I think some of these are not on the web site yet, like the Y-12, all those sections aren't up yet, but -- okay.

DR. TOOHEY: Dick Toohey, ORAU. The ones that, from what I know of what's going on, are farthest away from completion would be Los Alamos, Mound, Pantex and X-10.

DR. ZIEMER: Now let me ask the Board -- Oh, Tony, you have another comment?

DR. ANDRADE: Not really a comment, but I wanted to start the -- the auctioning process, I guess. Based on the chart on the degree that -- that indicates the degree of completeness for the site profiles, as well as what I think are objective criteria, and that is to look at the different types of radionuclides that were processed or handled, I would suggest the following to start with. I'd say Rocky Flats because of the plutonium finishing activities that went on there. Number two, Y-12 for all of the uranium work that went on there and continues to go on today. And third, to step into a deeper, somewhat more complex set of operations, I would suggest Hanford for the variety of types of work that went on there from reactor -- different

reactor type enrichment to -- activities to other types of activities. So that's my opening gambit there, those three sites.

DR. ZIEMER: Let's hear a comment from Mike first, and then we'll get some other -- I don't know if that was a motion, but I'm going to just treat it as a suggestion right now. Mike?

MR. GIBSON: Yeah, just to step back -- in process, which is the last in the -- in the review process? Is it the OCAS review or the ORAU review?

MR. ELLIOTT: It's the OCAS review.

DR. MELIUS: I guess to that list for consideration I would throw in Savannah River because of the fact that it's first, it's complete and that there's a lot of individual dose reconstructions that have been done for it, so I think -- I think they almost, in a practical sense, have to look at it.

DR. ZIEMER: I have Mark and then -- who was next? Tony, did you have another comment? No. Mark?

MR. GRIFFON: I actually -- I don't have a problem with Tony's list or Jim's addition. I'd throw out a possible -- if -- I was thinking of

five, and my other one was Idaho. One thing I do want to mention is that -- from the contractor's standpoint -- Y-12, although I have it on my list, it might be a little tricky for them. They have to reactivate clearances, and I think they have to talk to NIOSH about how to go about that, and I don't know how timely that can be achieved, but that could be a little holdup as far as getting (Inaudible) rolling too quickly.

MR. OWENS: Dr. Ziemer, I'd like to possibly structure a motion. I have five sites -- Nevada Test Site, Idaho Falls, Hanford, Savannah River and I would agree with Tony on Rocky Flats.

DR. ZIEMER: Your motion is for us to designate -- let's see if I have this correct -- Hanford, INEEL, Rocky Flats, Savannah River Site and --

MR. OWENS: Nevada Test Site.

DR. ZIEMER: -- Nevada Test Site.

MR. OWENS: As the initial --

DR. ZIEMER: Initial group of five.

MR. OWENS: -- group of five that's submitted for review.

DR. ZIEMER: Let me ask -- we can certainly treat that as a motion. Does somebody want to

second that?

DR. MELIUS: I'll second it.

DR. ZIEMER: Okay. Is there further discussion on this motion? Yes, Richard then Roy.

DR. DEHART: We have three gaseous diffusion plants. I would like to see one of those added to the list.

DR. ZIEMER: Is that a suggested amendment or just a comment right now?

DR. DEHART: I'll make it in the form of an amendment.

DR. ZIEMER: Are you asking that it be added rather than substitute, so we can have six?

DR. DEHART: Add.

DR. ZIEMER: Add.

MR. OWENS: In all due respect to Dr. DeHart's amendment, I think that, based on comments that were made yesterday, the gaseous diffusion plants, as we all know, are included in the Special Exposure Cohort and I think that for the ongoing credibility of the program, those individuals, those workers at those sites are being compensated, and I think that while there is a need to review the site profiles, I think that that can wait and I'd like to see these initial

five be included.

DR. ZIEMER: Charles is speaking against a motion to amend that has not yet been seconded, so let me ask if there is a second to Dr. DeHart's motion to amend.

(No responses)

There appears not to be a second, so that motion to amend dies for lack of a second, so you don't need to speak against it, Charles. The jury will disregard his remarks.

Okay, Richard, you have a comment?

MR. ESPINOSA: It might be more of a question. The five that we just suggested, motion, seconded, are these being listed as a priority, one, two, three, four? Or just said all five and expect all five?

DR. ZIEMER: My interpretation was that it was not a prioritized list, that the contractor would have flexibility in scheduling and reviewing. Is that the understanding of the movers, that this was not necessarily listed in some priority, it's just simply the group of five? Is that -- was that the understanding?

MR. OWENS: That was my intent, Dr. Ziemer.

DR. ZIEMER: Thank you.

MR. OWENS: Those were not ranked in a priority order.

DR. ZIEMER: Thank you.

