIB-81 is. And you can go through the items in any order you think makes sense, too.

I should say that.

DR. TAULBEE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: All right.

DR. TAULBEE: No problem, Mark.

UPDATE OF NIOSH ACTIONS

A. OTIB-81

DR. TAULBEE: OTIB-81 is our general coworker model for the entire Savannah River Site, which incorporates tritium, plutonium, uranium, neptunium, americium, curium, californium, mixed fission products.

I think I sent you an email last evening about identifying that OTIB-81 has been approved internally here at NIOSH. And so I posted it out there for the Work Group Members that they can now begin to review and look at. It hasn't been approved for public

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

release yet. I was hoping it would be by yesterday evening or today, but we are just waiting on the final review from DOE for public release. It shouldn't be an issue at all.

It has already gone through one particular review. So as soon as that is available, we will post it on our website, but, as far as we're concerned, you know, it is there for the Work Group to begin to review or consider as part of our coworker models for workers who were at Savannah River and didn't have bioassay for a particular radionuclide.

Now, keep in mind that in the past, we have had a very low need for a coworker model because there is so much bioassay for the workers in particular areas; for example, workers in the tritium facilities. Virtually everybody was monitored for tritium. And so this coworker model is really for cases where we're applying it to

This transcript of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Savannah River Site Work Group,
has been reviewed for concerns under the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a) and personally identifiable
information has been redacted as necessary. The transcript, however, has not been reviewed and
certified by the Chair of the Savannah River Site Work Group for accuracy at this time. The reader should
be cautioned that this transcript is for information only and is subject to change.

workers who we find possibly should have been monitored that the site didn't monitor. the population is not huge for this the application of this particular OTIB, but it's there for the worker to review now. MEMBER CLAWSON: Hey, Tim, this is Brad Clawson. I hate to interrupt, but where is this OTIB? Is it on the SRDB or what would it be under? DR. TAULBEE: It would be under the Savannah River Site SEC directory on your -- I don't know if it's your O: drive or K: drive. I don't know which one it is you all call it. Has anybody in the Work Group been able to find that?

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. I haven't. I didn't get a chance to look at your email last night. I was traveling this morning. So I have not.

MEMBER CLAWSON: That's been my problem. I haven't been able to get onto it,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

This transcript of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Savannah River Site Work Group,
has been reviewed for concerns under the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a) and personally identifiable
information has been redacted as necessary. The transcript, however, has not been reviewed and
certified by the Chair of the Savannah River Site Work Group for accuracy at this time. The reader should
be cautioned that this transcript is for information only and is subject to change.

but I needed to know for sure where it was at 9 so I could kind of refine my search. Sorry about interrupting. I just wanted to make sure I knew where it was at.

MR. KATZ: Tim, this is Ted. This is Ted. That was Brad a moment ago. Tim, I didn't get a copy of an email or anything related to this, but could you please send it to me so I can make sure it gets distributed to everyone it needs to go to?

DR. TAULBEE: Sure. Will do.

Sorry, Ted. I apologize for not having you on that. Okay. And yes, I will do that so that everybody can find it.

DR. KATZ: Okay. Thanks.

DR. NETON: Maybe even put the pack, the file pack --

DR. TAULBEE: I will try and put the file pack in that email -- okay? -- which kind of gets us to item number 2.

B. NP URINALYSIS DATA AVAILABILITY POST

NEAL R. GROSS

DR. TAULBEE: This is where I think there is a miscommunication, I think from our technical call about the neptunium urinalysis availability post-1990. In OTIB-81, there are hundreds of neptunium results post-1990 that we used in the coworker models all the way up through 2006.

So this data is available. And we used it as part of OTIB-81. I think there is some misunderstanding with the -- I believe it was Report 56. Is that the right number?

What the intent of that report was, it's simply to compare construction trades workers with regular operations workers for neptunium exposures.

And so we only went up through

1989 for that particular comparison. And we
weren't seeing any difference. So we didn't
continue on with that. You know, if the Work
Group feels that it is important that we

continue on with that evaluation for the 11 post-1989, we can. It's just a lot of coding effort to try and identify who is construction trades, who wasn't, whereas previous efforts have made that very easy for us to do.

So there is data available. It is there in OTIB-81. So that is one of the things that I just think there is a misunderstanding on this particular agenda item. Are there any questions associated with that neptunium urinalysis data?

DR. MAKHIJANI: This is Arjun.

Actually, once you explained that the Report

56 was to compare construction workers and

non-construction workers, I understood that.

So there wasn't a misunderstanding. It's,

during the call, you had said that you are

going to use urinalysis data post-1990. And

1990 and afterwards was not mentioned at all

in Report 56. And so we didn't have the

urinalysis data. And so the request was to

1 make it available. Presumably, is it there in 12 2 a spreadsheet format that you can post? 3 DR. TAULBEE: It is not in spreadsheet form in OTIB-81, obviously. 4 5 sure, we can get that data posted for you. DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, because we 6 7 will need that. We will need the detailed 8 compilation of the data to look at. 9 DR. TAULBEE: Okay. Do you just need it for neptunium or for other 10 radionuclides for 81? 11 DR. MAKHIJANI: We would need all 12 13 of the data that you have used in TIB-81. 14 Now, some of it we may have or we may not 15 I thought we had all of the tritium 16 data that you are using, but maybe you updated 17 your files. So if you could put the files 18 that you are using with the dates on which they were compiled in that same directory, it 19 20 would be very helpful.

DR. TAULBEE: Okay. We will get

1 that posted. It is probably going to take us 13 2 a few days to compile all of that. So give us 3 a couple of weeks here, and we'll get that up there for you. 4 5 DR. MAKHIJANI: That's fine. I have one other question, if I might, Mark. 6 That pre-1990 neptunium dose reconstruction 7 8 method has not changed from what you indicated 9 in Report 56, right? It's still using the whole body count. 10 DR. TAULBEE: That is correct. 11 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay. Fine. 12 Jim, this is Matt Arno. 13 MR. ARNO: Let me clarify. It's the body counts for a 14 In the '60s, it's 15 certain time period. 16 usually using urinalysis data. 17 DR. TAULBEE: Yes. Thank you, 18 Matt, for reminding me of that. Yes. And OTIB-81 actually points that out, Arjun, that 19 20 in the 1960s, we were using urinalysis.

Nineteen seventies and '80s, we used whole

This transcript of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Savannah River Site Work Group,
has been reviewed for concerns under the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a) and personally identifiable
information has been redacted as necessary. The transcript, however, has not been reviewed and
certified by the Chair of the Savannah River Site Work Group for accuracy at this time. The reader should
be cautioned that this transcript is for information only and is subject to change.

body count. And in the 1990s, we go back to $_{14}$ urinalysis.

DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes. I am just focused on the post-'72 period. So that's why I asked that. Thanks.

DR. TAULBEE: Thanks, Matt. Okay.

C. STATUS OF WHOLE BODY SCAN ISSUES
DISCUSSED ON TECHNICAL CALL

DR. TAULBEE: Status on the whole body scan issues discussed on the technical call. We're still looking into this. And so I don't really have too much of an update other than we are still investigating this. And we have had some conference calls discussing it. And as we get more details, I will provide that to the Work Group.

D. EXAMPLE DRs

DR. TAULBEE: The final one, example DRs, we are going to conduct some example dose reconstructions and give them to the Work Group here. The task ordering just

NEAL R. GROSS

1	went from Grady over to ORAU yesterday. So 15
2	that will be in the works. So I don't have a
3	schedule just yet because I've got to look
4	against their staffing and other priorities.
5	So when I get a date as to that, Mark, I will
6	give you an update as to when we expect to
7	have those completed and delivered to the Work
8	Group, but I don't have a date right now.
9	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay.
10	DR. TAULBEE: And so that is
11	pretty much an update of us here at NIOSH.
12	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: And did you do
13	you might have just hit on this the
14	example DRs?
15	DR. TAULBEE: Yes.
16	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: That was your
17	last item? Okay.
18	DR. TAULBEE: That's correct.
19	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. Sorry.
20	DR. TAULBEE: Once I get the date
21	of when those will be completed, then we will

be able to give that to you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

16

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay.

DR. TAULBEE: I guess one other item that I could bring up here: this has to do with the thorium discussion during the technical call of whether thorium comes through in that second extraction or whether it comes out in the first one -- and we have had a radiochemist look at this. And clearly it goes with the second extraction. Less than one percent will be going out with the first one, with plutonium, uranium and neptunium.

So we have got a White Paper on that. If the Work Group wants to see, we can certainly do that now or if you wanted to wait until -- I don't know if SC&A is going to make a comment about that or not, but if they do, our response is basically prepared for that already.

DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes. Well, as you know, this is an item of concern from the

NEAL R. GROSS

This transcript of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Savannah River Site Work Gro	up,
has been reviewed for concerns under the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a) and personally identifiable	
information has been redacted as necessary. The transcript, however, has not been reviewed and	
certified by the Chair of the Savannah River Site Work Group for accuracy at this time. The reader she	ould
be cautioned that this transcript is for information only and is subject to change.	

technical call. And so definitely we could 17 make a comment on it. So if you have data to 3 give us as to what the efficiency in the second extraction round is of thorium compared to americium, curium and californium, that would be very helpful. 7 DR. TAULBEE: Well, it's in that paper of 97 percent. DR. MAKHIJANI: No. That is the DR. TAULBEE: No. That is the second one, Arjun. DR. MAKHIJANI: I have a misunderstanding about this. The 97 percent 14 relates to when the eight or nine actinides are separated together. That is where the thorium efficiency is 97 percent. I've read the paper. 18 DR. TAULBEE: Arjun, I've had a Ph.D. radiochemist read the paper as well. 20 21 And he's telling me that less than one percent

1

2

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

goes out with the plutonium. That 97 percent $_{18}$ is, in fact, that second extraction.

DR. MAKHIJANI: That's what I'm asking, is the paper that you referred to did not mention the efficiency in the second extraction. And so if you have a radiochemist's opinion on paper about that second one, it will be very useful to have it.

DR. TAULBEE: Okay.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Hey, Tim, this is Brad. Can I ask you a question on the samples that you're going to do? How are these samples going to be picked? Are they just going to be random or are they going to be of actual cases or -- these sample DRs, how are you going to choose which ones you are going to do?

DR. TAULBEE: In the past, Brad, what we have done is just general examples. We haven't taken actual cases and done this. We have grabbed some typical scenarios

This transcript of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Savannah River Site Work Group,
has been reviewed for concerns under the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a) and personally identifiable
information has been redacted as necessary. The transcript, however, has not been reviewed and
certified by the Chair of the Savannah River Site Work Group for accuracy at this time. The reader should
be cautioned that this transcript is for information only and is subject to change.

informed from actual cases, but generally we 19 will take scenarios of a worker being exposed in this area for this period of time and then calculate out their dose and show how the methodology works.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay. That's what I was wondering. I just wondered if they were going to be actual cases or if they were just going to be illustrations, how it would do those. Thank you.

DR. TAULBEE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. And I think it goes without saying that SC&A, I mean, you are going to review OTIB-81. And I don't think we have to retask or anything, just part of our continuing effort here.

DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes.

DR. MAKHIJANI: I think, you know, essentially some of what I imagine is in OTIB-81 in terms of a method but not the detailed

NEAL R. GROSS

data is already being examined, you know, and 20 we've had that technical call about it. So yes, we will include OTIB-81 in the review, yes. Sure.

I had a question about the example dose reconstruction to follow up on what I think Brad asked.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes, please.

DR. MAKHIJANI: In this particular instance, you know, a lot of what is at issue is, do we know who was working with neptunium and who was working with thorium? So it actually would be useful to have actual cases, you know, examination of actual claims to see in the real world -- because I have looked at claims to see what is in the DOE files. And it's more difficult than what I read in Report 56.

And it does raise questions, at least at this stage, that could be set to rest by these examples or since we attribute

everything to neptunium, that you see for 21 chromium-51, what happens to chromium-51 exposure? Are you going to attribute the same peaks to chromium and use the same data for two different radionuclides?

And so there would be practical questions that arise when you look at actual data. And it would be useful to address actual data, at least in the case of neptunium.

DR. NETON: Arjun, this is Jim. I think we prefer not to use actual cases for various reasons, mostly for Privacy Act considerations. But I think we can get very close in putting scenarios together that would answer your questions. So we kind of know what your questions are.

DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay. Yes, so long as the concern is addressed, you know.

DR. NETON: Sure, I understand what you are saying, but I'd hate to go pull

NEAL R. GROSS

an actual case. It just doesn't make me feel $_{22}$ comfortable to do that in public.

