UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

+ + + + +

ADVISORY BOARD ON TOXIC SUBSTANCES
AND WORKER HEALTH

+ + + + +

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE SITE EXPOSURE MATRICES
(AREA #1)

+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY,
JANUARY 16, 2018

+ + + + +

The Subcommittee met telephonically at 1:00 p.m. Eastern Time, Laura S. Welch, Chair, presiding.

MEMBERS

SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY:

JOHN M. DEMENT
MARK GRIFFON

MEDICAL COMMUNITY:

LAURA S. WELCH, Chair
CLAIMANT COMMUNITY:

KIRK D. DOMINA
DURONDA M. POPE
GARRY M. WHITLEY

OTHER ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

FAYE VLIISGER

DESIGNATED FEDERAL OFFICIAL:

CARRIE RHOADS
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welcome and Roll Call</th>
<th>Carrie Rhoads</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMENTS ON DOL RESPONSES TO BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation #4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisions of the Occupational History Questionnaire (OHQ)</td>
<td>Laura Welch</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation #3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal Link between COPD and VGDF</td>
<td>Laura Welch</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjourn</td>
<td>Carrie Rhoads</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MS. RHOADS: Hello, everybody. My name is Carrie Rhoads. I'd like to welcome you to today's teleconference meeting of the Department of Labor's Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health, the Subcommittee on the Site Exposure Matrices or SEM. I am the Board's Designated Federal Officer or DFO for today's meeting.

First, we'd like to let the Board Members know that we appreciate their work in preparing for this meeting and for all the work they've been doing the whole time.

I'll introduce the Board Members and we'll take a quick roll.

Dr. Laura Welch is the chair of this group. Are you on the line?

CHAIR WELCH: Yes.

MS. RHOADS: And the other members are Dr. John Dement --

MEMBER DEMENT: Here.
MS. RHOADS: Mr. Garry Whitley.

MEMBER WHITLEY: Yes, here.

MS. RHOADS: Mr. Kirk Domina.

MEMBER DOMINA: Yes, I'm here.

MS. RHOADS: Mr. Mark Griffon. I'm not sure if he's joined but we'll give him a second.

MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes, I'm here. I am here.

MS. RHOADS: Great, thank you.

And then we also have Ms. Duronda Pope.

MEMBER POPE: Here.

MS. RHOADS: And Ms. Vlieger is also on the line as well.

MEMBER VLIEGER: Yes.

MS. RHOADS: Okay, we're scheduled to meet from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. Eastern Time today.

In the room with me is Kevin Bird from SIDEM, our contractor.

In terms of timing, I wasn't
planning on taking a break today but that can be up to Dr. Welch, if she would like to take one.

Copies of all meeting materials and any written public comments are or will be available on the Board's website under the heading meetings and the listing there for this subcommittee meeting.

The documents will also be up on the WebEx screen so everyone can follow along with the discussion.

The Board's website can be found at dol.gov/owcp/energy/regs/compliance/advisoryboard.htm.

If you haven't visited the Board's website, I encourage you to do so. After clicking on today's meeting date you will see a page dedicated entirely to today's meeting. The page contains publically available materials submitted to us in advance of the meeting. We will publish any materials that are provided to the subcommittee even after the
meeting as well.

If you are participating remotely and you are having a problem, please email us at EnergyAdvisoryBoard@dol.gov. The sign-in instructions are up on the web page.

If you are joining by WebEx, please note that the session is for viewing only and will not be interactive. The phones will also be muted for non-Advisory Board Members.

Please also note that we do not have a scheduled public comment session today. The call-in information is posted so that the public can listen in but not participate in this subcommittee discussion.

The Advisory Board voted at its April 2016 meeting that subcommittee meetings should be open to the public and so we'll do a transcript and minutes from today's meeting.

During the Board discussions, as we are on a teleconference line, please make sure to speak clearly enough for the transcriber to understand. When you begin speaking,
especially at the start of the meeting, please
state your name so we can get an accurate
record of the discussion. And also I would
like to ask our transcriber to let us know if
you are having an issue with hearing anyone or
with recording.

As the DFO, I see that the minutes
are prepared and ensure they are certified by
the chair. The minutes of today's meeting will
be available on the Board's website no later
than 90 calendar days from today per the FACA
regulations. If they are available sooner, we
will publish them sooner.

Also we will be publishing verbatim
transcripts. Those transcripts should be
available on the Board's website within 30
days.

