CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIATION AND WORKER HEALTH

TELECONFERENCE OF MEETING 151

THURSDAY, APRIL 20, 2023

The meeting convened at 1 p.m.

EDT via video teleconference,

Dr. Henry Anderson, Chair, presiding.

Vet Reporting

Certified Court Reporters

PO Box 72314

Marietta, GA 30007

678-646-5330 ext. 514

reporter@vetreporting.com

Members Present:

Henry A. Anderson, Chair

Beach, Josie, Member

Cassano, Victoria, Member

Brad Clawson, Member

Frank, Arthur, Member

Kotelchuck, David, Member

Lockey, James, Member

Martinez, Nicole, Member

Pompa, David, Member

Roessler, Genevieve, Member

Valerio, Loretta, Member

Ziemer, Paul, Member

Registered and/or Public Comment Participants:

Roberts, Rashaun, DFO

Adams, Nancy, NIOSH contractor

Barton, Bob, SC&A

Behling, Kathy, SC&A

Buchanan, Ron, SC&A

Cardarelli, John, NIOSH

Calhoun, Grady, DCAS

Fitzgerald, Joe, SC&A

Gogliotti, Rose, SC&A

Griego-Kelleher, Regina, DOE

Habighurst, Ashton, HHS

Registered and/or Public Comment Participants Continued:

Mangel, Amy, SC&A

Nelson, Chuck, DCAS

Ostrow, Steve, SC&A

Rutherford, LaVon, DCAS/ORAU

Taulbee, Tim, DCAS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROCEEDINGS

(1:00 P.M.)

WELCOME AND ROLL CALL

DR. ROBERTS: So, good morning (sic), and welcome everyone. I'm Rashaun Roberts. I'm the designated federal officer for the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health. I'd like to welcome you to the second and final session of Board Meeting 151. All of the materials for both sessions, the one yesterday and today, the agendas, presentations, and other documents are posted on the NIOSH website for this program under schedule of public meetings. You would just need to go to calendar year 2023 and click on the tab for April to find those materials. If you're participating by telephone, you can go to the website to access all the materials, and you can follow along with the presentations. All of the materials were provided to Board Members and staff prior to this meeting.

So, as you know, this meeting is being conducted by telephone and by Zoom. On the website there's a Zoom link which will enable you to hear and watch the presentations through Zoom. If you've chosen to receive audio through Zoom, you should be able to speak to the group and hear the presentations. If you're not speaking, be sure to select and stay on mute by muting the microphone on the lower left-hand corner of your screen if you're in Zoom. If you have dialed in, you'll only be able to speak and hear the presentations through the telephone line. Please make sure that your phone stays muted unless you are speaking. If you don't have a mute button, press star six; if you need to take yourself off mute, press star six again.

Also, if you're only participating by phone and we are unable to see your name, so please identify yourself before providing your comments or questions.

So, let me move into the roll call at this point. I'll start with the Board Members in alphabetical order. Board Members and staff should state any conflicts of interest you might have as you register your attendance. I will note that there is a discussion of the Savannah River Site today, and anyone who's conflicted will be asked to disconnect from the meeting for that agenda item and to rejoin for the Board work session.

So, let's go ahead and start with the Board Members. And we'll start with the chair, Anderson.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Present, and no conflicts.

DR. ROBERTS: Beach?

MEMBER BEACH: I am here. And I am conflicted at Hanford. Good morning.

DR. ROBERTS: Good morning.

DR. ROBERTS: Cassano?

MEMBER CASSANO: Good morning. I am here, and I am -- have no conflicts.

DR. ROBERTS: Clawson?

MEMBER CLAWSON: I'm here. I'm conflicted at INL.

DR. ROBERTS: Okay. Frank? I think he let us know he wouldn't be able to make today's session. Kotelchuck?

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Good afternoon. Present, no conflicts.

DR. ROBERTS: Lockey?

MEMBER LOCKEY: Good afternoon. Conflicted at Fernald, Y-12, K-25, and Portsmouth.

DR. ROBERTS: Martinez?

MEMBER MARTINEZ: I'm here. Sorry, I had a hard time unmuting. I am conflicted at Savannah River and Oak Ridge X-10, so I will be dropping off for the middle part of the agenda today.

DR. ROBERTS: Thank you. Pompa? Was he able to make it in from Teams? Let's go to --

MS. BURGOS: Yes, he's going to log in in Zoom.

DR. ROBERTS: Okay. Roessler?

MEMBER ROESSLER: I'm here. I have no conflicts.

DR. ROBERTS: Valerio?

MEMBER VALERIO: I'm here, and I'm conflicted all sites in New Mexico, Pantex, and Nevada Test Site.

DR. ROBERTS: Okay, Thank you. Ziemer?

MEMBER ZIEMER: I'm here. I'm conflicted at Oak Ridge X-10.

DR. ROBERTS: All right. While we wait for Pompa to join, we'll just go on to NIOSH/ORAU.

MR. CALHOUN: This is Grady Calhoun, and I am conflicted at Fernald.

DR. TAULBEE: This is Tim Taulbee, and I'm conflicted a Mound.

MR. RUTHERFORD: This is LaVon Rutherford, and I am conflicted at the Fernald Site.

MR. NELSON: This is Chuck Nelson, and I am also conflicted at Fernald.

DR. CARDARELLI: This is John Cardarelli, and I am conflicted at

Fernald.

DR. ROBERTS: Anyone else for NIOSH/DCAS/ORAU? Okay. Let's move on to SC&A.

MR. BARTON: Bob Barton, SC&A, no conflicts.

MS. BEHLING: Kathy Behling, --

DR. BUCHANAN: Ron Buchanan, S --

MS. BEHLING: Kathy Behling, SC&A, no conflicts.

DR. BUCHANAN: Ron Buchanan, SC&A, conflicted at Los Alamos.

MR. FITZGERALD: Joe Fitzgerald, SC&A, no conflicts.

MS. GOGLIOTTI: Rose Gogliotti, no conflicts.

MS. MANGEL: Amy Mangel, conflicted at Pacific Northwest National Laboratory.

MR. OSTROW: Steve Ostrow, no conflicts.

DR. ROBERTS: Anyone else for SC&A? Okay. HHS and contractors.

MS. HABIGHURST: Ashton Habighurst, HHS, no conflict.

MS. ADAMS: Nancy -- excuse me. Nancy Adams, NIOSH contractor, no conflict.

DR. ROBERTS: Any others from HHS or contractors? Is there anyone here from the departments, DOL/DOE, others?

MS. GRIEGO: This is Regina --

MEMBER FRANK: Rashaun?

MS. GRIEGO: This is Regina --

MR. FRANK: Rashaun? I'm sorry. Can you hear me, Rashaun?

DR. ROBERTS: Yes.

MEMBER FRANK: This is Arthur Frank. I'm actually in a recovery

room in a hospital, but I'm -- I'm doing fine, so I'll join as long as I can, but I'll be on mute and without my picture, but I am here.

DR. ROBERTS: Okay. Well, I hope you're getting rested.

MEMBER FRANK: I am. I'm going to be here for a while, but they may need to deal with me, and I am conflicted at Pantex.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Are you oriented as to place and time?

MEMBER FRANK: Let's see, it's -- the -- the -- the star shapes -- star station zebra and it's -- it's the 50th day of the month. Yeah, I'm fine, Andy.

DR. ROBERTS: Thank you. Okay. Well, while we're back to Board Members, has Pompa joined us yet. Okay. We'll give him some extra time. And I thought I heard someone from the DOL or DOE trying to speak.

MS. GRIEGO: Yeah. This is Regina Griego-Kelleher. I'm here for DOE.

DR. ROBERTS: Okay, great. Thank you. Anyone else from DOE/DOL, others?

MS. ADAMS: Rashaun, this is Nancy. It looks like David's on, but he's muted.

DR. ROBERTS: Okay. David, can you verbally confirm that you're here. If you're not speaking, just a reminder to put yourself on mute. All right. Let's move on to members of the public who might want to register their attendance at this time. Okay. And again, a reminder, you know, just to get everything settled, just to make sure that if you're on the phone, please mute it. If you don't have a mute button, press star six. If you need to take yourself off, press star six again.

So, with that, I will go ahead and turn the agenda over to Dr. Henry Anderson who's our Board chair for the official welcome. Andy?

CHAIR ANDERSON: I'm hearing someone's voices.

DR. ROBERTS: Yeah. I'm still hearing some interference.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Okay. Let's move into day two here. And our first presentation is the SEC petition status update from Chuck Nelson.

MR. NELSON: Thanks, Dr. Anderson. I'll attempt to share. Of course, we always have Grady if we need help with this. Let's see. Please let me know if that's coming up.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Yes, it is.

SEC PETITIONS STATUS UPDATE

MR. NELSON: Okay, then I will get started. My name is Charles Nelson. I will be doing the DCAS/SEC team update today, and I'll get right into it. We do this SEC update at every Board meeting, and the purpose is to update petitioners, our general public, and our Advisory Board on where we are with SEC petitions so -- with this update, but let you know how many petitions we have in qualification, and for those that qualify, how many are under evaluation by DCAS, and it'll also show the number or petitions currently with the Advisory Board. And finally, we'll identify any 8314's that are with -- that are with NIOSH or being initiated through NIOSH. Those are called 8314's.

Okay. So, to date, we have received 260 SEC petitions. We currently have no petitions in qualification. Thus far, there have been 153 SEC petitions that qualified for further evaluation by DCAS, and there are

currently no evaluations in progress. And of all the 153 evaluations that I mentioned, have been -- those evaluation reports have been completed by DCAS, and right now, we have an ongoing evaluation report with the Advisory Board. And to date, we have 107 petitions out of the 260 total petitions that we received that did not qualify for further evaluation.

Okay. So, let's talk about some of the petitions we have, first one being Lawrence Livermore National Lab. It's from the period of 1990 to 1995. It's in Livermore, California. That's SEC petition 221, and we're working on the ER addendum to address the remaining years for all employees and making some progress on that -- on the addendum. And we hope to have that out by September of 2023.

Also, an Advisory Board review is Hanford SEC-57. All the issues are closed except those related to the current ongoing coexposure modeling efforts. Next up is Savannah River. That's SEC-103, and we're working to resolve issues that were raised by SC&A and the work group. A working group meeting did occur on March 22, 2023, and following this meeting, there'll be an update from the work group on Savannah River.

Okay. Then we have Los Alamos National Lab. That's SEC-109. Again, we're working on -- to resolve issues raised by SC&A and the work group. You may remember there was a data capture to LANL. It was performed in January of 2023 and also included a tour of the LANL's facility. And there's going to be another additional data capture on May 5, 2023, and the purpose is to review some additional boxes and perform a tour at LANL's facility once again. I understand there'll be some work group members on that site visit.

Then we have Idaho National Lab. That's SEC-219. We're working on resolving issues raised by SC&A and the work group. Again, we did a data capture at INL the week of the 12th of December, last year. And there's a tentative plan to visit the site again, and I think the date we're looking at is June 26, 2023. And the purpose will be to review some classified documents related to the INL Burial Grounds.

Okay. Then we have Argonne National Lab West. That's SEC-224. NIOSH is working again to resolve some issues raised by SC&A and the work group. Next up is Santa Susanna. We've been working with the records center at EMCBC, and that's here in Cincinnati. But they've been digitizing records and providing those records to us. We've gotten quite a bit of records from them, so we are currently going through those in order to try to resolve remaining work group issues.

Next up is Metals and Controls. That's SEC-236. It's with the Metals and Controls work group. There is a Metals and Controls work group scheduled next month on the 12th, so that's May 12th.

Next up is DeSoto Avenue facility, SEC-246. DeSoto is similar to SSFL in that we are working with the records center in Cincinnati, EMCBC, and again, they've been digitizing records and sending to us for review. So, we continue to go through those records as we received those.

And we have Y-12, SEC-250. That's an addendum to the evaluation report. It was presented in August of '21 at the Advisory Board meeting, and SC&A was assigned to perform a review of that evaluation report.

And finally, we have Pinellas Plant. That's SEC-256. We presented the evaluation report in December of 2021. And again, SC&A was assigned to

perform a review of that evaluation report.