DR. MAKHIJANI: Sure.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Mark, this is
Brad again. Maybe this is something that the
Subcommittee for Dose Reconstruction can also
keep in mind of upcoming cases, that we may
actually want to pull one of these and have it
reviewed as an actual case, as a dose
reconstruction, as we have done before. It's
something to think about.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. I agree,
Brad. We should be aware of that on the DR

committee going forward. Also, I think, you

know, we probably want to find one that

applied the coworker models. And, as Tim

suggested, it is probably not many that -- you

know, so it might be hard to select that, but

I take your point. I agree.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: All right. Is

NEAL R. GROSS

This transcript of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Savannah River Site Work Group,
has been reviewed for concerns under the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a) and personally identifiable
information has been redacted as necessary. The transcript, however, has not been reviewed and
certified by the Chair of the Savannah River Site Work Group for accuracy at this time. The reader should
be cautioned that this transcript is for information only and is subject to change.

there any more from Tim for a NIOSH update? 1 23 2 DR. TAULBEE: Nope. That's all 3 I've got. CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. I just 4 have a couple of actions that I noted. 5 Ι might have missed something. But you are 6 7 going to -- NIOSH will post all of the data 8 associated with TIB-81 along with the TIB-81. That might take several days, but you're going 9 to get that up there soon. 10 11 The second action is the example DRs, you're -- they're not yet posted. You'll 12 let us know about the timing on that in the 13 fairly near future. And then a follow-up 14 action on this White Paper: you're going to 15 provide an expert opinion on this issue of the 16 17 second extraction. Does that sound like accurate there, Tim? 18 DR. TAULBEE: Yes. The only other 19 one that I had on there is to get Ted the 20

NEAL R. GROSS

information of where OTIB-81 is.

This transcript of the Advisory Board on Radiation	n and Worker Health, Savannah River Site Work Group,
has been reviewed for concerns under the Priva	cy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a) and personally identifiable
information has been redacted as necessary. T	ne transcript, however, has not been reviewed and
certified by the Chair of the Savannah River Site	Work Group for accuracy at this time. The reader should
be cautioned that this transcript is for information	only and is subject to change.

1	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. Yes. 24
2	DR. TAULBEE: So that's what I had
3	listed.
4	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I didn't note
5	that. Yes. That's fine.
6	DR. TAULBEE: And, by the way,
7	Mark, on those example DRs, the first part
8	will be getting you a schedule of when those
9	would be done.
10	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Right.
11	DR. TAULBEE: I hope to have that
12	within the next few weeks.
13	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay.
14	DR. TAULBEE: Okay.
15	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: All right.
16	DR. TAULBEE: Thanks.
17	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Thank you. And
18	
19	DR. MAKHIJANI: You hope to have
20	the schedule or the dose reconstruction?
21	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I think the

NEAL R. GROSS

1 schedule, he was saying 2 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay. 3 DR. TAULBEE: Schedule. All 4 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. 5 right. Arjun? Well, Joe is 6 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes. 7 going to give the --8 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Oh, okay. 9 DR. MAKHIJANI: -- update on the statuses. 10 UPDATE OF SC&A ACTIONS 11 Α. STATUS OF SITE VISIT 12 13 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, it's been 14 about two weeks since we got the data capture 15 plan into Savannah River and also the request 16 letters in to their management by hard copy. And at the same time, I had a call 17 18 with Greg Lewis, who then approved funding for 19 Savannah River to go ahead and do the data 20 So, again, it's been about two capture. So I will check with them to confirm 21 weeks.

where they stand. I doubt they're, you know, 26 ready for us but just to see where they stand and what guesstimate that they would have as far as what time frame.

I would think it's not going to be until maybe latter March depending on what the budget issue is, but I will try to feed back anything I hear from them. I will contact our point of contact down there.

My understanding right now, we have three folks from SC&A: myself, John Stiver, and one other and Tim Taulbee, certainly. I don't know who else will be slotted for that. There will probably be at some point we need to collect those names and get these security clearances transferred. I'll go ahead and send an email out. And if people can begin confirming who would want to participate in that data capture, I'll start keeping that list so that Savannah River can have that when we're ready.

DR. MAKHIJANI: And we sent a list $_{27}$ of names for interviews also to DOE.

MR. FITZGERALD: Right. That was part of data capture. They had those names, right.

DR. TAULBEE: This is Tim. From the NIOSH ORAU side, there will be one or two of us. It depends upon which dates you select for the data capture. So just keep us posted and let us know as soon as you find out what dates there are. And then we can give you the names of who would be tagging along for this data capture.

MR. FITZGERALD: My guess is, you know, by the time they have figured out who is available for interview and what the retrieval is on the boxes, that is when we will start getting some dates that we can pass around. But we will certainly pass that around, make sure everybody has the opportunity to figure out schedule-wise if they can come.

1	DR. TAULBEE: Thank you. 28
2	DR. MAKHIJANI: That is our
3	update. Do you want us to move to the next
4	item?
5	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. Sorry,
6	Arjun. Go ahead.
7	B. STATUS OF REVIEW OF ADDENDUM 3,
8	REGARDING THORIUM DOSE RECONSTRUCTION
9	C. STATUS OF REVIEW OF ORAUT-RPRT-56
10	ON NP (MATRIX ISSUE 5)
11	DR. MAKHIJANI: Why don't we take
12	the next two items together: Review of
13	Addendum 3, which is thorium; and review of
14	Report 56? We've started intensive review of
15	both of these things. That is one of the
16	things that led up to the technical call
17	because we had quite a number of questions.
18	Joyce is looking at the technical
19	issue. We have compiled some claimant data
20	that we are looking at in more detail as to
21	how those proposed dose reconstruction methods

This transcript of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Savannah River Site Work Group,
has been reviewed for concerns under the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a) and personally identifiable
information has been redacted as necessary. The transcript, however, has not been reviewed and
certified by the Chair of the Savannah River Site Work Group for accuracy at this time. The reader should
be cautioned that this transcript is for information only and is subject to change.

would work because we have a pretty good idea $_{29}$ of what is proposed, although we didn't have OTIB-81 until yesterday.

I just opened OTIB-81 during this call. So I haven't had a chance to look at it, but certainly after this Work Group meeting, you know, we will kind of put our heads together around this and factor in the review of OTIB-81 for thorium and neptunium.

The present plan is to kind of issue a report on each, although thorium and neptunium are proceeding so much in parallel, we might combine them into a single report.

Is that okay, Mark?

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. That sounds fine.

DR. MAKHIJANI: You know, originally we had thought that this could be completed a little more rapidly, but the site visit issues have taken so long, it's kind of hard for me. The work of reviewing the paper

NEAL R. GROSS

and the data is shorter, I think, in terms of 30 schedules than to figure out what is going to happen with the site visit and what we are going to come up with. So I'm afraid it looks like a little bit of a more extended schedule than what we had discussed last year at the Board meeting. I won't be able to give you a very good estimate until Joe and his team have gone over there and given John Stiver and me an idea of, you know, when we can complete this work.

I hope that it will be before the fall, that all of it will be complete before the fall meeting, or the summer. I'm not sure whether we can complete it before the summer meeting, but we will try.

In terms of the technical issues that are on the table, we have the review reasonably in hand. Of course, we're reviewing what NIOSH has sent us in terms of their positions on how these data are to be

interpreted. And we have to look at the urine $_{31}$ data for neptunium.