I would like to remind Advisory
Board Members that there are some materials
that have been provided to you in your capacity
as Special Government Employees and Members of
the Board, which are not for public disclosure
and cannot be shared or discussed publicly, including in this meeting. Please be aware of this, as we continue with the meeting today.

These materials can be discussed in a general way, which does not include using any personally identifiable information such as names, addresses, specific facilities if a case is being discussed, or doctors' names.

And with that, I convene this meeting of the Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health SEM Subcommittee. And I'm going to turn it over to Dr. Welch, who is the chair.

CHAIR WELCH: Thank you, Carrie.

We have two documents to discuss today. One is -- and these are both responses to the comments we received from OWCP on our prior recommendations.

So one is a response to the response on our recommended revisions of the OHQ and the other is the COPD presumption.

I thought we would take the OHQ one
first. I thought first I'd see if you all -- hopefully, you have had a chance to read it and, if you have any comments. And then if not, I have some specific things I want to point out just to be sure we're all in agreement.

So to open it up, does anybody have any comments on the Recommendation number 4, Revisions of the OHQ?

Okay. Well, the way -- John Dement put this one together, primarily. And what we did was simply summarize why they didn't accept the Board's recommendation and reiterate why we think it's important that they should.

The Item 1 is about some things that OWCP has already developed a revised OHQ and Item 2 is specifically about vapors, gases, dust, and fumes which we will discuss a little bit more in the COPD one.

We had discussed many of these points at the last meeting when we were all together that we didn't particularly like the
new draft OHQ because it includes free text, which is one of our recommendations that really doesn't structure the rest of the question that would help people remember specific tasks and exposures and that, you know I think all of our experience is that they really need to structure it to use tasks and materials, not just ask people for a list of what they were exposed to.

And we are reiterating the importance of having tasks and materials, not just asking them what were you exposed to.

Does anybody have any -- if you agree with it, you don't have to speak up. I just want to make sure that you got the gist of that and that you are agreeing with it.

Really what we're doing today is making sure that our committee is in agreement so on January 30th, when we review for the whole Board, we could tell them the subcommittee discussed it agrees with its response to comments.
Are you all good with that concept that we're going back and reiterating that they really need to use tasks and memory triggers around tasks and materials?

Okay. Is there anything that we left out of this that you all think you know when you remember our discussion about the OHQ, anything you think we should reemphasize?

MEMBER GRIFFON: Laurie, this is Mark Griffon. Can you say a little bit more about memory triggers because I totally agree with the concept? I'm just wondering how it is done and not in a site-specific questionnaire.

CHAIR WELCH: Let me see what we had. I'll get up my --

MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes, I'm trying to remember.

CHAIR WELCH: -- yes, what we had recommended. I can find that in a second.

MEMBER GRIFFON: Okay.

MEMBER DEMENT: Mark, this is John. I think one of the issues was we have a fairly
respectable list of tasks for construction and it's based on using it for a lot of years. We don't have as good a list for production workers.

And so this a two-prong attack. One is to include the tasks we knew about and that are fairly routine for construction and maintenance workers but then also to provide -- and it is sort of the same context -- if a worker lists an exposure, you again ask the task that they did to result in that exposure.

The issue with memory triggers is we found in the BT Medical exam that if we list tasks and ask workers about them, they are more likely to remember having done them than if we simply give them a blank sheet of paper and ask them to list the tasks that they did. And it's just a simple jogging of the memory; yes, I did that task.

CHAIR WELCH: I think that one of the -- so the BTMed we have worked at a list of tasks. And I think that the other programs
didn't focus on tasks as much but it wouldn't be extremely complicated to make some general list of tasks that would be memory-triggered for individuals who worked in production facilities such as you know cleaning carts, machine parts. We could sit down and make up such a list. It probably wouldn't be complete but it would be helpful.

And the same with materials. So in our recommendations, we listed some agents that should be on the list of hazards that then would, if someone said yes, I was exposed to acids and caustics, then the questionnaire would ask them well what tasks would you do that led to that kind of exposure. And that we included in our original recommendation a list of hazards.

And the original questionnaire that DOL has used for a long time does have some list of hazards. These are more categories, which shorten, rather than extending it.

I guess in our recommendations, the
first time around, we didn't really describe memory triggers but we did talk about how a worker may not know the names of all the materials he or she used but will know the tasks performed. The task alone, even without the names of the associated hazards can give the industrial hygienist a sense of what exposure occurred and then additional questions need to be asked.

And it is reported out in this response that it's all linked together. So then the industrial hygienist should be able to go back and talk to the worker to get more detail, which is the recommendation that Department of Labor did accept.