So, what we have here, we have sites with evaluation periods awaiting action. So, it'll have in one column the site, the SEC number, followed by the date. And what we have here is Hanford SEC-57, the time period of '84 to '90 related to prime contractors; Savannah River Site, SEC-103, '72 to 2007 for prime contractors; and then we have again Savannah River Site, SEC-103, it's '91 to 2007 for subcontractors; we have Los Alamos National Lab, SEC-219. It's from 1996 to 2005 followed by INO -- excuse me -- Idaho National Lab, SEC-191, from 1949 to 1970. We have Argonne National Lab West, SEC-224, for the time period of 1958 through 1979. And then Area IV Santa Susanna, SEC-235, 1991 through 1993. We also have Metals and Controls, SEC-236. It's from 1968 through 1997. That's the residual period. And DeSoto Avenue Facility SEC-246 from 1965 to 1995. Y-12, which is SEC-250, from 1979 to 1994, and Pinellas from -- which is SEC-256. It's 1957 to 1990.

Potential SEC petition is for West Valley Demonstration project. There was an SEC issued after 1969. We had a good amount -- we have a good amount of data between '66 and '68 we're going through to see if there's any potential feasibility. So that's currently in our house, and we're working on it.

That's all I have for now. Are there any questions?

MEMBER CLAWSON: Yeah, Chuck, this is Brad. Give me an update of where we're at on Hanford. That's kind of been dragging a little bit there.

MR. NELSON: Yeah, I can give you an update there, Brad. So, what we did is we were getting really bogged down from some of the early years.

There was -- a lot of it was related to fission product data, and as we're trying to do these co-exposure evaluations for these earlier years, we ran the problem that -- for completeness on fission product data. So, we started mining and trying to get this fission product data, and it slowed us down. So, what we did is decided to split it out into two periods, pre-1984, where we're running into some issues -- as a reminder, that's the SEC period -- and '84 and forward, so that's the current evaluation period. So that's moving forth, the '84 and forward, and we're still working on the previous time period. But our current schedule is hopefully by later this year, we'll be done with the '84 and forward. I think the other time period's gonna take a little longer, but we want to give due diligence to the already SEC period, so that's pre-'84, so that those people with nonpresumptive cancers get a fair shake at having some dose assigned to them, if at all possible.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay, thank you.

MR. NELSON: Okay.

MEMBER BEACH: Hey, Chuck. This is Josie. I have a question on slide six. You talked about the LANL trip for May 5th. Our original correspondence was May 16th. Did that change to May 5th or is that a typo?

MR. NELSON: Bomber, weigh in on that since he's the LANL guy.

MR. RUTHERFORD: That is a typo, and it's a typo that I should have caught when I reviewed it, so --

MEMBER BEACH: Okay.

MR. RUTHERFORD: Yes, it is May 16th and currently, I think, Brad is the one work group member that will be attending with me.

MEMBER BEACH: Okay, great. I was -- I was hoping you would say that.

And then the second one, Idaho National Labs, you're scheduled tentatively for June 26th. I'm interested in going on that data capture for the Burial Ground, so if you could, keep SC&A and the work group members in the loop on that.

MR. NELSON: We sure will. John Cardarelli's online if he wants to pipe in, but he certainly intends on doing that. And to back up a little bit on Metals and Controls, Bomber may have -- LaVon may have -- Lavon may have given me that comment, and I may -- you have missed it, so I will put him on the hook for that. But it just sounds kind of familiar is what I was gonna say.

MEMBER BEACH: Oh, yeah. That was for Los Alamos.

MR. NELSON: LANL, okay.

MEMBER BEACH: LANL. And then also, are you planning to go on -- or is there any plans of doing any worker interviews during that June 26th time frame, or is it just strictly data capture?

DR. CARDARELLI: Yeah, hi, Josie. This is John Cardarelli. Currently we're still planning that agenda, and I don't have any specific interviews in the pipeline for that particular week. We're really looking at those records at the Burial Grounds and potentially looking for additional neutron film badge boxes.

MEMBER BEACH: Okay, great. Thank you.

DR. CARDARELLI: So that trip is still in -- we're still planning the details. I will make sure that you are included for all the trip planning

logistics.

MEMBER BEACH: Okay, great. Thanks, John. Appreciate it.

DR. CARDARELLI: Sure, thanks.

MEMBER ZIEMER: Chuck, this is Paul Ziemer. Was -- I think it was your last slide. The West Valley, I assume that's an 8314. Is it?

MR. NELSON: Yeah, it's potentially an 8314. We're just evaluating the earlier years just to see if there is any feasibility, so.

MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay, thank you.

MR. NELSON: You're welcome.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Chuck, Dave Kotelchuck. You know, your slide three is a bit confusing. When I read it first, I added up all the numbers and I had 270, and I said wait, wait a minute. Now you explain this clearly in your report just now that the 260 represents what you have done through the SEC team, but an ordinary reader would look at the 10 reports with the Advisory Board and not realize no, you're -- you're just reporting for your SEC team. And I think it would be helpful clear it up for readers, including general public folks who may want to read it, --

MR. NELSON: Okay.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: -- if you indicate that -- you know, that this is for the SEC team and that the SEC team reported this to the Advisory -- and sent it to the Advisory Board and which 10 are now in consideration.

MR. NELSON: Okay. Thank you Dr. Kotelchuck, I'll make note of it, and I'll try to clarify that.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Sure.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Hey, Chuck, this is -- this is also Brad. Also, for

-- just for the other Board Members and stuff, the tour down for LANL, it's actually a classified tour, so you have to have a clearance to be able to go through it. And I thought you said the same thing about Idaho for the Burial Grounds, too, they are classified documents that you're reviewing.

MR. NELSON: I believe so. I'll let John weigh in here.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Well, what -- what -- just make sure that when you put that in that -- that people will realize that you have to have a clearance to be able to do on that one, on those two. Thanks.

DR. CARDARELLI: Yeah, Brad, I don't -- Mr. Clawson, this is John Cardarelli. I don't know, but we are looking at classified documents when we go out to Idaho. So, I think that answers --

MEMBER CLAWSON: Yeah, I just I just wanted to make sure people realize that.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Okay. Any other questions?

DR. CARDARELLI: I just wanted to clarify something. Right now those records that we're looking at in Idaho are actually restricted. They may be classified, but right now we know that they are to be -- they're restricted. That's their technical term.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Thanks, John. Other questions or comments about the status update? Okay.

SAVANNAH RIVER SITE WORK GROUP UPDATE

CHAIR ANDERSON: Let's move on to the next topic here, which is Brad and the work group for Savannah River Site. Just had a meeting, so give us an update on where we stand.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Thank you, Henry. Appreciate that. So, I just -- to bring the Board up a little bit of speed to where -- where we're at. You realize that we -- we've singled out the subcontractor --

DR. ROBERTS: Excuse me. Sorry to interrupt. I just want to remind Nicole you need to disconnect from this portion of the meeting, and we will give you a call for you to come back on.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Look at that, she already jumped off.

DR. ROBERTS: Okay. I can still see her there, but I just want to make sure she knows she needs to disconnect.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Are we good?

DR. ROBERTS: I think so. I'll just send an email.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Great. Go ahead, Bob. You're good. Brad, Brad.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Yeah. I was just gonna give a brief overview that back in March 22nd, we had a work group meeting and that we're -- we're evaluating, and a cut off time in Savannah River from '91 to -- to whatever the data is -- is really good. That's how we're trying to get to it. With that, I'll turn it over to Bob Barton from SC&A and let him work.

MR. BARTON: Okay. Well, thank you, Brad. Hopefully everybody can see the title presentation slide. Hopefully, I sound okay. I know we were having some problems with audio yesterday.

CHAIR ANDERSON: We're all good.

MEMBER CLAWSON: You sound good, Bob.

MR. BARTON: All right, excellent. Well, good afternoon, everyone. I will be providing a status update on SRS regarding recent report submissions, discussion -- and discussions with a focus on subcontract

construction workers after 1990, and that's under SEC-0103. Before I really get started and while I have the privilege of presenting this update, I'd like to take a moment to acknowledge Joe Fitzgerald and Ron Buchanan, which were the primary authors of the main report we'll be discussing that NIOSH has responded to and the work group discussed about a month ago. And they're on the line with us, so certainly will be available to answer any specific question that I might fumble around on regarding this material. So, without further ado, we'll start with a brief summary and time line of recent events and report submissions.

Hopefully you-all saw that. Okay. So, we'll start in July 2021. Of course, these discussions go back many, many more years than that, but these are really the sort of the pertinent things. Back in July of 2021, the Board submitted its recommended -- recommendation letter to the HHS secretary recommending SEC class for subcontract construction trade workers from 1972 through 1990. Actually, the class is not the entirety of 1972 because a previous SEC class actually ended in Sept of 1972. So that recommended class actually began in October of 1972, just for clarification. Note that the SEC-103 actually considers all workers from October 1972 through 2007, though like many of these evaluations, it just makes sense to evaluate it and discuss it piecemeal.

So, after the prior piece concerning subcontractors up through 1990, after that was settled, SC&A performed a focus review on the remainder of the period. So that would be 1991 through 2007, and we delivered that in April of 2022. NIOSH completed its response to SC&A's review of this latter period in November of that year, 2022, and it was delivered to everybody

presumably after ADC review was completed in January 2023. And as was -- as was already said, the work group met almost exactly a month ago to discuss this latter period, post-1990 for subcontractors.

So, the current issue really before the work group is that in the late 1990s, 1997 to be exact, it was found during a complete site-wide review of job-specific bioessays that only 21 percent of those required job-specific bioassay had actually been submitted, that is 79 percent never submitted the required bioassay. Just for clarity, for the -- those not close to the issue, job-specific bioassays were used for workers really performing nonroutine work that would require a unique radiation work permit. This could be like a glovebox maintenance, facility upgrades, or, you know, other types of repair operations. And the job specific bioassay was used for workers who were not already on a routine bioassay program. And a job-specific bioassay would be warranted to assess those workers' potential -- potential for intake.

Now, logically the most likely group this would affect would be your transient subcontract workers, which is why we're sort of focusing on them at this stage. And the reason is they're less likely to be on a routine program because of the short-term nature of their work at the sight. However, it should be noted that this would also affect workers maybe on the routine bioassay program for some source terms but maybe not all of the source terms that would be present for the job. For example, if they were on the plutonium program but not the americium program, job-specific bioassay was meant to fill in that gap in the monitoring coverage.

Further it was noted in some former worker interviews that some subcontractors were brought in to do the work associated with a higher

exposure potential. This was noted in a NIOSH evaluation that was emailed to the work group back in 2017. So, really the key question for the work group was did these noted deficiencies in a job-specific program preclude the creation of a co-exposure model, and that was formerly known as a coworker model. The Board recommended a SEC class, so here's the actual verbiage in the Board letter to the HHS secretary. I won't read the whole thing, but I think the key takeaway are the dates. Again, it was October '72 through 1990. And somewhat unique to this definition is the exclusion part of this statement that basically this recommendation only covers subcontractors, and the prime contractors, which are Dupont up through March '89, and then Westinghouse for the remaining nine months of this period, would not be included in this recommended definition.

So, the basis for the SEC. Basically noting the diversity of work activities performed by subcontractors that may have been used in short-term, higher risk activities. Also that some subcontractors may have been transient in nature and used in a non -- in nonroutine work and would be more likely to be covered by job-specific bioassay of the program, that is they are less likely to be covered by routine monitoring.

Further, in the Board recommendation letter -- I will read this part in. (Reading): The Board finds there to be insufficient information, including a lack of job-specific radio bioassay monitoring data for subcontractor construction trade workers and assurance of workplace monitoring and source term data enable NIOSH to estimate with sufficient accuracy all potential internal doses from radionuclides associated with fuel handling, reactor operations, fuel reprocessing, and/or research activities to which the

proposed class may have been exposed during the time period in question.