D. STATUS OF REVIEW OF OTHER ORAUT REPORTS

ISSUED LAST YEAR: TRIVALENT ACTINIDES,

TRITIUM, FISSION PRODUCTS,

EXOTIC RADIONUCLIDES

DR. MAKHIJANI: On the other report, the tritium was, you know, partially in progress when NIOSH said that they are going to expand upon it and we stopped in 2011. So Harry Chmelynski is looking at that.

And that work will be completed.

So we think -- those three are proceeding in parallel. The trivalent actinides, fission products and exotic radionuclides, we haven't begun serious work on them yet. Preliminary review of those indicated that the most important issues were in these other areas: neptunium, thorium, and -- neptunium and thorium mainly. So, you know, that is not a definitive judgment. That is just a

NEAL R. GROSS

preliminary reading.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

32

We can put more people on this, but my suggestion at the present time would be to kind of do the review in those areas where it seems like the biggest SEC-related issues might be there to sort out but open to your guidance, of course.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. I agree with that in principle. Can you say that list again, Arjun? Neptunium and thorium are being prioritized, but the other ones that --

DR. MAKHIJANI: Neptunium and thorium are being prioritized and also tritium. And when we go to -- well, I might as well bring this up now. It is in the matrix list, which is your next agenda item. All of these reports, 56, 55, the reports dealing with construction worker versus non-construction worker, and comparisons that NIOSH has done, NIOSH has not addressed one of the biggest issues that we have consistently

raised in Savannah River sites on this point, 33 which is that it's not enough to compare the collection of construction workers with non-construction workers or to put nuances on that comparison because there are clearly some subgroups of construction workers, for example pipefitters, who clearly have more exposure potential, as demonstrated by actual data, sometimes a lot more exposure potential. And then some areas are more important for some radionuclides. And NIOSH's analysis in all of these reports puts construction workers and non-construction workers in comparison as a group.

Now, they have got a little bit more nuanced comparison in these reports, but basically they do not break down construction workers by job types. And this issue continues to be unresolved for some years, actually now, two, three years.

So that is going to be a

NEAL R. GROSS

significant part of our review until it seems 34

-- I mean, we could -- I don't think it will
take long to review the trivalent actinides
report and the fission products report.

There is actually a fair amount of data for curium, californium and americium, but we don't think this is a major issue sort of off the bat.

The exotic radionuclides is really

-- the biggest issue is, do we have a

definitive account of when they were produced?

Now, I think NIOSH has taken that research

much farther in the report that they actually

sent. I think it was Report 53. I don't

remember the number, but I think the new

report contains a lot more information than

prior work. But it will not be that hard to

review.

I am not sure that we will be able to settle some of these questions or whether the data exists or paperwork exists to settle

them. Sometimes it's proving the negative. 35

And the Work Group will kind of have to draw a line for us somewhere.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. And just on the non-construction worker, construction worker question, I mean, this has been an issue since day one, right, that we have talked about?

DR. MAKHIJANI: Well, since the first time we looked at it, you know, we had published at least three different reports indicating that we did not believe that this was a sufficient comparison because sometimes the differences between significant groups of construction workers, you know, pipefitters come to mind, but I can easily send the reports around, are very large. They are not uniform across all periods or across all areas. And so you do get into a problem, you know, when you are lumping all construction workers together, first of all.

And then, secondly, we acknowledge 36 that when you parse them more finely by job or area, sometimes you run into sufficiency of data to be able to come to statistically sensible answers. And in many cases, it was clear that there wasn't enough information there.

Now, the current NIOSH databases may be bigger, but I think the general question remains unaddressed by NIOSH so far as we can see. There has not been a serious attempt to parse these data by construction worker job types. Maybe it has been done, but we haven't seen it.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I mean, Tim, do you have any response to that, not to put you on the -- I mean, it has been out there for a while. I am just curious whether you have thought about this.

DR. TAULBEE: Well, I think we have been responsive to the Work Group in

NEAL R. GROSS

1 comparing construction trades and 37 2 non-construction trades. I understand what 3 Arjun is arguing, of certain construction trades, but that is not -- we didn't have any 4 5 intention of doing that type of comparison. And we are really not prepared to try and 6 7 address that right here on this call. 8 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Sure. Sure. 9 I do know. I remember your Okay. Yes. response papers, Arjun, that you did raise 10 that question. 11 12 I mean, the other thing I would be 13 interested in is if those subgroups were 14 monitored to a great extent. You know, they 15 had a higher chance of exposure, but also were 16 they monitored with a higher frequency? 17 don't know. Anyway, it's something we need to follow up on, I think. 18 19 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes. If you would 20 like, Mark, or if the Work Group likes, I mean, I can send you -- it will take me a 21

couple of days to do this, but I can send you 38 the key reports where we raised the issues and where you can actually see why it is important to parse the data by area and job types because for most groups of construction workers or many groups of construction workers, what NIOSH is proposing is fine and is claimant-favorable, but it is clearly not so for some groups of construction workers. So we feel that it does need to be addressed. And, if you like, I could take that as a to-do from this teleconference to send around some examples or do you want to just wait until NIOSH responds? CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: No. I think it's fine. It might refresh our memories, too DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay. CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: -- just to forward that paper again or anything you think that --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

DR. MAKHIJANI: Basically I'll 39
white out the page numbers and figure numbers
and so on for ease of reference so people can
actually, you know, go directly into -CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: That would be
great.

DR. TAULBEE: One word of caution,
Mark and to others, is that within these
papers, I mean, there is a big difference in
how we analyze the data versus what Arjun had
done initially. We use a one-person,
one-sample type of maximum possible mean
methodology. So please pay attention to that
within our reports.

And the reason for that is that when you have the construction trades worker or even an operator involved in a single incident, they can drive the entire bioassay model of what the doses are. So, really, the only way to compare this is to use the one-person, one-sample type of methodology.

This transcript of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Savannah River Site Work Group,
has been reviewed for concerns under the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a) and personally identifiable
information has been redacted as necessary. The transcript, however, has not been reviewed and
certified by the Chair of the Savannah River Site Work Group for accuracy at this time. The reader should
be cautioned that this transcript is for information only and is subject to change.

Otherwise you can have individual incidents 40 that are dominating your entire data set. But I just caution you and please keep that in mind when you do the full reviews. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay.

DR. MAKHIJANI: However, NIOSH has

just proposed this one-person, one-sample model last year so far as I know. I know they came up with it initially the year before last, but the first time we saw it proposed was last year. And we definitely are taking a good hard look at the proposal. And it will be part of our report.

But obviously, you know, the data wasn't available in that format when we looked at it prior, but when we look at it in this round, we definitely will look at it from that point of view.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. That sounds good, Arjun.