MEMBER GRIFFON: Okay, thanks, Laurie. That's a good clarification for me. I was thinking we were -- I mean I remember the expression on tasks. I was thinking of different sort of memory triggers that you know we have used things like group interviews and things like that. I think it would be hard to
put in a generic.

You know so I'm thinking like it sounds like there are certain campaigns and if we said you know we had a list of campaigns that took place over the years, a lot of the workers would remember oh, yes, I've worked on that campaign, or that project, or you know and that might trigger them to remember what sort of exposures were involved, et cetera. But that would be more site-specific and that would be difficult to do.

CHAIR WELCH: Well, no, you know I mean how many sites are there? Twenty-seven. It's not like there are thousands of them. And there's probably only campaigns that you know --- a dozen. So it's really a good idea. It's another way -- you know in the same way using maps. If people are able to look at a map, it's not asking for that task.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MEMBER GRIFFON: I didn't think of that.
CHAIR WELCH: Oh, yes, yes, I remember working in that building and here's what I did.

MEMBER GRIFFON: Right.

MEMBER POPE: This is Duronda Pope. You could even put down those tasks and have like a slash or something, or campaign, or project that you might have worked on in that building.

CHAIR WELCH: Do you think we should add that, the idea of campaigns added as an example here that that would be another way in addition to a list of tasks to see if specific campaigns would help workers remember?

MEMBER POPE: I think that would be a good idea.

CHAIR WELCH: Okay.

MEMBER DOMINA: Hey, this is Kirk. I've got a question.

On that campaign type of thing -- and Mark might know the answer to this, I would think with all the data that NIOSH has gone...
through over the years, because they look at specific things at specific sites when they know things come up through their interviews or group interviews, that that would identify not just the rad site but the chemical, any other type of occupational exposure because it goes hand in hand with any of these campaigns that we've done.

MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes, I mean they have the Site Profile documents that NIOSH has developed for the large Site Survey, usually in multiple parts because of the bigger sites, anyway. But there is also -- they also realize that they are sort of ever-changing. I mean they try to get as much information as they can but often they're missing quite a bit of information on the first revision and then they modify it as they get more information. Over the last 15 years, they have certainly modified many times.

So they're not perfect but they have a pretty good history of, and like you said,
it's not only radiation work, it's you know all these plants, or chemical plants, really, you know with radiation exposures as well. So they list the history of projects, too.

So yes, and I don't know how much -- you know the other thing I would envision is if, and Kirk, I don't know how they do the questionnaires but, oftentimes, if you're going to have the intake person working with them on the questionnaire, I think this would be where the intake person could say, if they have knowledge of the site, they could have that sort of information to trigger, to help them answer some of these questions.

So I don't know exactly how they conduct these questionnaires, if they're just sent out and then someone goes over it with them on the phone, or how they do that.

CHAIR WELCH: I think they do them in person and they --

MEMBER GRIFFON: Oh, they do them in person?
CHAIR WELCH: Yes, they do them at -- I forget the name -- the centers that they have.

MEMBER GRIFFON: At the centers, right.

MEMBER VLIEGER: This is Faye. Some are done in person and some are not?

CHAIR WELCH: Okay.

MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes.

CHAIR WELCH: But Faye if it was, say it was a Hanford worker, if it was done over the phone, would it be someone from the Hanford Resource Center that calls them?

MEMBER VLIEGER: Yes, they do phone interviews but some of are just done on paper. But people don't remember these things and so the Resource Center workers have some experience but they really don't understand the chemical processes so they can't fill it in for them and the people don't know the names of the chemicals.

So this use of specific chemicals is
just daunting.

CHAIR WELCH: Yes. Well what I was thinking too, though, is if there you know this idea of either things that come out of the NIOSH Site Profiles for these campaigns, if there are people at Hanford who are doing the questionnaire for Hanford workers, there is even fewer -- they could become a little more expert in the kind of exposures that people have or what was done at the facility using these resources.

MEMBER VLIEGER: This is Faye. It is interesting that on the Site Exposure Matrix, and I'm looking at Hanford, they have work processes already but I don't know that the CEs ever look at this or if the chemicals listed in these have been vetted to be accurate and then used for the claimants.

CHAIR WELCH: Well DOL recently added this directory to these linked work process and it's a pretty narrow, very specific -- it's a short list of processes and they are
very specific and some of them probably didn't occur in the DOE facilities. I think it's a list of work processes that comes out of HAZ-MAP.