So now to the actual focus review that SC&A performed and NIOSH responded to and was discussed last month. There were really three main lines of inquiry in SC&A's process. The first involved the actual site policies concerning job-specific bioassay, basically looking at the procedures in place and the implementation of RWP-directed bioassay. For example, what percentage of RWPs actually specify the bioassay requirement (indiscernible) job, regardless of if they're covered by routine monitoring or job specific. The second, the completeness of the job-specific portion, basically what -- what percentage of the required job-specific bioassays were actually submitted. This third bullet refers directly back to the main report underpinning the entire discussion. This was report 92, which was titled "Evaluation of Bioassay Data for Subcontracted Construction Trade Workers at the Savannah River Site." And it gets to representativeness of the scope and matching of the jobs-specific bioassay to the actual submitted samples. Okay. We'll get into all of this a bit later, but two key words on this slide are essentially completeness and representation, which are really the core tenets, or two of the four core tenants, of what is known as the implementation guide, which really lays the groundwork, the criteria by which co-exposure models can be justified.

Hold on one second. Take a sip of water.

Okay, moving on. So, moving on to the conclusions of SC&A's focus review for this latter period, there were five total. We're also including NIOSH's responses to those conclusions and the subsequent work group discussions. So, this slide has conclusion one -- was that really the sampling

premise was not consistent with the actual SRS practices. RWPs, actually, were really introduced at the site in sort of a stepwise fashion. It really started with some Tiger Team findings which occurred in around 1990, but RWPs weren't actually implemented by procedure until 1992. That was in a procedure, 5Q1.1, I believe. Actual observed implementation of job-specific bioassay on the RWPs really wasn't to SC&A until the mid-1990s. In NIOSH's response, they note in that it was the transition between the prime contractors, basically DuPont transferring to Westinghouse, that led to the increase in actual job-specific bioassy that was mandated by the RWP. So, the absence of such requirements physically on the RWP is irrelevant to the overall discussion and basically that this line of inquiry is really not necessary to construct a co-exposure model.

The work group discussed this conclusion. There was definitely agreement that RWPs evolved during the '90s. There was still some disagreement on how the actual performance rate was calculated. And when I say, "performance rate," I mean how many workers on a given RWP were monitored via appropriate bioassay.

Moving on to conclusion two. This really regards how you assess what is termed direct and effective monitoring as found in report 92. And that's the report I mentioned earlier. In this context, "direct" refers to a worker who was on an RWP and is directly sampled, and "effective" refers to an unmonitored worker who essentially worked alongside or who had the same exposure potential as a monitored worker on the same RWP. NIOSH generally agreed and updated some of its tallies in its response; however, the updated numbers do not affect our conclusion that a co-exposure model

is feasible.

NIOSH was also concerned about part of SC&A's analysis that evaluated bioassay compliance, that is compliance with the RWP and used an arbitrary value of 80 percent compliance as a sort of delineation point. The work group discussed and acknowledged that the 80 percent metric was indeed arbitrary, though -- though it should really be noted that such arbitrary metrics have been used by both SC&A and NIOSH in the past for these types of evaluations.

Conclusion three. This is -- regards how you are establishing an appropriate match, that is a matching a monitored worker with an unmonitored worker on the same RWP. NIOSH's response was that you don't necessarily need a one-to-one correlation between workers, especially in the context of a co-exposure model. You only need to demonstrate the monitored workers have the same or higher exposure potential. And further that SC&A's criteria when we did -- we sort of broke down the numbers by a number of different ways, but the criteria of the same RWP, date, relative time, and job type is too restrictive.

During the work group discussion SC&A clarified that the matching contained in 92 is different than the co-exposure model, which essentially contains the entire monitored site population. But generally agreed that different crafts can be used if it is apparent that the same or higher exposures were monitored.

Oh, I think I lost my screen. Hold on, folks. Somebody took over.

MS. GOGLIOTTI: I think we're seeing Gary's screen.

MR. BARTON: Yeah. See if I can take it back here. One second,

folks. Gary, you might need to -- you might need to unshare. Okay, let's try this again. Okay, how we looking?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good.

MEMBER BEACH: You're -- you're back.

MR. BARTON: All right. Conclusion four. Essentially, SC&A's evaluation of the RWP-related monitoring for this latter period, that is post 1990, concluded that the data was indeed incomplete to varying degrees. NIOSH in its response pointed out that there are uncertainties with noncompliance with the RWP, and those uncertainties are unknown. And, again, that issue is not -- or NIOSH said that that issue does not affect the ability to construct a co-exposure model. Basically, if the samples were required by sight, were collected, and are part of the data set -- for example, when a suspect -- suspected intake occurred, again, the contention is a bounding co-exposure model is feasible.

The work group discussed this issue. One of the new pieces of information that came up is called the TRACK database, which was used to follow essentially for cause or incident or special types of bioassay monitoring. That was identified during a recent interview with the main site internal dosimetrist. NIOSH was tasked with corroborating this new information and also they're actually obtaining the TRACK database for review, which to my knowledge has not yet been captured. During discussions it was clarified that while these types of samples are certainly relevant to co-exposure modeling, but likely not relevant to the completeness of job-specific monitoring. Also, during that meeting, it was proposed that a comparison be made between subcontractors who do have

monitoring data and the prime contractors, that's prime contractor construction workers, that a comparison be made to see what that data might tell us. We'll get into that a bit more a little later.

And finally, the fifth conclusion. In the focus review, SC&A had concluded that the feasibility question should really balance the implementation of the RWP program and the completeness of the available co-exposure data. NIOSH accepted that comment and pointed out that if, you know, SC&A's first four conclusions are adequately addressed, then co-exposure models should be feasible. During the work group, SC&A pointed out that the data set must be representative, that is the data you have actually represents the exposures of those who have no data. Again, ultimately our review sought to balance the job-specific data completeness with information on -- on the program when considering when any -- any potential SEC cutoff point would be justified. These concepts, completeness and representation, are all contained in IG-006. That's the implementation guide, which, again, really lays the groundwork for the general requirements of -- for formulating co-exposure models.

So, work group actions and essentially, the path forward. NIOSH is to provide the TRACK database for review and also obtain documented and independent corroboration, basically of the procedural implementation and information about the special monitoring programs that were described in the recent interview with the site internal dosimetrist. In addition to this, SC&A was tasked with working with NIOSH and the work group to assess the utility and process of potentially comparing the data, and it's available currently between subcontractors and prime contractors. So essentially,

we'd be look -- looking at if -- potential exercise would be a use for the work group discussions, how it might be done, and really who is in the best position to do it if the work group elects to move forward with such an analysis. So, these items will be part of a discussion with the work group moving forward.

SC&A had also planned to issue a follow-up response to its discussion points, but upon reflection, all that tasking was really incurred during the work group and is consistent with past practices. And in looking through my notes for this meeting, I'm not certain it wasn't explicitly tasked, but that's certainly something that can be handled in a simple email exchange.

Finally, in this last bullet, it should be noted that while we're sort of parsing this into different time periods and groups, it does not mean the prime contractors are off the board. They would still need to be discussed and evaluated for -- for the full remaining SEC period, which is, again, 1972 through 2007.

And this is the last slide with just some -- some of the useful reports that were discussed in this presentation. So, with that, I guess I'll -- I'll turn it back to Brad.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Sorry, it takes a little bit to get off mute there. Thank you, Bob. I appreciate that. And I want to open it up for any kind of comments or questions that any of the Board Members before we turn it over to NIOSH? So, John Cardarelli -- Cardarelli, --

DR. CARDARELLI: Yes.

MEMBER CLAWSON: -- are you ready?

DR. CARDARELLI: Well, I didn't prepare any particular presentation

for this. I didn't expect to do that. Bob, could you go through -- through the slides real briefly, and I'll just make a couple of comments. I don't really want to take up a lot of time.

We are in the process of moving forward from that discussion, and I'll just update what we -- where we are on some of these. Let's go to conclusion one, I guess we'll start there. I don't think that there's any -- I think the key point here is that last bullet on the work group discussions where we contend that addressing the radiation work permits and bioassay requirements, it's not really necessary for conducting a co-exposure model. I think the Board recognizes that if we did not have a single radiation work permit, we have the bioassay data with sufficient numbers to produce a co-exposure model. Other sites have been done without having radiation work permits, and I think that's a factor worth acknowledging.

So, if we move on to the next conclusion. So, our response was that we agreed with the monitored -- I think Bob did a good job capturing this. Again, we'd like to read reiterate our conclusion that we can reconstruct or create a co-exposure model with this particular conclusion. So, we can move on here. Conclusion number three generalized matching not -- not sufficient. I don't really have anything major to add to that particular discussion that Bob covered.

Conclusion four. There were some issues and details that are more subtle, but I don't necessarily feel that we need to get into the details of it for the uncertainties associated with this. A lot of these issues also stem from the issue in 1997. I want to point out to the Board that when we talked about 1997 and 21 percent compliance, technically that only occurred

during the second quarter in 1997; it wasn't for the entire year, and it only represented 5 percent the total number of people who were in a bioassay monitoring program. Five percent represents those who were specifically as associated with job specific. So, it sounds worse than it technically is, and it wasn't for a full year; it was just for the single quarter, and we continued pursue that.

The TRACK database, we've made the request, and we are expecting to be getting that from the site in May, next May. We will share that with SC&A at the same time that we receive it. The other thing that we recently did, we shared the full database, what we call, the "data warehouse" -- that's the title given to it by the site -- with SC&A earlier this week. That -- that database contains something on the order of 40 or 39 to 40 files, and we are in the process of going through those files now and trying to determine how we might be able to identify subcontractor construction trade workers in the post 1990 time period.

Move on to conclusion five. I think we -- we're -- he covered that. So those are kind of where we're at. We're just in a process of pulling all of our information together and beginning to work with SC&A and sharing what we have.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Okay. John, explain the 1997 to me then, that first quarter. So, what you're trying to tell me is that the year before was 100 percent and the year after it was 100 percent?

DR. CARDARELLI: No. What I'm saying is the statistic that was presented represents the 21 percent that were monitored. That was for the second quarter in 1997. There was a different monitoring percentage, and I

don't have that off the top of my head, for the first quarter and 1997. So, after that second quarter, the problem remained, and then they went further and did more follow up. And I think what we did is -- what they did was 100 percent follow up on those people. It was like 253 people, they got them all, except for two who had left the site, and 100 percent of those people from the follow up from that second quarter that did not comply showed no intakes. So really, it's just a -- it's a fine window in 1997 that we're discussing about.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Okay. But you left out a little bit of it -- of why -- why they did 100 percent.

DR. CARDARELLI: Oh, well, why did they go back and monitor those folks who did not --

CHAIR ANDERSON: Because of the violation that DOE --

DR. CARDARELLI: Yes.

CHAIR ANDERSON: -- fined them for. That is why we are even where we are at right now.

DR. CARDARELLI: Right. And that violation was moved to a procedural violation rather than a health and safety violation. So, and there's a big difference in understanding the subtleties between that.

MEMBER LOCKEY: Hey, John, Jim Lockey. Can I ask you a question?

DR. CARDARELLI: Yes, sir.

MEMBER LOCKEY: In -- when we had our subcommittee meeting, I don't know that you or Brad or somebody made a statement that they looked at 1996. They went back and looked at 1996, and all the monitoring data was less than 100 millirem. Is -- was that -- are my notes correct on

that?

DR. CARDARELLI: I can't confirm that. I don't have that in front of me. Tim, I see you come on camera.

DR. TAULBEE: Right. Dr. Lockey what the site did, as part of their evaluation was they went back to the 1997 workers, and they requested samples on everybody who was not monitored or who you did not leave the samples and found that there was no intakes. They then went for the 1996 people, and they evaluated all of those people to find out that they need to try and request or not, and they determined that none of those workers had the potential to exceed 100 millirem, therefore they do not need to be monitored in the first place.

MEMBER LOCKEY: And what about all the data from '91 to '95? Any data on that?

DR. TAULBEE: There is some data from that standpoint. There were several facility evaluations that were conducted, and there are some reports. We're trying to get those details out of those reports, and I believe we requested those from the site. We actually have the names of them now and which areas. Several of these were actually tritium facilities, and so they were not the actinides that we looked at in report 92. So, some of this is actually covering some of the tritium facilities. And as we've shown in the past, the tritium doses are all well below 100 millirem for virtually all the workers onsite.

MEMBER LOCKEY: And one more question for you, John. How do you plan to use the -- the TRACK data? I mean, you're gonna analyze -- NIOSH is going to (indiscernible) TRACK data.

DR. CARDARELLI: Yeah, --

MEMBER LOCKEY: How are you going to use that in relationship to your does reconstruction model?