DR. MAKHIJANI: But yes. The data

NEAL R. GROSS

	information has been redacted as necessary. The transcript, however, has not been reviewed and certified by the Chair of the Savannah River Site Work Group for accuracy at this time. The reader should be cautioned that this transcript is for information only and is subject to change.
1	that you will post is in that format, right, $_{41}$
2	raw data plus one-person, one-sample? Tim?
3	DR. TAULBEE: I'm sorry. Could
4	you repeat that, please?
5	DR. MAKHIJANI: The data that we
6	talked about earlier for OTIB-81 that you are
7	going to post contains the raw data as well as
8	the aggregated data into one-person,
9	one-sample approach?
10	DR. TAULBEE: I believe so, yes.
11	I will have to verify that. Actually, I don't
12	know the answer to that. I believe it might
13	just be the one-person, one-sample compiled,
14	but we do have the original. So we might be
15	able to give you both.
16	DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes. It would be
17	helpful to have both.
18	DR. TAULBEE: Okay.
19	DR. MAKHIJANI: So that is my
20	report, Mark.

This transcript of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Savannah River Site Work Group, has been reviewed for concerns under the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a) and personally identifiable

NEAL R. GROSS

Okay.

That

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON:

sounds good. You know, I am worried a little 42 bit about the -- we haven't discussed the other matrix items yet, but I am worried a little bit about timing. I mean, I know our next Board meeting is in Augusta. And it seems pretty obvious that we're not going to have -- I mean, we can give an update but we're not going to have any conclusion until the summer, probably the fall on any of these items, even the priority items. Is that accurate?

DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes. The main hangup from our side on the priority items is the site visit and what we will come up when we interview the site visits because it all takes place the end of March, early April. I can walk you through it, and we'll have interview notes that will go from classification review and then they will go to the interviewees. That always takes three or four weeks to come back. So by the time we're

This transcript of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Savannah River Site Work Group,
has been reviewed for concerns under the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a) and personally identifiable
information has been redacted as necessary. The transcript, however, has not been reviewed and
certified by the Chair of the Savannah River Site Work Group for accuracy at this time. The reader should
be cautioned that this transcript is for information only and is subject to change.

in the middle of May and then we get to look 1 43 2 at them and work with them, we will try to --3 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: DR. MAKHIJANI: We will try to do 4 5 at least one report, one report by the summer. Which month is the summer meeting? 6 MR. KATZ: Arjun, this is Ted. 7 8 Mark, I just want to join this conversation about this because I had the same concern that 9 Mark has about timing. 10 11 The summer meeting is the third 12 week in July, somewhere around the 17th of July. I don't recall exactly the date, but 13 that is the ballpark. I can look it up while 14 I'm talking. 15 I would be -- I mean, in this 16 17 case, given the time that has already transpired, Mark, I don't think it's a bad 18 idea to have SC&A apply more resources to get 19 things done in parallel if that will help or 20

increase the likelihood that we could actually

bring things to conclusion or major pieces of $_{44}$ this to conclusion by July.

I think that would be money well spent. I mean, I guess it takes two to tango. So it also depends on whether the folks at DCAS can similarly bring what resources they need to bear to their side of the equation on matters that need to be resolved by the Work Group. But I think it's a worthy goal to put more resources on this to make major progress by July.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. I would agree. Just one question for Arjun, I mean, are all of the pieces out there for these other -- I am assuming that these other nuclides, a lot of them are covered in this OTIB-81, correct, the ones that you have in --

DR. MAKHIJANI: From Tim's description, it has the whole --

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes.

DR. MAKHIJANI: -- all of the

NEAL R. GROSS

radionuclides in all of the coworker models. 1 45 2 Right, Tim? 3 DR. TAULBEE: That is correct. I think we are 4 DR. MAKHIJANI: 5 currently looking at essentially all of the radionuclides because the reports that were 6 7 put out on exotic radionuclides and trivalent 8 and neptunium and thorium and so on and 9 fission products covered that waterfront. So I think what OTIB-81 adds is the actual 10 coworker model and the compiled data that we 11 don't have as yet except maybe for tritium and 12 13 because we don't have that compiled data. 14 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. 15 think Ted is probably right that at this 16 point, it looks like most of the actions are in your hands. 17 18 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes. 19 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: And maybe 20 putting more resources would -- of course, I understand if you have certain experts that 21

1 are doing -- you know, you can only have so 2 many experts in certain areas. 3 DR. MAKHIJANI: CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I think it 4 5 would be a good idea, yes. Mark and Ted, 6 DR. MAKHIJANI: 7 where I suggested putting more resources into 8 it was to put personnel to look at the reports where we haven't started an intensive review. 9 I would not recommend putting more resources 10 in neptunium and thorium and tritium because 11 I think we have got very capable people 12 working on this. And for somebody new to 13 14 enter would just delay things. 15 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes, yes, yes. 16 No. That's --DR. MAKHIJANI: The main hold-up 17 18 there is that what is going to be coming out of the site visit and the interviews, and how 19 20 are we going to deal with it. We will definitely put, you know, all of the effort 21

that we can to produce at least the neptunium $_{47}$ and thorium reports by July.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: And can I ask just one thing on the site visits? What is your focus on the site visits? What do you hope to achieve with the interviews?

Well, we don't --DR. MAKHIJANI: you know, we don't have interviews, and we don't have all of the documentation about the production of neptunium and thorium and exotic nuclides in terms of the dates. And so, as I mentioned earlier, for instance, on exotic radionuclides, really, the one pesky item that is difficult to put to bed is these dates. And we are going to try to put it to bed as much as possible because exotic radionuclides covers such a wide array of radionuclides that we don't want to have questions dangling out We have done all the paper research we can through SRDB and other sources and haven't been able to put it to bed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

know, we want to verify some of NIOSH's work and to see what other documentation there was about thorium because there were thorium stocks, not large, but into the 1990s. And, similarly, neptunium processing went on until 1992. We don't have those dates. And we have enough doubts about the approach in Report 56 that we want to make sure that people who were working with neptunium actually had some of the data that is proposed to be used. That is sort of the big dangling question out there.

And so our site visit requested lots of log books, for example. So we want to look at those log books and see who was working with neptunium and what were they monitored for.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. Okay.