I was very excited when they first started this process. I thought it was very helpful but I don't know that they've got a way to add work processes to the list. I don't think they have a system. That's something that the Board can continue to look at down the road.

Because the work processes would be very helpful. It's a much easier way to do a claim.

MEMBER VLIEGER: I just looked at one of the work processes at the Hanford Site Exposure Matrix for coal handler and they list diesel exhaust, gasoline, gasoline exhaust, kerosene, kerosene and petroleum mid-distillate but they don't list coal dust.

So I don't know that this is going to help us either.
CHAIR WELCH: I'm not sure. That probably doesn't exist there, does it, coal?

MEMBER VLIEGER: Yes, it did. Hanford had a coal-fired power plant for many, many years.

CHAIR WELCH: Oh, okay. Yes, I mean it's a great idea. It's a very complicated process but some of them are useful, you know like if you're a welder, you are exposed to welding fumes. It helps presume some exposures, anyway, but making the list longer would be good. And some of them -- I mean you look at the list because you can go into SEM and get a list of all the processes. You don't even have to do it site by site. I think they may have about 30 of them in there, quite specific.

So I'll add to this document that we recommend they add a list of campaigns at each site as a memory trigger. And then they may or may not know even what we're talking about but we need to get it in the recommendation.
What do you think we could do with the NIOSH Site Profiles? Should we recommend --

MEMBER GRIFFON: Well, I don't know if that -- I mean I would hope that people that are working on the SEMs and updating the SEM are consulting with those documents as well. So I don't know.

But I certainly think --

CHAIR WELCH: I think those do get incorporated into the SEM. It's not --

MEMBER GRIFFON: Right.

CHAIR WELCH: It may be more useful like a narrative for people as training. Because once it goes into the SEM, it becomes this specific agent at a specific building and that's maybe not quite as -- you can't just read it.

MEMBER GRIFFON: Right.

CHAIR WELCH: Well, I'll put a note in here that the Site Profiles prepared by NIOSH could be helpful as background
MEMBER GRIFFON: For the interviewers. Yes, that's good.

And I would say campaigns or projects maybe. I mean campaigns I think tends to be a specific term for like -- I'm not sure but I think it's more specific to like Nevada Test Site; whereas, projects might be a broader term.

CHAIR WELCH: And a project would be like making a particular like you know -- that they were machining something for a short period of time on-site or --

MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes, if there was a project during which they were working on a certain part or a certain -- you know.

And some of them even had classified names. So it might have been like Project X or something you know.

CHAIR WELCH: And are there lists of projects?

MEMBER GRIFFON: I'm not sure there
is a master list anywhere but I know that we ran across that kind of information when we were putting together the medical surveillance needs assessment stuff. And I'm pretty sure NIOSH also did when making their Site Profiles.

CHAIR WELCH: Okay.

MEMBER POPE: Duronda Pope. I know at Rocky Flats we had several projects from time to time that we started and completed. So projects -- Mark is right, projects might be a better term than campaign, now that I think about it.

CHAIR WELCH: Okay.

So we could add that they should add, in addition to tasks, they should add projects to OHQ and then, ideally, have a list of projects to each site that could be used as memory triggers for the workers and see how that goes.

That's good, though.

MEMBER WHITLEY: Garry Whitley here.

If you go in and file a claim in OHQ and then
at a later date you go back and file a different claim for like the first one might be hearing and the next one might be lung cancer, do you automatically get to update your OHQ or do you have to request it?

MEMBER VLIEGER: No but you can file a supplemental.

MEMBER WHITLEY: So they don't -- you have to request to do that, though, don't you?

MEMBER VLIEGER: You just -- you can just fill out the form or request to do it at the Resource Center, yes.

MEMBER WHITLEY: Okay.

CHAIR WELCH: Do you think you're done with this one? It's more of the conversation might spark other ideas. Like I just don't want to close it out.

But we can move to the other one if people feel we got that one done.

MEMBER VLIEGER: Ultimately, what I would like to see is an interactive form that
actually looks at these databases because the Resource Center workers are only as good as their memories.

CHAIR WELCH: Yes, now that would be good. I know many people in that position that over the years have talked about developing that computer-based Occupational History Questionnaire that could be fairly general, that would start out with general categories of work and then ask questions within that that then become even more specific based on an algorithm but it has never happened. But it would be a good idea.

