The Subcommittee for Dose Reconstruction Review
of 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 Eighth Meeting
January 8, 2008

The Eighth Meeting of the Subcommittee for Dose Reconstruction Review (the Subcommittee) of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health (ABRWH or the Board) was held in Las Vegas, Nevada on January 8, 2008. The meeting was called to order by **Dr. Lewis Wade**, the Designated Federal Official, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH). These summary minutes, as well as a verbatim transcript certified by a court reporter, are available on the internet on the web site of the NIOSH/Office of Compensation Analysis and Support (OCAS) located at www.cdc.gov/niosh/ocas. Those present included the following:

Subcommittee Members: Mr. Mark Griffon, Chair; Mr. Michael Gibson, Ms. Wanda Munn, and Dr. John Poston; with alternates Mr. Brad Clawson and Mr. Robert Presley.

Designated Federal Official: Dr. Lewis Wade, Executive Secretary

Federal Agency Attendees:

Department of Health and Human Services: Mr. Larry Elliott, Mr. Stuart Hinnefeld.

Contractors:

Sanford Cohen & Associates: Ms. Kathy Behling (via telephone), Mr. Doug Farver, Dr. John Mauro.

Public Attendees: None identified.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Dr. Wade introduced himself as the Designated Federal Official serving the Eighth Meeting of the Subcommittee on Dose Reconstruction Review, identifying the Chairman, members and alternate members and noting all were present at the table. He announced **Mr. Stuart Hinnefeld** would be representing NIOSH, with **Ms. Kathy Behling**, attending via telephone, and **Dr. John Mauro** present on behalf of SC&A.

Dr. Wade invited other participants on the telephone to identify themselves if they wished, with no responses.

Mr. Mark Griffon, Subcommittee Chair, opened the meeting by explaining that today's meeting will be primarily updates of ongoing work. He noted that in between Board meetings the Subcommittee does have meetings in which they get into more technical findings and resolutions, but this will be a status report.

Mr. Griffon commented that **Mr. Hinnefeld** had just provided the Subcommittee with matrices in order to select the next round of cases for SC&A review, and they will be going over those.

Outlining the agenda, **Mr. Griffon** noted the first portion of the meeting will be to discuss the fourth, fifth and sixth review matrices which are in various stages of the comment resolution process. Those sets are comprised of 20 cases. The review process was explained for those in the audience not familiar with it, noting the seventh and eighth sets of cases have not come back to the Subcommittee at this point. He added that at the end of the meeting they will focus on the selection of cases for a ninth set for SC&A review.

Mr. Griffon discussed that he had spoken preliminarily to SC&A about rolling the matrices into a database similar to one being incorporated by the procedures review workgroup.

*** * * * ***

FOURTH SET OF CASE REVIEWS

In updating the fourth set of cases **Mr. Griffon** noted that they are close to resolving all findings. He commented he would address a few specific issues to be sure everybody was together on the status. He discussed findings including those related to a failure to properly account for radiological incidents, a question about some IREP entries, triangular distribution related to whole body counting, environmental internal exposure values, all of which it was agreed had been resolved

to the satisfaction of both NIOSH and SC&A.

It was agreed a question of whether a person should have had neutron monitoring based on areas worked would continue to be addressed and resolved in the Y-12 site profile review. Other issues and their resolutions were discussed.

* * * * *

FIFTH SET OF CASE REVIEWS

This group of cases was discussed in much the same way, with issues enumerated and resolutions, or approaches to resolutions, agreed upon. This included an extensive discussion on reviews of AWE sites.

* * * * *

SIXTH SET OF CASE REVIEWS

Mr. Griffon commented that he was not going to go through the sixth set in detail. There had been one meeting to review the initial NIOSH responses and those had been discussed at that time. He explained they had agreed a lot of the findings had been seen on other case reviews, so a number of them were resolved fairly quickly. Those will be brought to the next technical Subcommittee meeting.

* * * * *

BUILDING A DOSE RECONSTRUCTION DATABASE

The building of a dose reconstruction database populated by the six sets of reviewed cases was discussed. **Mr. Griffon** remarked he would like to wait for the Procedures Review Workgroup to work out the kinks in order to make it a more expeditious process for the Subcommittee to use the workgroup's format, but with a separate database. The building of the database was discussed at length, with various suggestions offered, including the ability to link from one database to another.

* * * * *

BLIND REVIEWS

Mr. Griffon reminded the group that they had agreed to select two cases for blind review, and possibly that would come under the last fiscal year's work for SC&A. The cases were selected, but **Mr. Griffon** reported he has just recently been notified that one of those cases is

under appeal. The replacement case has been selected and SC&A should shortly have both cases to begin work on those blind reviews.

* * * * *

DOSE RECONSTRUCTION GUIDELINES

Mr. Griffon raised the issue of dose reconstruction guidelines used by the dose reconstruction staff. He explained this has been hard to define, but his suggestion was that the case file should include those guidelines, even retroactively, if possible. **Mr. Hinnefeld** had looked into the matter and reported it would be very much of a problem to accomplish retroactive inclusion, and **Mr. Griffon** had agreed to drop that portion of the suggestion.

Going forward with guidelines being placed in currently active files, **Mr. Hinnefeld** did not have the information on when that could be implemented. He indicated he had had some initial discussions with the contractor. **Mr. Hinnefeld** explained the guidelines are often given out in staff meetings and are a clarification of something already available in a technical document, so it will take more discussion with the contractor to determine the extent of what can be done. In looking at the cases for today's work, there is no way of knowing whether any of those would have the guidance documents in their files.

* * *

Mr. Griffon added that once the fourth and fifth matrices are completed, he would send around a straw man draft roll-up summary report of the first 100 cases reviewed.

* * *

Mr. Larry Elliott joined the discussion to clarify exactly what was being expected, explaining that in some cases there may be some formal guidance but in others there may not. This will necessitate some discussion with the contractor, with some thought being given to exactly what can be provided. Many times it may be notes taken by an individual who attended the contractor's meeting, a slide show presented, or even something from training sessions.

* * * * *

SELECTION OF CASES FOR FUTURE REVIEW

A 9-page list of randomly-selected completed cases, and a 19-page list

of 400 cases with full internal and external dose estimation types, were provided and reviewed in an effort to select a minimum of 60 cases for SC&A review. It was agreed that the Subcommittee would begin with the 19-page list and consider cases working from back to front because cases had been sorted by approval dates, with the oldest date first. The Subcommittee had previously discussed they preferred to choose those most recently completed cases so they could be reviewing cases using the most current approaches.

Their intent was to select 60 cases, the number to be reviewed by SC&A in their current year's work, with the understanding that a number of those cases would be dropped off for various reasons and would have to be replaced later. By selecting a large number now, it will afford SC&A a generous supply of cases to begin their work.

After a discussion of individual cases from both lists, 60 potential cases were identified and would be presented to the full Board for their consideration. **Mr. Hinnefeld** observed that at the end of the Board's deliberations NIOSH will have Department of Labor review the selected cases for identification of those with a likelihood of reopening or which may be in the early stages of a reopening. NIOSH will look at the Program Evaluation Review list for any cases that may have to be taken off the list until those issues have been resolved. They will then go through the remaining cases and add the supplemental information about internal dose reconstruction type, external dose reconstruction type, neutrons, et cetera.

The anticipation then is that at the next Subcommittee meeting they can review the updated list and fill in those gaps, but this will give SC&A the material to start work.

*** * * * ***

With no further business to come before the Subcommittee, the meeting was adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

End of Summary Minutes

♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦

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

_____

Mark Griffon, Chair Date