No. That is reasonable. Okay. So I think

based on what Ted said -- and I agree with

this -- I think to the extent you can -- and

NEAL R. GROSS

٦	This transcript of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Savannah River Site Work Group,
ŀ	has been reviewed for concerns under the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a) and personally identifiable
i	nformation has been redacted as necessary. The transcript, however, has not been reviewed and
(certified by the Chair of the Savannah River Site Work Group for accuracy at this time. The reader should
k	be cautioned that this transcript is for information only and is subject to change.

we'll certainly leave the management up to 49
you, but to the extent you can apply more
resources and expedite the overall progress
DR. MAKHIJANI: I hear you.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I think we'd
all appreciate that. Yes, yes.
DR. MAKHIJANI: The way we will do
that is
CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes.
DR. MAKHIJANI: you know, John
Stiver and I, who are co-managing this thing,
will kind of assemble our team on a conference
call and make sure everybody gets the message
that this is a very high priority. We will at
least try to finish neptunium and thorium by
July. And maybe we would be able to give you
some of the other stuff also.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. And now
just
DR. MAKHIJANI: One question I
have for NIOSH is, are we going to get any

	certified by the Chair of the Savannah River Site Work Group for accuracy at this time. The reader should be cautioned that this transcript is for information only and is subject to change.
1	further response on refinement of, you know, 50
2	parsing the construction workers into job
3	types or are we kind of going to rest?
4	MR. HINNEFELD: This is Stu
5	Hinnefeld. We are going to talk about that
6	here in a little bit.
7	DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay.
8	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. And I am
9	on to the last agenda item, which is the Other
LO	Matrix Items. I don't know if, Arjun, would
11	you feel comfortable taking the lead on this?
12	DR. MAKHIJANI: No problem. I
13	have the matrix in front of me.
L4	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. Hit the
15	main ones.
L6	DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes. I'll just
L7	hit the main ones.
18	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes.
L9	3. OTHER MATRIX ISSUES
20	DR. MAKHIJANI: This is a matrix

This transcript of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Savannah River Site Work Group, has been reviewed for concerns under the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a) and personally identifiable information has been redacted as necessary. The transcript, however, has not been reviewed and

NEAL R. GROSS

update dated December 2011. Item 3 is

recycled uranium. And we had suspended this 51
a couple of years ago. And we have restarted
it. It is not a high priority right now. It
is a memorandum that needs to be finished,
some, basically, SRDB type of research that
needs to be completed to finish this. We will
try to accelerate this, but we haven't given
it a high priority to complete it. This ball
is definitely in our court.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I'm sorry?

What was that item?

DR. MAKHIJANI: Recycled uranium, item number 3.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. Okay.

And we did give that a lower priority, given the other --

DR. MAKHIJANI: Right. It was a lower priority before. And then when NIOSH said they were providing new data and so on, we suspended work on this item. And then after the NIOSH reports were published and you

This transcript of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Savannah River Site Work Group, has been reviewed for concerns under the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a) and personally identifiable information has been redacted as necessary. The transcript, however, has not been reviewed and certified by the Chair of the Savannah River Site Work Group for accuracy at this time. The reader should be cautioned that this transcript is for information only and is subject to change.
advised us to kind of restart work on all SEC $_{52}$
issues, we restarted work on this but haven't
given it a high priority.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: And refresh my
memory. How has NIOSH had a model out
there for dealing with assigning dose from
recycled uranium?
DR. MAKHIJANI: Well, as I
remember, NIOSH published a set of ratios for
it.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. All
right. So consider any of these that are
I would say use your judgment, too, but any of
these that are potentially you know, not

there's going to be clearly a Site Profile issue, rather than an SEC issue.

DR. MAKHIJANI: Right.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: If it's going to be an SEC issue or has that potential, I would say try to put it on your radar again and move forward.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay. 53 2 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. DR. MAKHIJANI: Our goals are what 3 we did before. And if it looks like it might 4 be an SEC issue, we'll give it a higher 5 priority. 6 7 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. 8 DR. MAKHIJANI: Then we have covered the various other issues: trivalent 9 activation, fission products, neptunium, 10 exotics, tritium. The next item that we have 11 not covered is item 10, which is special 12 This ball is in NIOSH's 13 tritium compounds. court for some time in terms of providing us 14 15 with information about solubilities and how they are going to approach it. I can read 16 more details. 17 18 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Tim, do you recall this being -- it was an outstanding 19 20 action for you. DR. TAULBEE: No, but now that I 21

	information has been redacted as necessary. The transcript, however, has not been reviewed and certified by the Chair of the Savannah River Site Work Group for accuracy at this time. The reader should be cautioned that this transcript is for information only and is subject to change.
1	think about it, this was one of them that we $_{54}$
2	put on the back burner due to a lower
3	priority. And so it very well might be in our
4	court and it dropped off my radar. And I
5	apologize for that.
6	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: No. That's
7	okay. If we're asking SC&A to close out, I
8	think you should probably hone in on this one.
9	DR. TAULBEE: Okay. Will do.
10	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay.
11	DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay, exotic
12	nuclides, we have covered. Internal dose due
13	to incidents, SC&A had prepared a report and
14	it says here NIOSH will
15	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Arjun, I'm
16	sorry. Is that
17	DR. MAKHIJANI: No dose due to
18	incidence.
19	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Is that number
20	12?

This transcript of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Savannah River Site Work Group, has been reviewed for concerns under the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a) and personally identifiable

NEAL R. GROSS

DR. MAKHIJANI:

21

Number 12, yes.

1 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. 55 2 DR. MAKHIJANI: Sorry. And the 3 issue description is special hazards investigation is incomplete. The tank farm 4 5 data bank acknowledged incidents were not recorded. And workers have also said that 6 7 incidents were not recorded. So the question 8 of completeness of incidents in the DOE 9 records has arisen. And SC&A prepared a report on this. And we haven't received a 10 response from NIOSH. 11 DR. TAULBEE: Can you let me know 12 13 what the date of that report is again, Arjun, 14 please? 15 DR. MAKHIJANI: Hang on for a 16 second. I will go to my records list. It's an incident record that Savannah River Site, 17 discussion of Special Exposure Cohort issue 18 number 12 related to incident, January 2011. 19 20 I can send it to you again if you like.

NEAL R. GROSS

DR. TAULBEE: Yes, please.

1 DR. MAKHIJANI: I'll make a note 56 2 of that in my to-do list. Excuse me. Just a 3 second. I'll send it to Ted. All right? I will list 4 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: 5 that as a NIOSH action to review that, that 6 report. 7 DR. MAKHIJANI: I have noted to 8 send it around. 9 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. DR. MAKHIJANI: Then item 13, 10 construction worker versus non-construction 11 workers, I've already mentioned. I don't know 12 13 if you want to take that up more at this 14 stage. 15 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: No. I think we 16 have that on record. And I guess the question is -- I think that's kind of -- I think we 17 18 will leave that up to you, Arjun, for SC&A to look at the way the models are done now and 19 20 see if it remains an issue, you know, that you still think is relevant or --

1	DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes. 57
2	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: And if that's
3	the case, then we can bring back the you
4	know, that issue if we want.
5	DR. MAKHIJANI: This will
6	definitely require significant effort. And as
7	soon as, Tim, if you will, please, send me an
8	email as soon as you have posted the data,
9	then I can, you know, put a couple of people
10	on this so we give it the due priority.
11	Otherwise, we won't be able to complete that
12	analysis.
13	DR. TAULBEE: I will let you know
14	once we get it posted.
15	DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay. Thank you.
16	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Sounds good.
17	DR. MAKHIJANI: Next item. So a
18	lot of these items are really subsumed now in
19	this construction worker versus
20	non-construction worker. And the next issue
21	is tank farm exposure geometry. This is

This transcript of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Savannah River Site Work Group,
has been reviewed for concerns under the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a) and personally identifiable
information has been redacted as necessary. The transcript, however, has not been reviewed and
certified by the Chair of the Savannah River Site Work Group for accuracy at this time. The reader should
be cautioned that this transcript is for information only and is subject to change.

unlikely to be an SEC issue, but, again, I 58 don't want to prejudge anything. It's up to you, Mark.