Okay, let's go to the COPD one. This one, I put together -- I took the old recommendations that we've made but added in some -- changed it a little bit in trying to respond to OWCP's comments. Remember we had the discussion that they said well, vaporous gas, dust, and fumes isn't the toxic stuff so it has to be -- the language says the covered illness has to be at least as likely as not
exposure to a specific toxic substance was related to employment and the program has a definition they use for toxic substance. Plus they thought that VGDF was way too broad.

So the response I put together was basically that the language -- the enabling language doesn't need to be in specifics. And that they have -- there's many examples where OWCP has been using complex mixtures and accepting claims from those.

We had at the meeting or I had said I would try to put together a list of -- a more specific list of agents. But as I thought about it and talked with John and Mark, we realized it really wasn't possible to have a list. There could be a list but then there had to be ways for other people to get their claims in.

So what we ended up with was that the presumption may be someone has to have a presumption of significant exposure to chronic substance use would occur if they had five
years of work in a DOE site with the shorter list of agents; five years of work in any one of the job titles at a DOE site encompassed by these major categories of construction, installation, maintenance and repair and the claimant's job title is linked to a toxic substance in the SEM; or five years exposure to VGDF as recorded in the revised OWCP that included something that is in one of these categories of agents.

So instead of it just being any dust or any vapor, we narrowed it but not really narrowed it that much. It's just I think it's more understandable to say that we presume if people were in these job titles, they would have had an exposure. Or if they weren't in one of those job titles, if they report exposures in these categories or the SEM links their job title to HED categories.

And within the SEM for any agent it tells what category it belongs to. So it's possible for the claims examiner to do this, to
say that the worker said they had exposure to you know trichloroethylene and they can see that it's in the group of solvents.

So my hope was it's a little more -- it's more responsive to what their criticisms were but we're still hanging on to the concept of VGDF has been an important causative agent for COPD.

So with that intro, any comments, or thoughts, or additions, or suggestions? Or I didn't -- I don't think I included here the job list, those categories of -- Category 47 Construction, and 49, Installation, Maintenance and Repair.

Steve Markowitz has produced some expanded version of that for the accepted presumptions. So we would be using the same list. And he's got very specific job titles within that community of 30 or 40 job titles that fall under those categories.

All right, somebody was going to say something.
MEMBER DOMINA: Yes, this is Kirk. We need to stay with the VDGF just because I think I brought up at the meeting in Santa Fe about our tank farm workers are a prime example because you have all of this mixed into one or some of the different other processes that we did, based on lack of ventilation in these different buildings. And I think that kind of showed a little bit, too, when we went into the machine shop at Los Alamos, where you have the building built in 1953 and all these different things that has gone on there for years and years, and all these different processes, that it is a very real lexicon or whatever they want to call it.

It needs to be included because I think some of these people that are making the decisions don't understand the complexity and all these things are rolled into one every day when we were working it.

MEMBER DEMENT: This is John. I think the other thing, based on the discussion
that Laura, and Steve, and I had with the literature on COPD clearly supports this VGDF exposure metric and its relationship to COPD risk.

And so I think scientifically it's valid, it's defensible, it's supported by the literature. And as Laura said, there are ample examples in the SEM itself where complex mixtures are already considered collectively together in their relationship with disease.

So I think we should stick with our guns on VGDF.

MEMBER GRIFFON: This is Mark Griffon. I wholeheartedly agree with John on that.

I just had one question on the -- I think it's at the bottom of the second page, number 4, Laurie, where it talks about duration of exposure.

CHAIR WELCH: Oh, yes, I'm looking at that. Yes.

MEMBER GRIFFON: The five years can
be accumulated by a combination of DOE employment and employment outside of the DOE. Have we talked --

CHAIR WELCH: Yes, I must have edited that. We decided to take that out.

MEMBER GRIFFON: Oh, okay. Yes, I thought so.

CHAIR WELCH: And I'm sorry. I must have been working from an old document because at the meeting I understood that the DOL can't take into account exposure.

MEMBER GRIFFON: That's what I thought, yes. That's the only thing I caught.

CHAIR WELCH: Yes, thanks for that.

MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes, that needs to come out.

CHAIR WELCH: Yes, I just took it out of my version and I'm creating a new version here.

I mean I think by combining -- by using these broad categories of agents, which are then complex mixtures but dust and fibers,
I think they really accept that as a complex mixture. And then the acids and caustics -- I think this makes it more understandable for people who are not really versed in the technicalities of the research and it makes it more -- I think it's not really changing that much but I think it's making it more manageable for a claims examiner. So hopefully, this will be acceptable.