DR. CARDARELLI: Well, we understand that the TRACK data really is data that was associated with specials. So, a special is different than a job-specific. A special is a known event occurred at the site. It doesn't necessarily mean an intake confirmed, but some -- there was some failure in protocol, either engineering control, an alarm went off and a specific call went out to the site, a lead health physicist or internal dosimetrist, and they made the call as to whether or not a special for-cause sample would be taken. And those are typically those incidents which the highest potential exposure may have occurred, and they are particularly used for doing dose reconstructions and things of that nature.

So, these would be representative of the highest known exposed workers where a situation occurred that caused a special bioassay sample to be left behind by the worker. Those would be by what we would understand to be the highest numbers. We want to verify that those samples are part of the co-exposure model to make that model claimant favorable. So, that's really the purpose of the TRACK database. If we can ensure that the data from that database is included in the co-exposure model, that helps with claimant favorability and bounding co-exposure estimates.

MEMBER CLAWSON: So, what you're telling me is that this TRACK database, you've got to have an incident to even get involved in it.

DR. CARDARELLI: Well, that's how the specials were collected. Something special happened at the site that required it.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Something drove it?

DR. CARDARELLI: Yes.

MEMBER CLAWSON: So, we could have missed some of that too, so...

MEMBER LOCKEY: Well, Brad, is -- are those special -- is that -- is that -- is that mostly accidental exposures or something went wrong at the facility, and that's why they would do it?

MEMBER CLAWSON: We -- we -- we called those oh, shits. That's when we were expecting to be able to get so much but went into it and come to find out we had other radionuclides that we were not expecting, or that we were a part of, or that we received a higher dose. But that was -- something had to trigger it. Somebody -- somebody had to -- the only way that we come to find out that we'd got into different nuclides was through air sampling and everything else like that, and then when they figured out that my gad (sic), we've got different nuclides than what we were expecting, then sometimes they put us into a special like that. But there's a lot of times that you never knew it unless something triggered it, something went wrong.

MEMBER LOCKEY: I understand that, but I was trying to figure out -- I -- I sort of look at it as a -- as an unusual occurrence, mechanical failure, accidental, something -- something happened that's not routine, and that would call in this type of special monitoring?

DR. CARDARELLI: That's correct.

MEMBER LOCKEY: Okay. That's -- I was just trying to get handle around how TRACKS -- so ,John how you gonna -- if -- if you're data doesn't correlate with your current dose reconstruct model, where are you going to

go with it?

DR. CARDARELLI: I'm not sure I understand that question. You mean the data in the TRACK database?

MEMBER LOCKEY: That's correct.

DR. CARDARELLI: Well, we have to get the TRACK database. I believe the TRACK database, the specials are probably already incorporated into the co-exposure model, but we want to validate and verify that assumption by getting this TRACK database, and if that's the case, then we already have a bounding co-exposure model. If it's excluded, then that's something that we need to discuss and likely include in the co-exposure model. And one -- one thing that --

MEMBER LOCKEY: Okay. So, you think the data is already in the database. I missed that, I guess, with the meeting.

DR. CARDARELLI: Yeah. We think we -- well, we've included all the data that we currently have at the site, but I want to verify that the specials have certainly been part of that co-exposure model.

MEMBER LOCKEY: So that's part of your completeness -- completeness.

DR. CARDARELLI: Yes. And keep in mind on the correlation issues and -- and we've presented this before in previous meetings -- workers may have been involved in an incident where they had to leave a special, and when you do a special, other things are done as well, air sampling results are let out, a lot of times nasal wipes are taken, and those results are reported. Usually sometimes there might even be a special investigation where they write up all of the situation that was going on. What we have

seen before in the past, we have workers who have had very high nasal wipes but their internal intake -- uptakes were zero. So, you know, even though you could be surface contamination, it may not actually result in an uptake. And but that's not -- not always the case, so correlation may not be 100 percent all of the time and that, you know, it's justifiable depending on the radionuclide, how quickly they were decontaminated, and a variety of other scenarios that occur on the site.

MEMBER CLAWSON: And John, just -- just to use you -- your -- your point it the one side. And also, there have been people that get very low nasals but then when they pull the samples, they have very high intakes.

DR. CARDARELLI: That may occur as well, Mr. Clawson, absolutely.

CHAIR ANDERSON: So those -- the specials are really across the whole workforce, or are we just talking about specials as they relate to the subcontractor workers?

DR. CARDARELLI: It's -- it's a standardized procedure for the whole workforce.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Okay. Yeah. So, the comparison wouldn't necessarily be -- I mean, I'm just kind of going back through the claimants that we're trying to reconstruct their doses from. We're now branching out to include all the data from all of the people and all of the specials. Have any idea how many specials were actually pulled on the subcontractors --

DR. CARDARELLI: I --

CHAIR ANDERSON: -- or none? Yeah.

DR. CARDARELLI: I don't have those numbers handy.

CHAIR ANDERSON: No, I'm just saying, but it would be interesting to

know if -- if the number of specials one would think might be more likely to occur in the main workforce or not there intermittently or whatever. And we're watched more carefully and, you know, so incidents are more likely to have been reported, I would think, from the main workforce. So, --

MEMBER LOCKEY: Henry, Jim Lockey, --

DR. CARDARELLI: This is --

MS. HABIGHURST: This is -- I'm sorry to interrupt. Can -- can Gary stop sharing his screen, please? Thank you.

MEMBER LOCKEY: So, Henry, Jim Lockey. I -- I think your point is well taken. The subcommittee sort of discussed that. Is the -- is the short-term subcontract a special group of people in relationship with the rest of the population. I think that's -- I think that's the agenda to discuss if that has to be looked at or not in more detail. Because I agree with what Joe -- Joe has said in the past. He keeps bringing it up. The short-term subcontractor -- and I agree with this in my experience -- versus sometimes they're given jobs that aren't the best jobs in the world and perhaps they can be the most hazardous. So, it's -- I would like some reassurance that they -- their -- their data is representative of the overall database.

DR. TAULBEE: This is Tim. If I could jump in here. Some of the questions you're asking there, Dr. Anderson, those are things that we can address once we have the TRACK database and can make those comparisons and look and see if subcontractors are in there and at what level and in what numbers, etc.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Agreed.

DR. TAULBEE: And also, as Dr. Lockey has pointed out, you know,

he's suggested an analysis. That's the bullet point two here that Bob's got up there of us looking at the short-term workers versus the long-term worker. So, there's ongoing work here that needs to be done, and we're working to get that done. And so, before we try and speculate and so forth, I would actually urge us to wait until we get this data, and we can analyze it and come back to the work group and to the full Board with the answers.

CHAIR ANDERSON: What -- what time frame are we looking at, Tim or John?

DR. TAULBEE: Well, in May is --

CHAIR ANDERSON: I thought -- I thought --

DR. TAULBEE: -- when we are supposed to get the TRACK database from the site. We have the other data -- data warehouse now and that, as John pointed out, that has been transferred or identified over to SC&A. It's in the virtual volumes now, so SC&A can begin looking at that.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay. You know, I know that you guys call it a TRACK database, but it's just an incident-driven database, basically is what it is. It's just the --

DR. TAULBEE: That's correct.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay, thanks.

MEMBER LOCKEY: Henry Anderson?

CHAIR ANDERSON: Yeah?

MEMBER LOCKEY: So, when we had our subcommittee meeting, maybe the rest of the Board's aware of this, but the issue came up of what -- what a safety violation represents and what a procedure violation represents. And -- and I -- I was clueless. I didn't know, but Paul came on

board and he's a member of the subcommittee, and he sort of explained that to me, and I don't know if that would be useful for the Board overall. Because there was a safety violation issued here, but then it was later changed to a procedure violation. And I didn't know -- I didn't know what that meant, and I have a better understanding about what that means now. I don't know if the Board would be interested in hearing Paul's explanation of that or not.

CHAIR ANDERSON: It depends on -- you know, what -- what -- what does it matter?

MEMBER ZIEMER: I think -- this is Paul. I think -- I think John Cardarelli already explained that pretty well, so I --

CHAIR ANDERSON: Yeah.

MEMBER ZIEMER: Yeah. I -- I -- I just feel like we should -- I -- I agree with what Tim said. We need to have a look at that TRACK database and see what the impact is there and then make a decision on some of these.

CHAIR ANDERSON: We will. That -- that's what it comes down to. You know, Jim, we can -- we could probably debate this all day long, and we're pretty good at that. So, what Tim said, and John also said, first of all, they've got to get this data, we've got it will evaluate it, and we've got to go from there. So, we're going to need to set up another work group. We'll evaluate where we're at, and then we'll be able to better explain to the Board our path forward and what we have. If that's -- that's good enough.

MEMBER ZIEMER: I think, Brad, you and I agree that we don't want this to go out years like -- we want -- we want this to be moved -- moved

forward as rapidly as possible.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Yeah, well, I -- that's why I was surprised that we didn't have the TRACKs database, but it -- it is what it is, and we deal with what we've got. We'll go from there. I -- I'm -- I'm glad to hear that some of the information is there that SC&A will be able to get to and be able to go from there. I need to make sure that they are -- if this is still part of the tasking for them or anything else, or if we have to task and -- I think it's still part of the tasking. So, we'll just go to that. With that said, I'm -- I'm good with it unless any other Board members have any questions.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Again, I -- I would go back to do we have a sense of so how many workers fit into this group and how many claims have we gotten out of that group? I mean, we're spending a lot of time and effort and resources on trying to crack this down and do a co-exposure model.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Well, you know what, you -- I just want to say something. This -- this TRACKs database and all of this other stuff just has to do with -- with the co-exposure model. It has nothing to do with the issue of when the data is good enough for us to be able to tie off when the end of the SEC should be for this. This -- all of this -- all of this other stuff is just -- it all -- all pertains to the co-exposure model.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Okay, let's move -- we'll just get -- those of us not on the committee will get more confused as we move forward. So, I will look forward to hearing more about it. Are there any other questions that members have?

MEMBER LOCKEY: Well, I just -- this is Jim Lockey. I'm not sure, did we task SC&A and NIOSH to look at the subcontractor group in more detail,

the short-term worker group?

MEMBER CLAWSON: Well, that's what I'm -- you know, --

MEMBER LOCKEY: I didn't --

MEMBER CLAWSON: -- there are --

MEMBER LOCKEY: -- didn't get an answer to that. I didn't know if we did it or not.

MEMBER CLAWSON: So, Bob, I guess, that would be a question to you. I just want to make sure that you guys are covered to be able to proceed forward with what you need. And I thought it was under -- I thought it was under this review that you had done. I think it was still part of that. But I just want to make sure that you're able to be correct in what you need to be able to proceed forward.

MR. BARTON: Well, I think specific to Dr. Lockey's question about the comparison work, if I read that question -- question correctly, the discussion at the end of the work group last month, was a set -- essentially, we should look into what can be done, the utility of it for the work group, is it going to be really helpful, does the work group want to proceed with it, how can it be done, for which we really need to see what the data looks like from a macro sense, not actually get down in the weeds with the -- with actual calculations necessarily, but essentially a feasibility study. And then we, maybe, hold a technical call, discuss that, and then if the work group wants to move forward with it, it would be who's in the best position to do that work. I'm going to be honest, --

MEMBER LOCKEY: John, I think that's a good path forward.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay. I'll leave it up to you. I just want to

make sure that we make sure that we have the proper tasking and everything, and we don't put either side out to pasture there. So, I -- I -- I agree with what you said. And with that, I'm -- I'm good, Andy.

BOARD WORK SESSION

CHAIR ANDERSON: Okay. So, let's move into the Board work session. We got some good material sent to us on reviewing the status of all the various sites. I think that SC&A update really is very helpful to get a sense of where things are at. So, I hope everybody does take a look at that.

So, Rashaun, do you have any specific things we need to go over?

DR. ROBERTS: I just wanted to make sure that we're giving Dr. Martinez an opportunity to rejoin.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Oh, yes. Okay.

DR. ROBERTS: I've asked her to be called.

MS. BURGOS: I will call her.

DR. ROBERTS: Okay, thank you. So, Andy, it may be a few minutes.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Sure. How much do we have to go over? Updates from the various groups?

MEMBER CLAWSON: Well, --

CHAIR ANDERSON: -- some reviews --

MEMBER CLAWSON: -- comments.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Yeah.