MIOSH was supposed to prepare a model of adjustment factors for external exposure geometry in the tank farm. And we were supposed to review it when it was published. I don't believe it has been published.

DR. TAULBEE: This is something that is still on our to-do list. And we are making some progress on that. It has again taken a lower priority. But this is something that we are cognizant of that we do still owe the Work Group.

DR. MAKHIJANI: Mark, in the past, as you know, exposure geometry issues have generally not been SEC issues. I don't want to prejudge anything in this case, but -
CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Right, right, right.

NEAL R. GROSS

DR. MAKHIJANI: Just from 59 experience, as you know, NIOSH generally has been able to come up with models, I think, starting with Mallinckrodt, if I'm remembering correctly.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. I think it would be good, Tim, if you can come back to the Work Group maybe with a proposed approach, even if it's not -- you know, you don't have all the particulars, we might realize quickly in a discussion whether it's not an SEC issue.

DR. TAULBEE: Mark, this is Tim.

I can give you a rough idea of what it is now.

We are currently modeling, through MCNP, a

worker standing on top of the tank farm and so

the difference in dose from organs in the

lower portion of the body to the upper

portion. And then also a worker would be

crouching over one of the sampling holes and

looking at that exposure as well. Those are

the two models that we are currently modeling

in MCNP. So that is our approach to coming up $_{60}$ with the correction factors for this.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: And is there a question of the source term in that circumstance?

DR. TAULBEE: That's actually what's been a little bit of our delay of modeling what is in the tanks based upon time and, over time, the mixture of fission products for that. And that's been what the largest part of the delay is. It has been tied to OTIB-54.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Mark, this is

Brad. I just wanted to remind Tim one other

thing. If you remember, when we were talking

about these waste tanks, one of the processes

was and what brought a lot of this up was

because of the workers explaining about

pulling those pumps out of there, too,

because, remember, you know, we had all the

different radionuclides and the change in the field. So I know these two scenarios are there, but one of the ones that brought it up was because of the removal of some of the pumps that went out in those tanks.

I really DR. TAULBEE: Okay. don't remember. I mean, I remember them talking about those particular tanks. I don't remember what your concern was, though, Brad, with that because when they come out of the area, for most people, you are kind of facing the tank or if you're back to it or you're turning, you're kind of rotational geometry. And so we have got correction factors already for that in the OCAS-IG-0001 type of methodology. So this is why we weren't approaching this as part of the exposure geometry.

The two scenarios where we didn't have those types of corrections is kind of a fixed source with people walk in on top of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

kind of high-level waste tanks. Once the pump $_{62}$ comes out, it's kind of rotational and AP geometry.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay. I quess it really stands out to me because I remember in one of the interviews that we were involved down there, it basically got into the construction trades. And that geometry is fine, but once you start to pull the pumps, which they -- the operations people assisted with, but it was usually the trades that did it, those pumps that came out of there were streaming. And this is a process because of some of the product that was going in there readily took those pumps out. I didn't know how you were going to model for that. just wanted to make sure we addressed the concerns of what the claimants had brought up with that.

DR. TAULBEE: We can add a discussion to this exposure geometry report

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

that will address that and show how our 1 63 2 current methodology would take that into 3 consideration. 4 MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay. Thank you. 5 I appreciate it. 6 DR. TAULBEE: Okay. 7 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Sounds good. 8 Thanks, Tim. 9 Arjun, are there other items on the matrix? 10 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes. One of the 11 scenarios I brought from memory now, having 12 looked at tank farm data, is the diversion 13 boxes and so on, where the workers actually 14 entered closer. And I don't know exactly what 15 16 kind of procedures they used. I don't recall

NEAL R. GROSS

But I am not sure there is a scenario

there to consider, but you might think about

where they are actually approaching the pipes

and junction boxes, diversion boxes, and so

on, to see whether there is an appropriate

that.

17

18

19

20

scenario. It is basically a source term 64 difference with somebody standing on top of the tanks. But they may be a significant source term. That's it.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. And that is it on the matrix items?

DR. MAKHIJANI: Well, there are two others which we have put together, items 22 and 23, badges not capturing dose and external dose recording accuracy and completeness. This was, you know, basically issues raised by workers and worker representatives and came up repeatedly in interviews. And we have prepared a report addressing this.

This is from some time back. I

don't remember what exactly is in the report,

but I can send this one around to -- the

report was done in -- and so we await a NIOSH

response on this. It was done also in January

of 2011. It says, Matrix issues 22 and 23

NEAL R. GROSS

1	regarding petitioner external dose issues. 65
2	And so basically we tried to
3	comprehend the petitioner-raised issues and
4	put them into a report as to how they might
5	relate to our examination. And NIOSH hasn't
6	responded as of yet.
7	I can send that report over.
8	DR. TAULBEE: Yes. Please do,
9	Arjun. This is Tim.
10	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. Thanks
11	for the update.
12	And then I wasn't sure. Stu, you
13	had some things to say. You said we would
14	address it later in the meeting.
15	MR. HINNEFELD: No. I meant NIOSH
16	internally would address that question when
17	this call was over.
18	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Oh, when the
19	call was over. Okay. Okay. All right.
20	DR. MAKHIJANI: Sorry. There is
21	one other item, which was 26, which is in the

same vein as 22 and 23, which was another set of issues raised later on by petitioners, which SC&A also did a report about in February I'll send that around, too. That's it. CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. And yes. Again, I think the primary issues are in SC&A's court right now and adding more resources I think makes a lot of sense. Ι really would like to be able to be in a position to possibly, you know, vote on at least a further portion of the SEC in that summer meeting. So I hope we can strive toward that. If we need to do another Work Group meeting, we can do that, you know, albeit phone or in Cincinnati. I think this has to be put the resources in now so we can come to a close on this.