DR. MELIUS: Can I ask just one other question on the Y-12 or any of the other sites where clearances may be at issue, I assume that would be in process anyway or -- I don't know -- quite understand the --

MR. ELLIOTT: We do need to get with Sanford Cohen & Associates and if they have clearances that need to be reinstated, we need to get started work on that right away. We don't have to wait now for the other two tasks to be awarded. We need this to start right now.

DR. ZIEMER: And that would not necessarily preclude them from beginning their process on these sites, either.

MR. PRESLEY: Paul, can I speak without getting in trouble?

DR. ZIEMER: You can't mention Oak Ridge.

MR. PRESLEY: I would like to see one of the production plants also put in here, and that's as far as I will go. When you look at what we have here, we don't have any of the plants that have a lot of production on a lot of different types of

metals there, and I think we need to put one of the production plants in there.

DR. ZIEMER: Okay, thank you. Mark?

MR. GRIFFON: Can I propose to amend the motion to add Y-12, notwithstanding the clearance issues? I think -- I think that's kind of what Bob might have been getting at --

DR. ZIEMER: Don't put words into Bob's mouth.

MR. GRIFFON: I won't, I'm not, but --

DR. ZIEMER: Is this --

MR. GRIFFON: -- that was also on my --

DR. ZIEMER: -- a motion to add it to the list or --

MR. GRIFFON: That was the one difference in my original list of five with Leon's and I'm proposing to amend his list to include Y-12.

DR. ZIEMER: That's six to be --

MR. GRIFFON: Yeah.

DR. ANDRADE: I second that motion.

DR. ZIEMER: That's seconded. Okay. Now, anyone wish to speak for or against the motion to add Y-12 to the list?

MR. OWENS: I'll speak in favor of that motion, Dr. Ziemer. That was an oversight on my

part. I did have -- I did have Y-12 was -- within the group, not of five but of six, so --

DR. ZIEMER: So you had -- you had six.

MR. OWENS: -- I'll speak in favor of that.

DR. ZIEMER: The mover is therefore telling us that this is a friendly amendment. Does the seconder agree that that's a friendly amendment? Who seconded this original motion?

MR. OWENS: Dr. Melius.

DR. ZIEMER: Dr. Melius? It sound friendly to you?

DR. MELIUS: Yes, very friendly.

DR. ZIEMER: Then the Chair declares that as part of the original motion and it -- we don't even need to vote on this amendment.

Now Rich.

MR. ESPINOSA: Yeah, can you repeat the list of five with addition of the six?

DR. ZIEMER: Yeah, the list now, as I understand it, is Hanford, INEEL, National -- well, Nevada Test Site, Rocky Flats, Savannah River Site and Y-12. That's six sites. Does that -- everybody agree that those are the six? Are you ready to vote? Comment, Robert?

MR. PRESLEY: Can I vote, or do I need to

recuse myself?

DR. ZIEMER: Perhaps what we can do -- the Chair will divide the vote into six parts. The Chair's allowed -- you can divide a motion into parts, and you can vote on those parts for which you have no conflict of interest. Is that agreeable?

The record will then allow people to recuse themselves on particular votes, or abstain. And it would be -- an abstention would be in order. Are you ready to vote in six parts?

First -- the first part would be to approve Hanford as being on the list of site profiles to be reviewed initially. All in favor, aye.

(Affirmative responses)

All opposed, no.

(No responses)

Abstaining? One. Let the record show that Wanda has abstained.

Idaho, INEEL, all in favor, aye.

(Affirmative responses)

Opposed?

(No responses)

Abstentions?

(No responses)

We have no Idaho folks here. Nevada Test Site, all in favor, aye?

(Affirmative responses)

Opposed?

(No responses)

Abstentions? We have two abstentions. Okay. Where am I on the list?

Rocky Flats.

UNIDENTIFIED: You may want to give for the record who the abstentions were because --

DR. ZIEMER: Yes, we did indicate the abstentions. We have that on the record. Right?

THE COURT REPORTER: I don't have the names.

DR. ZIEMER: I'm sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED: The names for the last one you didn't do.

DR. ZIEMER: The last abstentions were Mark Griffon and Robert Presley. That was on Nevada Test Site.

Rocky Flats, all in favor, aye.

(Affirmative responses)

Opposed, no.

(No responses)

Abstentions?

(No responses)

None. Savannah River Site, all in favor, aye.

(Affirmative responses)

Opposed?

(No responses)

Abstentions?

(No responses)

Y-12, all in favor, aye.

(Affirmative responses)

Opposed?

(No responses)

Abstentions?

Roy DeHart abstains, Robert Presley abstains, the Chair abstains.

Then I declare that those submotions have all carried and those six sites will be identified to our contractor as the first group to be audited.

Now does the Board wish to identify on AWE facilities some initial sites? In this case we have for the total contract -- I think it was a maximum of four, was it not?

UNIDENTIFIED: Two to four.

DR. ZIEMER: Two to four. Do you wish to identify any of these at this time for initial review?