MEMBER ZIEMER: Andy, what was -- this is Ziemer. What was the date of that SC&A update that you just mentioned?

CHAIR ANDERSON: Oh, let me see if I can --

DR. ROBERTS: And Bob, did you want to stop sharing at this point?

CHAIR ANDERSON: It's --

DR. ROBERTS: -- or -- you could do that.

CHAIR ANDERSON: It came from Rashaun in one of the attachments.

DR. ROBERTS: Thank you.

MEMBER ZIEMER: Oh, okay. I thought maybe there was a different one that --

CHAIR ANDERSON: No, no. It's --

MEMBER ZIEMER: -- you were talking about.

CHAIR ANDERSON: It -- there were, I think, three of them. The one was like 67 pages --

MEMBER ZIEMER: No.

CHAIR ANDERSON: -- or something --

MEMBER ZIEMER: No, no.

CHAIR ANDERSON: -- each of the sites going back into two thousand whatever. So --

MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay, thanks.

CHAIR ANDERSON: -- yeah. And -- and to you, one of the things that I saw on the list is there's the surrogate data work group which seemed to me to cover some of the same issues as the SEC issues work group. Now, you happen to be at both of them, so I didn't see any updates for your group surrogate data. Is that pretty well closed down now, or what's the status?

MEMBER ZIEMER: No, no, it's not closed down. I think -- I think surrogate data group's on standby for times when target data issues come

up.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Okay.

MEMBER ZIEMER: What we have at Savannah River is not a surrogate data issue.

CHAIR ANDERSON: No.

MEMBER ZIEMER: And but it is -- it is an issue on the use of (indiscernible) data efficient -- sufficiency, --

CHAIR ANDERSON: Yeah.

MEMBER ZIEMER: -- which is a separate thing. Data sufficiency is separate and not the same as surrogate data at all.

CHAIR ANDERSON: No, no, right.

So, we can wait a little longer. Hopefully, she'll come back on.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Can you see if she's back on line, Henry?

DR. ROBERTS: Actually, I've just received a message. She's trying to get back on. She's been having a few computer issues.

MEMBER CLAWSON: That isn't the first time we've heard that.

DR. ROBERTS: Yeah, so.

DR. TAULBEE: I believe Nicole's back now, Rashaun.

CHAIR ANDERSON: There she is.

DR. ROBERTS: Oh, there you are. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Okay, we're good to go. Rashaun, do you have any specific agenda?

DR. ROBERTS: I think we had the work group and subcommittee reports to start.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Okay. Let me -- I can start with one that is

coming up for the SEC issues work group and that we just received a white paper January 26th. Tim sent that along. That's -- the title of it is "A Discussion of Completeness of Co-exposure Modeling, Data Completeness," and we're going to want to review that and they've -- I've heard from -- it was sent around, but I've heard some of the committee members that we should really task that to be first before we begin discussing to have SC&A take a look at it, like we have the previous ones, and do a review and report to us. And then we -- after that we can schedule a meeting, rather than trying to schedule a work group meeting only to turn around and at that meeting task them to -- to do the work. So, we'd like to do that on -- on this meeting. And everyone, hopefully, is agreeing that we should do that, and then we can task them and they can get started. You would see in their review on that one document mentioned that they put in there that they had not been tasked to review this new document, which I took as a suggestion that they would be willing be able to do that, so that would be my suggestion here.

And just following a little bit up on that, is -- is -- there's been some concern in the past about tasking done and doing it with agreement to do so by email and whatever, which isn't quite as transparent as we would like. So, Ashton has agreed to put together a little protocol for tasking for us. And I don't know, Ashton, if you can tell us where that's at or when we might expect that, but I think that certainly is a good thing we need. You all got her little review and suggestion on the impact of those who would want to sit in on committee meetings who are not on a committee as a member, and we don't really need to be concerned about a quorum and all those

kinds of issues that we did raise at one time. So, I want to thank Ashton for doing that. I thought, for me, it was very helpful to be sure that we're not overstepping our approaching things.

Anyone have any questions about that, or?

MEMBER BEACH: Andy, I -- this is Josie. I have a question about that. It was all -- things have changed a little bit with COVID and us not meeting in person. We did go more to that email back and forth. So -- so, that's -- so one thing. But can you explain on the tasking if SC&A is tasked to review a document, any subsequent documents related to that initial tasking are automatically tasked, is that correct, or do we have to have every single review of a review tasked?

CHAIR ANDERSON: Rashaun?

MEMBER BEACH: Yeah.

DR. ROBERTS: I think there's some automatic taskings that have happened, like when a document or whatever is initially released by NIOSH/DCAS. So, it is generally understood that SC&A would be tasked to review that product. I think it's just a matter of making sure that, you know, this is -- it's coming through the proper channels and also making sure that we have put it -- you know, to the extent possible, on public record and have also included DCAS in the -- in the chain to know, you know, what's been tasked. So, it's really, you know, more of a communication issue and just making sure that all taskings are going through the proper approvals and consistent with what SC&A is -- is contracted to do for the Board.

MEMBER CLAWSON: So, Rashaun, --

MEMBER BEACH: So -- wait, wait, wait, before -- can I follow up on

my initial question just briefly?

MEMBER CLAWSON: No.

MEMBER BEACH: I don't think you've touched on it, Rashaun. I'm sorry, Brad. So, if -- if SC&A is tasked to write a report or to review a report, and then NIOSH puts out a report, the -- are they automatically tasked to -- to do the rebuttal on the on the initial report or is that --

DR. ROBERTS: Well, hopefully --

MEMBER BEACH: -- is that separate?

DR. ROBERTS: -- be a work group meeting so that we could sit and talk about the initial document --

MEMBER BEACH: Okay.

DR. ROBERTS: -- and then the review and then decide what's happening beyond that.

MEMBER BEACH: Okay. And see, that has changed a little bit with this COVID, and we've done so many of these taskings just via email. So, okay. That's -- that's more clear. Thank you.

DR. ROBERTS: Okay.

MEMBER CLAWSON: So -- so, Josie, can I talk now? Are you --

MEMBER BEACH: Yes, please, do. Sorry for stepping on you.

MEMBER CLAWSON: No, no. I -- my whole thing was -- Rashaun, was, I was kind of the mindset -- and that's why I even brought this up, because this TRACKs database and everything else like this, this actually refers back to the work group meeting and what we got into and -- and that's where I kind of -- I just want to make sure that we don't put SC&A in a bad position or -- that we -- we haven't done the tasking right. And that's

why -- that's why I was questioning. I just wanted to make sure I was covering and to keep you in the loop of it, too.

DR. ROBERTS: Right. And --

MEMBER CLAWSON: You're always -- you're involved in our work groups and stuff, so I just want to make sure -- if we needed to make sure or anything else like that.

DR. ROBERTS: Yeah. No, that was appropriate to try to clarify things and, you know, it's really just a matter of making sure that everybody is, you know, clear on what's being tasked and all of that. So that -- that seemed appropriate.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Thank you.

MEMBER LOCKEY: Rashaun, Jim Lockey. Does take -- should -- is tasking or should tasking be part of the public record or not?

DR. ROBERTS: Ideally, yes, it probably should be. I mean, there might be extenuating circumstances every now and again. You know, as Josie is pointing out with the COVID situation, I think, you know, some exceptions were made about tasking via email. But even in that case, we at least need to, you know, be including NIOSH in those taskings as well just so that -- in addition to the work group so that everyone is clear on what's being tasked and when.

MEMBER LOCKEY: Gotcha, okay. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSON: I was just impressed looking through that list of how much is on SC&A's table already, so I think we have to be cognizant of the amount of effort some of these things may take, but we need to get them started on projects as quickly as possible so that we can get the

discussion groups going up to speed again.

So other committees update? Do we -- we have Metals and Controls coming up in May. And now we have all of the case reports, the individual case reviews, I think. Are most of those scheduled in May as well?

MS. GOGLIOTTI: Yes. The first one begins next week, and we'll wrap them up in May.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Right. Rose? Rose? This is Brad. Would it be appropriate just to go through the dates that each one of us have, just so that everybody's sure that they're -- they're in there? I know we have quite a few cases coming up.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Brad, you're on next Monday with me. Don't forget.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Yeah, I know it. That's what I just wanted to make sure, and I'm on with -- I'm on with Henry.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Yeah.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Well, I --

CHAIR ANDERSON: That's why I raised the issue. It looked to me, I get a lot of the cc's, and I thought man, we're really, like, getting busy, so you have to look at where the other committees get scheduled in and not forget that these -- this work has to be done as well.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Right.

MEMBER BEACH: So, can -- oh, Andy, can we go back to the SEC group tasking? Was that completed? Did you need a yea or nay? Has that been so tasked?

CHAIR ANDERSON: I think so. Yes.

MEMBER BEACH: Okay.

CHAIR ANDERSON: I didn't hear any -- I didn't hear any objections.

MEMBER BEACH: Okay.

CHAIR ANDERSON: -- part of it. I just wanted to be sure we wouldn't run up against by a complaint at some point, which is thought I would raise it at this meeting.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Dave, again, on the dose reconstruction review subcommittee, as you noted, as Rose noted, all of the one-on-one scheduling is completed. She commented to me that this was done in record time. And so, on her behalf and on mine and on Amy's, thank you all for doing that. And, again, repeat that all of the new members, now that you have subcommittee assignments, which were sent out by Rashaun, I believe it was yesterday or recently, try to come to some of the one-on-ones. Perhaps -- perhaps, if you're appointed to a subcommittee, go to folks who are from that subcommittee doing a one-on-one. That would be really good. But it's -- it is valuable, particularly as you're beginning.

And then finally, in terms of what Brad said, I think it would be very helpful if a schedule of them with the people were just put out. If Rashaun's office could take care of that, just a summary, just as she did for the membership and the working groups.

MS. GOGLIOTTI: I could just send out an email of my --

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Okay.

MS. GOGLIOTTI: -- tracking who's on what call, if that would help everyone. And I --

MEMBER CLAWSON: Rose, hold on one second. I want to comment

on what Dave said. One of the things, Dave, to make sure. We -- we go over several different cases and we need to make sure that they can't be conflicted on any of those.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Ah, so.

MEMBER CLAWSON: So just keep -- just keep that in the back of your mind. I think -- I think what you said is absolutely true. I think it's very important so you see what the really working is, and so you can better understand what the -- the dose reconstruction process is with DCAS and so forth. But you've just got to be careful because some of these tabs may have five different sites involved in it, and you don't want to be involved in one that you're conflicted on.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Good point. Good point. How would -- how would the new members be able to check out whether they're conflicted on any of them?

MS. GOGLIOTTI: Dave, --

MEMBER BEACH: Dave, -- oh, Rose, go ahead.

MS. GOGLIOTTI: My list of cases that I send out does have the employment sites for each of the cases that we're going to be discussing.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Okay.

MS. GOGLIOTTI: So, each member would have to look to confirm that independently.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Yeah, no, I understand.

MS. GOGLIOITTI: For the normal Board Members, we've already done that for you, but for -- for the Board Members, if you're planning on attending one, just double-check, please.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Oh, so contact Rose. Okay.

MEMBER CLAWSON: And that's -- that's all I was trying to get to. Sorry to cut you off, Josie. Go ahead.

MEMBER BEACH: That's okay. And Rose, you'll be sending out the call information prior to each of our meetings, correct?

MS. GOGLIOTTI: You should have already received that, but I can resend them before --

MEMBER BEACH: No, no, that's okay. I have the emails. I just didn't look that closely, so.

MS. GOGLIOTTI: -- everyone should have received all the cases, but if --

MEMBER BEACH: Yes.

MS. GOGLIOTTI: -- you need a new link, please, let me know and I can send that again.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: I hate to bother asking -- asking Rose and others with more work, but reminders are really helpful. If people -- people will have it in the -- have it in their -- in their -- you know, in their email accounts, but it -- it's really helpful or -- to have a reminder, honestly. And I let -- why don't I leave it up to you to think what is an effective way of getting in touch. If you send out reminders that we're -- of our -- to each of us individually, that should work.

MS. GOGLIOTTI: We can certainly do that, Dave.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Okay. I appreciate that.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Rose, this is Brad. Now, this is the first time I've really used Microsoft Teams, so this is still through our computer, our

government computer?