DR. MAKHIJANI: I definitely got that message, Mark. And as soon as I have a chance to meet with John and kind of regroup

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1 with our team, I will send you an email and 2 copy Ted. 3 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: And I think at this point, if there is nothing else, I would 4 5 offer the petitioner an opportunity or petitioners' representatives to say a word if 6 7 they would like. 8 MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Mark. 9 You know, obviously we are disappointed. CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: 10 I am sorry. Just maybe for the court reporter, your name? 11 MR. ANDERSON: David Anderson, 12 13 Administrative Manager with the law offices of 14 Bob Warren. 15 I have really appreciated all the 16 work you all are putting into this today. are disappointed in the timing. I think you 17 18 all are disappointed in the timing. appreciate the fact that SC&A is going to go 19 20 down to the site and actually do these

interviews and look at some of the data

21

This transcript of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Savannah River Site Work Group,
has been reviewed for concerns under the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a) and personally identifiable
information has been redacted as necessary. The transcript, however, has not been reviewed and
certified by the Chair of the Savannah River Site Work Group for accuracy at this time. The reader should
be cautioned that this transcript is for information only and is subject to change.

because we have serious questions about the 68 source materials. And we have not been able to have a look at those, even though we have filed FOIA requests.

So I am glad you all are moving forward. I am sorry for the claimants, who, as you all know, are aging and dying as we speak. But you're doing the best you can, and we appreciate it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Thank you. And I think we all agree that we need to move and try to come to closure on this.

Any other --

DR. RINGEN: Mark, this is Knut
Ringen. First of all, when SC&A does the
reviews down there, I think it is very
important to get more input also from the
regular workers who have been out at the site.

The report, Addendum number 3 is heavily skewed, it seems to me, by the four identified experts that NIOSH has relied on

NEAL R. GROSS

from the site that they have interviewed and that are listed in the addendum. It doesn't seem to me to be balanced with the views that other workers, ordinary workers have given.

I think all of this still comes down to two things. One, are the extrapolation models that have been proposed valid? We have very big doubts about it, including the one-person, one-sample model. And we'll make some comments about that in March.

The second issue, which is also very important, is, even if that model might be valid, how do you identify those workers that it applies to? NIOSH still has not presented in this addendum a valid approach or any approach, for that matter, as to how it will place a construction worker in a particular area of the site. It's the same problem that we had when the last SEC Evaluation Report was reviewed by the Board.

And it is going to be the same problem that 70 comes up again now. So it has to be dealt with, in one form or another, by SC&A.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Thank you,

Knut, and look forward to your other comments at the meeting in Augusta.

DR. MAKHIJANI: Mark, could I ask
Dr. Ringen a question?

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes.

DR. MAKHIJANI: Knut, do you have names of workers that you would especially like us to interview? We have sent some names, a list of about a dozen -- right, Joe?

MR. FITZGERALD: About that.

DR. MAKHIJANI: -- to DOE so we can interview them. If you have particular people who have special knowledge on any of these areas, but especially neptunium and thorium, we would be happy to interview them. If you could send, you know, Mark or me or John Stiver or any of us an email, we would

NEAL R. GROSS

1 share that, you know, with the Work Group. 71 2 And, Joe, you know, there are 3 three of us, three people from our team, with clearances who are going down there. So if we 4 5 could have that as soon as possible, it would be appreciated. 6 7 DR. RINGEN: Sure. We'll work on 8 that, and thank you for the opportunity. MEMBER CLAWSON: 9 Hey, Mark, this is Brad. I've got one question, if I could. 10 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Go ahead, Brad. 11 MEMBER CLAWSON: Well, my question 12 This OTIB, I believe it was, 81 13 is for Tim. 14 that we really haven't been able to look at, 15 this basically gives the methodology of how you're going to do this coworker data. 16 that correct? 17 DR. TAULBEE: OTIB-81 provides the 18 basis of how we develop the coworker models. 19 20 That is the data, the data analysis associated with it, how we came up with the intakes that 21

we would be assigning to an unmonitored worker $_{72}$ who we feel should have been monitored.

MEMBER CLAWSON: This is part of What guidelines are the people my question. going to have to meet to have this OTIB-81 I was just wondering how these people are going to be chosen or what lack of information they need to have. Is there any kind of guidance of telling us which people? This kind of comes back to a little bit of what Knut just said of who these people are going to be and who are going to fall into this category. What criteria do they meet to have to have OTIB-81 used? Do we have any guidance for that?

DR. TAULBEE: Let me get back to you on that, Brad. I am not sure if it's in the TBD. Actually, I know it is not in the TBD because we didn't have coworker models back then. But I believe there are some other OTIBs where we have this particular guidance

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

as to who it would be assigned to. But I need $_{73}$ to research that a little and get back to you on that, Brad.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay. Well, what

I was just going to say in the -- I didn't

mean to put you in a predicament there, but

the thing is, once we know how this is going

to be applied, I think it's a question. And

if you wouldn't mind kind of taking that as an

action item to get back to the Work Group on

how this will be applied and who it would

apply to, I would greatly appreciate it.

DR. TAULBEE: Will do.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. Are there any more -- before I close out, any more people who wish to speak on behalf of the petitioner?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: All right. So, not hearing any, I think we can close this meeting out. You know, I think we got a lot

NEAL R. GROSS

of action items, the weight of which are on 74 SC&A, but look forward to you moving ahead on this. And we'll at least do an update in Augusta for the local community. And we'll just move ahead as quickly as we can.

Any other thoughts before we

MR. KATZ: This is Ted. Just one.

Once we get better information from SC&A as to what they can do when, and more information about the site visits, I think, sometime in early March, middle March, we should book another Work Group meeting, in the May, early June time frame. I think it is always helpful to have, actually, a target to shoot at first. And at that point, we may be only ready to sort of get reconnaissance of how close we are with documents, but we probably should do that.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. Okay.

And I'll keep in touch with Tim and Arjun.

NEAL R. GROSS

close?

	information has been redacted as necessary. The transcript, however, has not been reviewed and certified by the Chair of the Savannah River Site Work Group for accuracy at this time. The reader should be cautioned that this transcript is for information only and is subject to change.
1	And we can kind of pick a date. I think it is 75
2	a good idea, but we should pick a date that is
3	going to be useful for all parties. We should
4	do that.
5	All right. I think that should
6	close it out. And thanks to everyone for
7	attending.
8	MR. KATZ: Thanks, everybody.
9	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: And we'll see
10	you soon.
11	MEMBER CLAWSON: We will see you
12	all later. Bye.
13	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Bye.
14	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
15	matter went off the record at 2:09 p.m.)
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	

This transcript of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Savannah River Site Work Group, has been reviewed for concerns under the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a) and personally identifiable

1 ||

2

3

4

5

6

NEAL R. GROSS