MEMBER POPE: This is Duronda. I am in agreement with Kirk in regards to do we have to, do we need to spell it out in terms of the tank farm. Do we have to spell that out in order for them to accept them being included?

CHAIR WELCH: I don't think so.

MEMBER POPE: Okay.

CHAIR WELCH: I mean the tank farms clearly are a complex mixture, probably vapors and solvents. The only problem would be that the workers at the tank farm, they can't describe any specific exposures. Because they wouldn't be able to say they were exposed to an
acid, or a caustic, or a dust, or a solvent.

MEMBER DEMENT: But if they filled out - this is John -- their OHQ, they clearly could state they were exposed to VGDF and they could then state where they got it -- from the tank farm.

CHAIR WELCH: Oh, okay.

MEMBER DEMENT: I think that is -- so if you take the Occupational History Questionnaire and this presumption collectively together, I think we're covered there.

CHAIR WELCH: That's what I'm looking at right now. They'd have to be in the category of this number C, the five years of exposure to VGDF during DOE employment as reported in the revised OHQ that assesses VGDF exposures. But then we say and the SEM shows this job title or tasks are linked to agents in one or more of the following toxic substance groups.

So if the SEM hasn't incorporated tank farms, then this isn't really going to
help them.

   But in a way, this is a presumption, right? So if there are people whose job doesn't fit, then they put together industrial hygiene assessments.

   You know I think what I should do, based on that -- what we had before was claims examiners shouldn't deny claims for COPD if the worker had fewer than five years of exposure. But I think what we need to add and they shouldn't be denied. They should go to full review if they report VGDF for five years, even if it's not identified in the SEM or something like that.

   Does that make sense? Because I think -- I don't know that tank farm people would be covered.

MEMBER POPE: Right. So I just wanted to make sure that you know if we didn't have to -- if they have to have it spelled out so they're not excluded from being on that list, per se.
CHAIR WELCH: So they would need an IH review. But we still need the -- we need the questionnaire to have the VGDF questions and I'm presuming that's true based on the way this is written.

MEMBER DEMENT: The other way they could possibly get in as a tank farm worker is a job title. I'm not sure exactly -- you know there are many different job titles that work on the tank farms.

MEMBER POPE: As a production worker, like I was, operator, tank farm workers wasn't, per se, part of the job but it was a part of the operator job.

MEMBER DEMENT: Okay.

MEMBER POPE: As an operator, you would operate a section of tank farms.

CHAIR WELCH: So it wouldn't fall under installation, maintenance, and repair?

MEMBER POPE: No.

CHAIR WELCH: It would be an operator job.
MEMBER POPE: Yes.

CHAIR WELCH: Because then it wouldn't be covered under our presumptive job title.

So we have to still put in that someone who has -- the VGDF question has to be on the questionnaire. And if people report that and they are not -- the presumption doesn't really fit, then we need a detailed IH review.

And that's because there are going to be other people, too, who their job title or task may not even be in the SEM so it can't be linked to toxic substances groups if it's not even in the SEM or the exposures they had are not characterized for that job.

So I will do that.

MEMBER DEMENT: Here's another question. In our response to the comments on the OHQ, we didn't specifically say that we still recommended this VGDF exposure questions be added to the questionnaire.
I mean we've said it in the original recommendation but in our response, you know they came back. I think we should probably, in that response --

CHAIR WELCH: Yes.

MEMBER DEMENT: -- state that those questions need to be retained.

CHAIR WELCH: Yes, because what we did say was it would be addressed --

MEMBER DEMENT: Right.

CHAIR WELCH: -- in the response so they could do the recommended presumptions. I can say they will be addressed in more detail but it has to be retained.

MEMBER DEMENT: Yes, they were linked together.

CHAIR WELCH: Okay. I'm making notes but I'll make it sound a little bit better and then I can send it to everybody just to see if you like the way I have expressed it.

Well, I think we're okay. We're going to get a chance to talk about this again
on our January 30th call. But I will send this around again with these edits and then mark the edits and you can make sure they're okay with you.

And if anything else comes up, let me know and I can -- or we can all respond to each other, I think as long as respond okay and see if there is any final edits we want to make before the 30th.

Does that sound okay?

Anybody have anything else they want to add now? Any other comments now? I figured it would be quick today.

Okay, Carrie, I think we're done.

MS. RHOADS: Great. Like you said, if you're sending drafts around, make sure to copy the Board's inbox as well.

And then I think if nobody has anything else, then we will hear from everybody on the 30th at our next meeting.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 1:53 p.m.)