MS. GOGLIOTTI: Yes. It'll work the same way as this. You just click on the Team's link, and it'll pop up. We like to keep them really informal, so you can share your screen, if you want to, with video, you don't have to. Whatever you want to do is fine with.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay. I just wanted to make sure that it was -- I saw the video part of there. We've been doing it by phone and stuff like that. I just wanted to make sure --

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Yeah.

MEMBER CLAWSON: -- that I did it right on the government computer, so thank you, Rose.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Same.

MEMBER BEACH: Andy, I have a couple of work group --

CHAIR ANDERSON: Go ahead.

MEMBER BEACH: -- real quick -- reports. So, I noticed that Mound's external TBD revision is going to actually come out in April of 2023. Mound -- we haven't met since 2016, so I wanted to ask about tasking that as soon as it's -- looks like I'm going to get signed out, so if I do -- gosh, darn it -- anyway, back -- so can we go ahead and task that when it comes out for SC&A to review the external TBD, the revision, that we've been waiting for, for many years, unless NIOSH has any other comments on that, that it's actually not going to be out?

DR. TAULBEE: Sorry, I was trying to come off mute. This is Tim. I don't think it's going to be coming out later this month. I think it's going to be a few months --

MEMBER BEACH: Okay. That's -- yeah.

DR. TAULBEE: -- from that standpoint.

MEMBER BEACH: I -- I looked at the DCAS work, and it said was, so.

DR. TAULBEE: Right. I just pulled that up and I saw --

MEMBER BEACH: And then it all --

DR. TAULBEE: -- that, --

MEMBER BEACH: Okay.

DR. TAULBEE: -- but I don't believe that that is correct. And -- and we'll get you a proper date.

MEMBER BEACH: Okay. And then while you're here, Brookhaven, it said it was going to be out, the revision to 0048, on 5/23. Is that a correct date or -- and, again, that was from your website, your update?

DR. TAULBEE: That one I don't know. LaVon, --

MR. RUTHERFORD: Yeah, that was the --

DR. TAULBEE: -- do you have an answer on that?

MR. RUTHERFORD: That was the date that was in the project plan and given to me, so and I haven't heard any change about that. So, if that's not going to be the date, Josie, I can get you an update quickly, but that --

MEMBER BEACH: Okay. Yeah, those are just really backburner. We haven't talked about those, and so I tried to keep track. Thank you, Lavon.

And the last one is -- for me is LANL. We have three reports that were combined into one. I reported on it at the last meeting. And those are coming to the final review sections. I know they have to go through ADC and DOE, so it may -- I don't know if SC&A has a time frame on that, but once those are out and in NIOSH's hands, I'd like to start thinking about a

work group meeting.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Okay.

MR. RUTHERFORD: The only thing that, Josie, I would like to say, -- this is LaVon. I would like a little bit time to -- to review SC&A's response to this report so we can be prepared to discuss Metal work group meeting.

MEMBER BEACH: Oh, of course. We'll give you a week or so.

MR. RUTHERFORD: Oh, thank you. You're so kind.

MEMBER BEACH: I'm just kidding.

MR. RUTHERFORD: Yeah, I know.

MEMBER BEACH: I'm just kidding. No, that's why I was wondering when -- if SC&A had -- Bob, if you had any idea of how soon we would see that and -- and if -- of course, we'll give you a as much time as you need.

MR. BARTON: That report is finished from a technical side. It is really with our editing department, --

MEMBER BEACH: Okay.

MR. BARTON: -- and so once they're done with it, you're right, it has to go to the site first and then to DOE HQ. And but really, that's out of our hands at that point.

MEMBER BEACH: Okay.

MR. BARTON: Yeah.

MEMBER BEACH: So that could be a couple of weeks? a month? or?

MR. BARTON: I would say it would probably be a little -- little more than a month or maybe a month after we release it from our shop --

MEMBER BEACH: Okay.

MR. BARTON: -- to go through the two-stage review. Again, after I

can't really say how long it's going to take for the site to get back to us and then for it to go to --

MEMBER BEACH: Okay.

MR. BARTON: -- HQ in DC and have them look at it so that it can be released and -- yeah.

MEMBER BEACH: Okay. Thank you.

MR. BARTON: But it should be out of our shop within a few weeks.

MEMBER BEACH: Okay, in a few weeks. So too premature to be scheduling a work group call. Thank you.

MR. BARTON: I think at this point, yes.

MEMBER BEACH: Okay.

DR. TAULBEE: Josie, --

MEMBER BEACH: Yes.

DR. TAULBEE: -- to answer your question there on Mound, I just pulled it up and was looking closer at that. And where you see that April 2023 update, that's just an update. That means this Board's update, and it indicates there that the one of the white papers that's needed for this to complete that external TBD is expected to be completed in August of this year. So that --

MEMBER BEACH: Oh, okay.

DR. TAULBEE: -- TBD is not -- not really close at all.

MEMBER BEACH: Okay. All right. Thank you for that. Appreciate you looking. That's all I have, Andy.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Okay. Others?

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: I have one more issue to raise. As I was

looking over the committees, we have a dose reconstruction methods working group that was set up quite a few years ago. And as chair of that group, I'm not sure it really is functionally -- and I'd like to think about it. I'm not prepared to really go over the history of it and -- also, but I'd like to raise at our next meeting, at our August meeting, to consider whether, in fact, it is a useful committee. And, obviously, Henry, you have to weigh in on that too, because you have a longer vision, if you will, of our -- of our Advisory Board. But I would like to -- I'd like to open up that I don't see its functionality at this point. Although it was functional a number of years ago under Jim Malices' (ph) (indiscernible). So, might I raise this at the next meeting, or would you like to speak with me or -- in any way before raising this with the group?

CHAIR ANDERSON: Are you --

MEMBER BEACH: Did you --

CHAIR ANDERSON: Go ahead.

MEMBER BEACH: Did you tell us what committee?

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: This is the dose reconstruction methods working.

MEMBER BEACH: Okay, thank you.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Yeah. And as I said, we haven't met in about -- really since Jim's death. But my -- what -- what would you think, Henry, or -- or -- I'm trying to think about -- I could raise it with you as -- as -- as chair. You may -- you may want to make a decision on that, and that's fine, or you might want to discuss it -- discuss it.

CHAIR ANDERSON: We have a number of committees that are pretty

well on hold. I wouldn't disband this committee at this point. I would say are there some issues that you see as the chair that you would like to have your group discuss as a first step. And now we have a larger overall --

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Okay.

CHAIR ANDERSON: -- so trying to have a starting discussion amongst all of us, although it's easier when we're face to face, it is not the most efficient. So, if there are some dose reconstruction issues that have come up or that you've heard come up that you say well, we ought to discuss those, -- it's a bit like the SEC issues committee and the --

MEMBER ZIEMER: Is that a work group or a committee? I think it's probably a work group.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: It's a work group.

MEMBER ROESSLER: Who's on the work group?

MEMBER ZIEMER: That was -- oh.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: I saw the list today, some of our new members on it. I don't have the list in front of me. So I'm -- I -- first, I don't -- I don't have that list in front of me, but Henry, what -- are you suggesting, perhaps, that we should call a committee meeting -- a working group meeting and let me talk to the folks in the working group about the history and background and then bring it to you or to this group in the future?

CHAIR ANDERSON: I think that as chair if you're -- if you want to have a call or something, we could certainly do that and see -- I mean, we have everybody here now that -- does anybody see an activity or a review that would be appropriate for your committee, that would be fine. I don't

think -- I was only saying I -- I don't think because a committee has not been active that we need to, you know, close it down. I think this is a -- you know, it's a focus area that is still relevant to all of our activities, and dose reconstruction becomes, you know -- remain a key component --

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Oh, yeah.

CHAIR ANDERSON: -- of what we're doing.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Yeah, it certainly does.

CHAIR ANDERSON: I mean, you could ask NIOSH, see -- are you working on a dose reconstruction other than, you know, the development of coworker models then, you know, co-exposure models now, where do they see that dose reconstruction activity going. Tim?

DR. TAULBEE: Well, you're calling on me, but I believe the DCAS point of contact for that one is Grady.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Okay. Grady?

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Okay. That's --

CHAIR ANDERSON: Your -- your picture, Tim, is right in front of me, so I could...

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: I can --

MEMBER CLAWSON: Hold on just one second. That being said, we've got several work groups that are not really active, but they need to be there because we do have issues that come up in this sometimes. And sometimes it's better to take it to this group. So, I -- I -- it's -- I'm on several of them, the securities --

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Yeah.

MEMBER CLAWSON: -- a bunch of them like that, but when they do

come up, we need to be able to have the people that are there that are able to handle it. And we'll -- we'll -- we'll redo it, I think, is a basket.

By the way, Genevieve, I want to say bless you. I -- I saw that.

So, I just -- I think it's better that we just put them there and keep them there, and if we need them, we'll resurrect them and go on.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Well, I'm --

MEMBER ZIEMER: Henry, this is --

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Go ahead.

MEMBER ZIEMER: This is Ziemer. I have a comment, maybe a cautionary comment. Maybe -- maybe counsel can weigh in on this, but the difference between a work group and a subcommittee has to do with work groups technically are, like, ad hoc committees. They are not permanent.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: That's true.

MEMBER ZIEMER: A subcommittee is permanent, and that has implications on how you announce meetings on -- on the federal register and that sort of thing. So, I -- I think if a committee no longer has an obvious function and you terminate it, you can always resurrection -- resurrect it if you need it. It might also help to recall each of the committees is supposed to have a description of what it does. And we may need a reminder of what that original description was for the work group, and it's not a committee. I think it's a work group.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Oh, it is a work group. No question. No question.

MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Okay, I thought it was a committee.

MEMBER ZIEMER: And what its charter was and whether or not it should -- if it's still working on something, then that's fine. I don't know if legal counsel wants to weigh in on -- thinks it's --

MS. HABIGHURST: This is Ashton. Dr. Ziemer, you're correct. Work groups, you know, are more ad hoc. They're not supposed to be permanent. There's also a question about, you know, technically, because they're not permanent, they're not part of the charter. They're created, you know, as you go and when you -- when certain issues come up, and so FACA doesn't technically apply to them. It does -- FACA does apply to the full Board and the subcommittees. So, it really is up to you all on how you want to -- to handle the work groups and continuing it going forward if it's kind of dormant. But they are intended to be not permanent and just kind of like a transient -- once an issue is handled, you can dissolve them.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Okay. I -- thank you. I think -- Henry, I -- I think that one of the issues that comes up, though, is that sometimes we make changes in the methods which we have done in the last few years with our subcommittee, that is our dose reconstruction subcommittee, has at times and made useful changes in the -- in our procedures. And so, the question is whether that subsumes it or whether we need a methods committee. I'm perfectly happy to just say nothing has come up recently, therefore, we have not had meetings. If -- if you and others think this is a category that we should maintain for the future, I'm more than open and -- and maybe that should answer the questions that are coming up here.

CHAIR ANDERSON: -- not a standard subcommittee, it's a work group --

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: It is.

CHAIR ANDERSON: -- it's supposed to be a short-term thing, then it would seem to me that if you contact your folks and say we haven't had anything come up, we have nothing on our agenda, then you report that back, we can shut it down.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Well, that's -- yeah, and that's what --

CHAIR ANDERSON: Or make it -- you could say it's a sufficient set of changes that have gone into place that have not been looked over that you think ought to be done, then we could change it to make it a -- keep it going or change it to --

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Okay.

MEMBER CLAWSON: You know what -- this -- this is Brad. I think we've got to keep it in place because you look at the changes that we're going through right now and everything else like that, and some of these may not -- shouldn't be going into there. Maybe it should be going to this work group, but we just haven't put it in place. So, I believe we need to keep it in place. MEMBER ROESSLER: Henry?

CHAIR ANDERSON: Yeah.

MEMBER ROESSLER: I agree with Brad and was going to say it before he did that, I think we should keep it. This is a subject that's really basic to the whole program. And we never know when something might come up. If it does, then we have it. There's no harm in keeping it.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: There's certainly no harm. But, you know, new people are coming in, they're assigned to the committee and, you know, the committee is not meeting.

CHAIR ANDERSON: I (indiscernible).

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Yeah, I'm -- I'm -- I'm perfectly open to it or maybe I should look into it a little bit more and think a little bit more about it, maybe, on an email with others who are members of the committee. Paul, I think you are a member, and I think Brad may be a member. I'm sorry, I didn't look over the list.

MEMBER BEACH: Dave, I looked over the list. This is Josie. I'm a member, you're a member, Paul's a member, Frank, and Martinez.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Okay. And Frank and Martinez are new people and were added.

MEMBER BEACH: Right.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: So why don't I look into this matter and send out an email to members of the committee to talk about what prospects there are or what tasks might lie before us? And, of course, whether we should continue it as things come up. There's no question that methods are a -- are important. We're always talking about methods. But not -- the working group if you will, has been a subset of -- of the dose reconstruction review subcommittee in the past and doesn't have to be. So, I'll --

MEMBER MARTINEZ: Dave, I --

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: I'll email folks. Nicole?

MEMBER MARTINEZ: Yeah, --

MEMBER FRANK: Yeah, this is Arthur Frank. And if you email me and you have some prospective dates, I'll let you know if I'll be able to join your group as a newbie.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Okay, great. Sure.

MEMBER MARTINEZ: This is Nicole. Can you hear me?

CHAIR ANDERSON: Yes.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Yes.

MEMBER MARTINEZ: Okay, great. As a -- also as a new member, I think that would be very helpful because otherwise I don't really have an opinion. Obviously, I think dose reconstructions are important, so it strikes me that this working group would be important, but without the history it -- it -- it's hard to know. So, I think it'd be very helpful to have just a meeting to kind of check in and say this is, you know, what we're tasked with, this is kind of what we'll look like going forward. So, either way, I think that would be very useful. Thank you.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Well, I will consider that suggestion, and I'll task myself with doing it and send it out to all of you who are on the subcommittee. And then we can continue and discuss it together. Okay?

CHAIR ANDERSON: Okay. Any other --

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Brad --

CHAIR ANDERSON: -- committee --

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: -- and Gen, right. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSON: -- subcommittee or working groups?

MEMBER ZIEMER: Andy, this is Ziemer. I -- I -- let me preface what I'm going to say by mentioning that the reorganization and reappointments and so on for all the work groups and subcommittees have resulted in me becoming the chairman of the gaseous diffusion group for which I had not been a member before, so I have to figure out what's going on. But I -- I do note that within the last couple of years, SC&A had a tasking -- I think they

were looking over evaluating neutron exposures at the gaseous diffusion plant, and they found that they were dealing with the -- I think it -- I believe it was software dealing with an overarching issue on neutron exposure. And I don't know if Chuck knows. Are you still involved with the gaseous diffusion group?

MR. NELSON: Yes, I am.

MEMBER ZIEMER: So, maybe you can help on this. But is that overarching issue -- I assume by overarching, it means it's hitting not only gaseous diffusion but some of the other work groups as well. And apparently that's tied in with the availability of the new of software and the security issues that are going on at the NIOSH/CDC. So, can you or maybe SC&A tell us where we are on that overarching issue and -- and whether that impacts more than just the gaseous diffusion plants?

MR. NELSON: I do know that the issue of quantile regression analysis --

MEMBER ZIEMER: Yeah, that's the one --

MR. NELSON: -- SC&A --

MEMBER ZIEMER: -- quantile regression.

MR. NELSON: Yeah. And it's with the -- make sure I get the -- the procedures review subcommittee, and so that's -- has not been completed with regard to the other sites it effects. And Tim may be able to jump in, but I think it's Mound in some others.

DR. TAULBEE: That's correct. I believe it is Mound, Nevada Test Site, and the gaseous diffusion plants. The quantile regression method is something that -- that we've proposed and have implemented, and I believe

it's -- there with the subcommittee for procedures review as an overarching type of issue. Just turned on --

MEMBER ZIEMER: Bob Barton, --

DR. TAULBEE: -- so.

MEMBER ZIEMER: -- can you tell us from SC&A's point --

MR. BARTON: Yeah. Obviously, it was --

MEMBER ZIEMER: -- particularly on the gaseous diffusion, how does that impact?

MR. BARTON: Well, obviously, we for something with quantile regression analysis, you're gonna need some statistical tools to be available. And we're still waiting on those to be put in a safe spot in the Edge computing platform so that our folks can go in and do their analysis on that report. So, it's sort of in our hold while those tool -- tools are made available. Currently, I believe they are not.

DR. TAULBEE: Okay, Bob, I do have an update on that. I apologize there. I thought I'd send an email to let you know. That those R statistical packages that you had requested and the ones that we had have been uploaded now into that workspace, into the analytical workspace. It's not under the HP workspace that you're typically using. There's a separate one that is the analytical workspace, and I believe you and Rose have access to it, but I think there's others on your team that now have access to it as well.

MR. BARTON: Okay. Well, we can certainly take a look at that. And if so, we can resume that specific tasking.

DR. TAULBEE: By the way, that's just happened within the last week or so, so that's not -- that's not something that's been sitting out there for a

long time. It's very recent.

MEMBER ZIEMER: That's very helpful. And then once SC&A completes that review, then I think the work group can proceed to take the next steps that need to be done, which involve whatever the next steps are and then whatever it takes to educate the new chair.

MR. BARTON: Well, I think it was it was tasked under procedures, but I think it -- that's where it would start and then any issue --

MEMBER ZIEMER: But it impacts on gaseous diffusion in terms of moving ahead on that as well.

MR. BARTON: Right.

MEMBER ZIEMER: Yeah, okay. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Okay. Others? Go ahead, Genevieve.

MEMBER ROESSLER: I'd like to report on the ORNL/X-10 work. The work group, and I think also, SC&A received the long-awaited report on the exotic radionuclides a couple of weeks ago. And, I think, on this we should follow with the protocol and -- and recommend that SC&A review the report and then perhaps set up a work group meeting. I talked to Josie about this, so she, I think, agrees that this is what we should do. And we have -- Loretta is also on the work group and Dr. Frank if -- if they don't disagree, then I recommend that this report be assigned to SC&A for review. Doesn't sound like any disagreement.

CHAIR ANDERSON: No.

MR. BARTON: Well, I'll certainly never turn down a tasking, but we'll -- a lot's being thrown at us, so we might have to start prioritizing what we can use our resources on. That's all -- I think, as Dr. Anderson points out,

there's a lot of tasking already out there, so we might have to work on that to get -- prioritize, which I -- I plan to get it put -- essentially put it in a queue.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Put it on the list, yeah, so we don't forget about it.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Exactly. Okay. Others?

MEMBER VALERIO: This is Loretta.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Go ahead, Loretta.

MEMBER VALERIO: I believe that document all included the Y-12 site, so I agree with Gen as far as tasking it to SC&A for a review. Thank you, Gen, for that.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Okay. Other committee upcoming activities? Okay. Go over my list here, let's see. Any other -- any board members have other issues they want to raise?

MEMBER VALERIO: This is Loretta again. I just have a quick question for Dave. The Ames work group, from my recollection, has never met, and I was just wondering if there was anything that was planned this calendar year for Ames?

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Yes. What we're doing is awaiting the gathering of data so that we can write a PER, that is, so that we can update the evaluation report. So, the -- the reason we never met was that the Board -- the report to the Board indicated that there was insufficient data to -- to do individual dose reconstruction, so that -- the Board voted before we even met as a -- as a working group, that this should be an SEC. But we do need to update the -- the PER.

MR. RUTHERFORD: Yeah, Dr. Kotelchuck, this is --

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Yes.

MR. RUTHERFORD: -- LaVon. I can -- I can provide a little more update to that. After the -- yeah, after the SEC was granted and we -- the class was awarded, we have been working to revise that site profile to include the SEC information. There are still some outstanding activities that -- or outstanding issues that are associated with Ames, but we are going to get the TBD out. Should be out sometime within the next month. And that will include the -- the information associated with the SEC -- the SECs that were granted, but it will not include other issues that are still out there. We still have a 10 CFR 835 era, you know, which is basically post 1994-time frame that we -- we still have to evaluate and look at. So, there will be another update to that TBD that will be coming out as well. But I just wanted -- and -- and I don't have a timetable for that.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: That's very good. Appreciate that. And you will inform me and -- and -- and -- and -- or us about when we have enough information, in fact, to meet?

MR. RUTHERFORD: That's correct.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Okay, good. So, Loretta, I think that takes care of it. Yes?

MEMBER VALERIO: It does. Thank you.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Yeah.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Okay. Other issues people have? Rashaun, do we have any thoughts on the December site?

DR. ROBERTS: Let me go over -- I can skip to that, but I think I was

going to review the December public comments --

CHAIR ANDERSON: Oh, yeah.

DR. ROBERTS: -- quickly, and then we can move into the scheduling of meetings, if you don't mind.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Go ahead.

DR. ROBERTS: So -- so -- so most comments in our December meeting back in '22 were related to the Pinellas Plant, as you might remember. The Board heard a number of personal testimonies about their work and exposures at Pinellas and their illnesses. In addition, there were comments in the record about missing dosimetry records for employees, a lack of formal documentation of investigations, and exposure anomalies for the site, as well as some comments about disposal of radioactive materials and leaks and a lack of exposure assessment and monitoring. There were also citations of various expert opinions, that certain types of doses could not be reconstructed, a citation of the DOE 1997 report on the presence of various radionuclides at that site. So, in its response, NIOSH noted that the Pinellas evaluation report, of course, is still undergoing review by SC&A to be discussed subsequently by the Pinellas work group. NIOSH also noted that some of the public comments about missing dosimetry records and unmined -- monitored exposures are covered in the SEC-0256 evaluation report and various other reports.

Apart from the comments regarding Pinellas, there was a comment about the evidence of mag-thor at the Rocky Flats Plant. In response, NIOSH noted that it and the Rocky Flats Plant work group evaluated the potential presence of mag-thor alloy at Rocky Flats. NIOSH also noted that

documents related to this issue have been provided by a member of the public and documents from LANL, Denver Records Center from Sandia, and other federal record centers have been reviewed related to that. So that's just a general summary of the public comments and the response.

I think that's it, so we can move into the schedule of meetings now.

MEMBER ZIEMER: Before we do that, Andy, could I just insert something here real quick?

CHAIR ANDERSON: Sure.

MEMBER ZIEMER: Yeah. So, I -- I just pulled up the description of what the charge is to the -- the dose reconstruction review methods work group. And I'll start by saying it's not the dose reconstruction methods review, it's the dose reconstruction review methods. Very different.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Yes.

MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay. Now, and here's -- and I had forgotten this. Here's what it says. (Reading): This work group is responsible for advising the Board on possible new approaches reviewing a sample of NIOSH dose reconstructions. And his -- a little history of this. You remember originally this group recommended sampling two -- I think was 2 1/2 percent of all dose reconstructions --

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Right.

MEMBER ZIEMER: -- and that they would be selected randomly. Then later after we had some experience with that, a couple of things happened. The group recommended reducing that from 2 1/2 to 1 percent.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Correct.

MEMBER ZIEMER: Also recommended selecting cases that were closer

to 50 percent and some -- and some other things like looking at certain cancers and, you know, so it no longer was a random sample was a -- particular kinds of sampling. So that's what that group was charged with doing. It's not figuring out how to do dose reconstructions, but how to sample -- doing the selection of samples, such as the ones that we are going to be reviewing in small groups right -- or are doing right now. So, that's the function of that group.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: That I -- yeah. That movement from 2 1/2 percent to one 1 percent, I proposed to the Board when we adopted the report to the secretary.

MEMBER ZIEMER: Yeah.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: I believe was done, though, before we had a methods working group.

MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, I'm not sure when this group started. You'd have to go back historically to look at it. But it -- it -- it -- it didn't have anything to do with reviewing how the dose reconstructions were done; it had to do with how we sampled the -- the universe of dose reconstruction.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Well, if you will send that to me, I'm -- or -- or the link, I'd appreciate it.

MEMBER ZIEMER: Actually, I don't have to send it to you. I think that -- I think that Nancy Adams just put the link on the --

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Chat.

MEMBER ZIEMER: -- on the chat --

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Oh, good. Okay.

MEMBER ZIEMER: -- on the chart part of our page here today, which -

-

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Well, thanks. Okay. Good, good.

MEMBER ZIEMER: -- which gives all the assignments of all the -- gives the charges of all the work group that -- or all group descriptions as well as the membership.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Very good, very good. And I will go over that history and review it on my commitment to give a report to the whole committee about where we're -- where we're at and where we should be.

MEMBER ZIEMER: Yeah, I just wanted to catch that. Sorry to Rashaun. I kind of backed it up in the agenda, but.

MS. BEHLING: This is Kathy Behling. Can I also make a comment about that --

CHAIR ANDERSON: Sure.

MS. BEHLING: -- work group?

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Sure.

MS. BEHLING: Because Rose and I had attended that meeting. That was back in, like, 2015 or 2016. And one of the other issues that we discussed during those meetings was this whole issue of professional judgement. In fact, I think Mark Griffin had written a -- an independent report. That was after he was a -- a -- a -- yeah -- part of the -- work -- yes, part of the Advisory Board here. But we were looking at professional judgment issues, how to -- to determine what is a professional judgment issue and the consistency of those. In fact, that is why on our blinds we now include a section about -- on professional judgment. And so, I believe we were going to tally up that type of information, and it was going until we

had enough data to be able to do discuss anything of relevance regarding the consistency of professional judgment issues because we haven't done all that many blinds. That was also one of the topics that was part of that subcommittee -- or part of that work group.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: You're right. You're right about that, and that I -- I really overlooked in terms of that we said we're going to collect data, and we'd have to wait until we have enough blinds to -- to do some relevant assessment of what we learned. So, that's a function that is outstanding on that committee. You're absolutely right. Okay, well, good. Thanks.

CHAIR ANDERSON: There's a lot in our history that we have got down in writing, but we --

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Yes.

CHAIR ANDERSON: -- a long time.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Oh, yes. Oh, yes.

CHAIR ANDERSON: We have to prioritize. Okay, any other issues? Back to the dates, Rashaun?

DR. ROBERTS: Okay. So, we have a meeting scheduled up through December of next year. Typically, what we try to do in scheduling the full Board teleconferences and meetings is to plan them out for about a year in advance. So, let's see. Why don't we start with -- before we get into February and April of 2024, one outstanding issue is a location for December of 2023. And usually, we will be discussing this in August, at our August Board meeting, but because it has seemed a little more difficult to identify a location for the face-to-face component of the meeting, I think that we should try to pick out some potential locations for the December meeting

now. So, I want to open it up and see if people have any thoughts about where we might have the December -- I believe it's December 6 and 7 meeting that we already have on the books. Any candidates for location?

MEMBER BEACH: So, Rashaun, this is Josie. I would like to throw out an area close to Metals and Control. We met there once. I just can't remember what town we were in. Attleboro?

DR. ROBERTS: Okay.

DR. TAULBEE: Josie, I think that was in Providence, actually, which is --

MEMBER BEACH: Providence, that's right. Thank you.

MEMBER ZIEMER: Do you recall what the attendance was there? Did we get many Metals and Controls actually attending the meeting? Do you recall that at all?

MEMBER BEACH: We got some primary people that spoke at that meeting, and ones that speak at every one of our work groups.

MR. CALHOUN: This is Grady. I --

MEMBER ZIEMER: There's still some folks around the area then; is that right?

MEMBER BEACH: Yes, yes, there are.

MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay, thank you.

MR. CALHOUN: This is Grady. What we've done in the past is we -- we -- we want to make done Metals and Controls as far as voting, because we don't want to go to the place when we -- there's a possibility of voting on an SEC. We've always avoided that --

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Right, right.

MR. CALHOUN: -- because there's too much pressure on the Board Members potentially and the claimants as well, and it can be an ugly situation. So, unless we're sure it's gonna be done by then, and I'm not sure it is, I'm not sure that's a great idea. But I just wanted to throw that out there.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Well, there's always Idaho in December. That'd always be nice.

MR. CALHOUN: Idaho is always nice, Brad. I haven't been there in a while.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Well, I -- I'm just -- we have not been to Hanford for a while, and I know that I've been getting quite a bit from Hanford of where are we at and what are we doing, so I'd always throw Hanford out there too.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Vicki, you want to comment?

MEMBER CASSANO: Yeah. I'm just thinking December weather, doing anything up north can really screw people up and end up not having a meeting because you are -- because of the weather. And I'm just wondering if maybe we might want to moderate farther south than the -- in the country for the December meeting.

MEMBER CLAWSON: There -- there's always -- that's true. And now you're sounding like the rest of the Board.

MEMBER CASSANO: I guess I learned something, right?

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Right.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Well, I just threw it out there, but there's always Los Alamos. There's always there's always Albuquerque or -- or Santa Fe

with Sandia, but I just -- I'm not sure where we're at on a lot of those.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Right, right.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Or back out to -- we haven't been to California in a while.

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Well, it's always south of Hawaii, you know. Just joking. Just joking.

DR. ROBERTS: Tori, do you have your -- do you want to make another comment?

MEMBER CASSANO: (Indiscernible) my hand.

DR. ROBERTS: Okay. All right. I know there have been data capture trips out, is it, Livermore, California? Would that be a site, a possible site?

MEMBER CLAWSON: Sure.

MEMBER BEACH: Definitely.

MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, there's also been data captures out at the Berkeley facility as well. And I know they were trying to -- actually, the Berkeley work group hasn't met since just before the pandemic. They were trying to get some additional interviews. I don't know where that stands now. And I couldn't tell from the SC&A review is -- whether anything has happened since 2019. It looked like they were awaiting results from the data capture still.

DR. ROBERTS: Okay. Does NIOSH or SC&A want to speak to that?

MR. BARTON: Well, this is Bob. I'm a little caught off guard. I didn't think there was much movement on Lawrence Berkeley, but I could be mistaken. So, I -- I pass --

MEMBER ZIEMER: Or Lawrence Livermore.

MR. RUTHERFORD: Lawrence Livermore. This is LaVon. For Lawrence Livermore we are working on that addendum. We have completed our data capture, and we're working on an addendum that will address the remaining years. And as Chuck had mentioned, that is scheduled to be out in September, that addendum, so we will be presenting that at -- at the Board meeting shortly thereafter.

MEMBER BEACH: There's always Santa Susanna also. I'm not sure, we didn't hear a report on where we are with that, but I believe NIOSH is working on -- on that.

MR. RUTHERFORD: Santa Susanna, that's the issue that Chuck also presented that we've been getting doc -- getting documents, too, trickled in from the EMCBC and as we've been getting those documents in, we've been uploading. And we should -- I believe, and Chuck can correct me if I'm wrong -- wrong, that that is going to continue through the summer.

MR. NELSON: Definitely. I know there's a ton of documents that have come in. I mean, we're trying to answer questions that are kind of hard to find the answers, so we're casting our nets wide and receiving lots of documents. So, each of those have to be gone through as we get a multitude of them via electronic records, and those continue to flow in, and I -- I --

MEMBER BEACH: But that -- yeah. But that still could be a candidate above -- to have a visit at that area; is that correct?

MR. NELSON: Yeah, I think so.

DR. TAULBEE: This is Tim. Going back to Livermore as a potential, I mean, as Chuck had pointed out, we're expecting that ER addendum to

come out at that time or around September type of time frame, and so it does kind of queue up for a nice, kind of, area or time where you can hear what our addendum is and then provide or get input from the public as well as -- well, I would assume -- depending upon which way our ER comes out as to whether you would task SC&A at that time. But it's just a thought. It seems like Livermore might be one of the best approaches, at least from my standpoint.

DR. ROBERTS: Yeah, that's my impression also. Would it -- would there be any objection to Livermore?

MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: No.

MEMBER BEACH: No.

MEMBER CLAWSON: No.

DR. ROBERTS: Well, let's tentatively go with that one.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Yeah, I think that fits.

DR. ROBERTS: Does that sound good? Okay. Very good.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Haven't been there in a long time.

MEMBER ZIEMER: Where would we specifically meet?

MEMBER CLAWSON: Yeah, well...

DR. ROBERTS: I think that that may depend on where -- you know, hotel available and all that.

MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, yeah, I understand that. Livermore was one of those places where, I think, the last time we were out there, I think there were zero people that attended from the site. And it's -- it's not really -- it's not very easy to get to Livermore from the airport, but if you -- it's worth looking into. Somewhere out in that area may -- may be. I don't know.

DR. ROBERTS: Well, would it make sense to put the Livermore as sort of the first option and then a fallback might be Santa Susanna -- Santa Susanna ?

MEMBER BEACH: That sounds reasonable.

MS. ADAMS: This is Nancy Adams. Did we stay in Oakland the last time we did Livermore?

MEMBER BEACH: Yes, we did.

MR. CALHOUN: That's a good place if you want to stay in your hotel.

MEMBER CLAWSON: Well, we were also chastised because we had there, and the people didn't come, if I remember right too, because there was -- you know, it's a fairly good drive from there to Livermore area and so forth,

so.

DR. TAULBEE: Brad is absolutely correct. That was one of the feedback that we had was by staying in Livermore (sic), we thought we could get more of Berkeley and Livermore pulling them in together and neither happened, and I don't think we had hardly anybody show up for the public comment at that time.

MEMBER CLAWSON: All right. So --

DR. TAULBEE: Closer to the site would be best.

DR. ROBERTS: Great. Very good feedback. Thank you. Any other comments about location? Okay. Then we just have a couple of additional things. I'm looking for a date for a teleconference next February. Typically, we schedule these -- these meetings on, like, a Wednesday or a Thursday. So, let me pull up the calendar, and you might want to consult yours as well

to see where we might put that. How would the middle of the month be, like 14th or 15th? And this, again, is just a teleconference.

MEMBER BEACH: The 14th is a holiday, but it's...

DR. ROBERTS: Oh, is it?

MEMBER BEACH: It shouldn't affect anybody. It's just Valentine's Day.

DR. ROBERTS: Okay.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Either of those days look good for me.

MEMBER BEACH: Yeah, me too.

MEMBER MARTINEZ: The 14th would be better for me. I teach almost all day Tuesday-Thursday in the spring.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Okay, 14th. Any objections to the 14th?

MEMBER MARTINEZ: Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSON: I expect a Valentine's card at least.

DR. ROBERTS: Yeah, so everyone's good with that. Typically, the teleconferences don't go very long. Maybe about an hour or so at most. Okay. And then the next date that we need to book would be in April, and that would be for the fall face-to-face meeting. So, if we wanted similar timing to what we have done this year, we could look at the week of the 14th or the week of the 21st.

CHAIR ANDERSON: April?

DR. ROBERTS: April 2024.

MEMBER BEACH: Yeah, that's works for me.

DR. ROBERTS: Okay. Is there a week that's better, either the 14th or the 21st?

MEMBER CASSANO: I think the --

MEMBER BEACH: -- either.

MEMBER CASSANO: -- for me. The week of the 14th is better for me. When is -- anybody know when Easter is?

MEMBER BEACH: It's on the 1st it looks like.

MEMBER CASSANO: Okay.

MEMBER BEACH: Oh, no, that's not correct.

MEMBER CASSANO: No, the 1st is -- March 31st is Easter, so that's not a -- the -- the earlier week is better for me.

DR. ROBERTS: Okay, week of the 14th of April. Does that not work for somebody?

MEMBER BEACH: No, that's fine.

DR. ROBERTS: Okay.

MEMBER BEACH: Are we talking Wednesday-Thursday?

DR. ROBERTS: Probably, like a Wednesday-Thursday.

MEMBER BEACH: Okay.

DR. ROBERTS: So that would be the 17th-18th. Is that okay?

CHAIR ANDERSON: Yeah.

MEMBER BEACH: Yes.

DR. ROBERTS: Okay, so we have February 14th and Wednesday, April 17th and Thursday, April 18th. Perfect. All right. Well, with that, I don't think I have anything else to cover, Andy. Back over to you.

CHAIR ANDERSON: Any other comments or reports people want to make? If not, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn?

MEMBER BEACH: I'll make that motion, Andy. This is Josie.

MEMBER CLAWSON: I'll second it.

MEMBER ZIEMER: Second.

CHAIR ANDERSON: How about a newbie?

MEMBER CASSANO: I'll (indiscernible).

CHAIR ANDERSON: Okay, we'll take it. That's fine. Give me something to review in the transcript... Okay, we're good to go. So, thanks everybody. Good job.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m. EST).