

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

+ + + + +

ADVISORY BOARD ON TOXIC SUBSTANCES
AND WORKER HEALTH

+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY
APRIL 24, 2019

+ + + + +

The Board convened in the Lamar Ballroom at the Augusta Marriott at the Convention Center located at 2 Tenth Street, Augusta, Georgia, at 8:30 a.m. Eastern Daylight Time, Steven Markowitz, Chair, presiding.

MEMBERS

SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY

JOHN DEMENT
GEORGE FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ
MAREK MIKULSKI
KENNETH SILVER

MEDICAL COMMUNITY

MANIJEH BERENJI
STEVEN MARKOWITZ, Chair
CARRIE REDLICH

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

CLAIMANT COMMUNITY

KIRK DOMINA
RON MAHS
DURONDA POPE
CALIN TEBAY

DESIGNATED FEDERAL OFFICIAL

DOUG FITZGERALD

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Welcome/introductions 4

Review of agenda 7

Update and remarks 18

Board Operation Update 54
 Renewal of charter
 Replacement of Dr. Cassano
 Review of proposed DOL Data Request
 Form

Ombudsman Report 125

Review Board Nov. 2018 and Feb. 2019 action
 items and responses 165

Update, presumption for COPD 108

Claims review, COPD claims 110

Report from Parkinson's Working Group 257

Claims review, Parkinson's 279

Public comment 316

Adjourn 374

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

2 MR. FITZGERALD: Good morning
3 everyone. My name is Douglas Fitzgerald and I
4 would like to welcome you to today's meeting of
5 the Department of Labor's Advisory Board on Toxic
6 Substances and Worker Health. I'm the Board's
7 Designated Federal Officer or DFO.

8 Before we begin, I'd like to go over
9 some general housekeeping items so to make sure
10 everyone's visit today is safe and comfortable for
11 the next couple of days.

12 First, restrooms are located to your
13 left down the hall. There's also a restroom
14 downstairs in the lobby area. In case of emergency
15 or if an alarm sounds, please follow the exits that
16 are to your left, to your right, as well as to the
17 back of the room and exit the building.

18 I'd like to express my appreciation for
19 the work of the Board Members in preparing for this
20 public meeting and for their forthcoming
21 deliberations. I also wish to thank my colleagues
22 at the Department of Labor for all their efforts

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in preparing for today's meeting, particularly
2 Carrie Rhoads and our Committee staff; the
3 Alternate DFO who makes this job so much easier
4 for us, as well as our SIDEM contract staff who
5 also do a fantastic job in arranging everyone's
6 travel, preparing briefing books and running these
7 meetings again.

8 As a DFO, I serve as the liaison between
9 the Department and the Board. I'm responsible for
10 approving meeting agendas and for opening and
11 adjourning meetings while ensuring all conditions
12 of the Federal Advisory Act are met regarding
13 operations of the Board.

14 I'm also responsible for making the
15 Board's deliberations fall within the parameters
16 outlined in its enabling statute and its charter.
17 Within that context, I work closely with the Board's
18 Chair, Dr. Markowitz, and OWCP to ensure that the
19 Board, as an advisory body to the Secretary, is
20 fulfilling the mandate to advise and is addressing
21 those issues of highest priority and appraisalment
22 for the Secretary of Labor who is ultimately

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 responsible for the administration of the Energy
2 Employees Occupational Illness Compensation
3 Program.

4 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: This might work a
5 little better.

6 MR. FITZGERALD: Maybe, okay. All
7 right, I just got the Chairman's microphone and
8 maybe this will work a little better.

9 So within the context, I work with the
10 Board's Chair, Dr. Markowitz, and OWCP to ensure
11 that the Board, as an advisory body to the
12 Secretary, is fulfilling that mandate to advise,
13 and is addressing those issues of highest priority
14 and of greatest benefit to the Secretary of Labor
15 who is ultimately responsible for the
16 administration of the Energy Employees
17 Occupational Illness Compensation Program.

18 And finally, I also work with the
19 appropriate Agency officials to ensure that all
20 relevant ethics regulations are satisfied.

21 Regarding today's meeting, we have a
22 full agenda for the next couple of days, and you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 should note that the agenda times are approximate.

2 So we'll try as best as we can to adhere to that
3 timeframe, but we may not be able to actually meet
4 exact times that the agenda lays out.

5 Copies of all meeting materials and
6 public comments are or will be available on the
7 Board's website under the heading Meetings. The
8 Board's website, I think everyone can find that
9 easily if you just go to the Department of Labor,
10 dol.gov, and go to OWCP, you'll find the Advisory
11 Board's website fairly easily.

12 There you can find a page that's
13 dedicated to this week's meeting. It contains all
14 materials submitted to us in advance, and you'll
15 find the agenda for today's meeting as well as
16 instructions for participating remotely in both
17 the meeting and the public comment period later
18 this afternoon.

19 Public comments will begin at 4:30 p.m.

20 And if you have not already scheduled to speak
21 and would like to speak, please follow the Chair's
22 directions prior to the public comment section

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 later this afternoon if you're participating
2 remotely.

3 If you are present and would like to
4 speak, please inform Carrie Rhoads, the Alternate
5 DFO, of your interest in speaking.

6 If you are participating remotely, I
7 want to point out that the telephone numbers and
8 the links to the WebEx sessions are different for
9 today and tomorrow, so please make sure you read
10 those instructions carefully.

11 If you're joining by WebEx, please note
12 that sessions are for viewing only and will not
13 be interactive. Phones will also be muted during
14 public comment period. That begins at 4:30 this
15 afternoon.

16 The Chair will also note that the public
17 comment period is not a question-and-answer session
18 but rather an opportunity for the public to provide
19 comments about their own experiences and address
20 any of the issues that the Board is discussing
21 today.

22 During Board discussions and prior to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the public comment period, I would request that
2 the people in the room remain silent as possible,
3 as quiet as possible since we're recording this
4 meeting to produce transcripts.

5 If, for any reason, the Board Members
6 require clarification on an issue that requires
7 participation from the public, the Board may
8 request such information through the chair or
9 myself.

10 The Federal Advisory Committee Act
11 requires that minutes of this meeting be prepared
12 to include a description of the matters discussed
13 during the next several days and any conclusions
14 reached by the Board.

15 As the Designated Federal Officer, I
16 prepare the minutes and ensure that they're
17 certified by the Board's Chair. The minutes of
18 today's meeting will be available on the Board's
19 website no later than 90 calendar days from today
20 per FACA regulations. But if they're available
21 sooner, we'll post them sooner.

22 Although formal minutes are being

1 prepared because they're required by the FACA
2 regulations, we'll also be publishing verbatim
3 transcripts which are obviously more detailed in
4 nature, and these transcripts will be available
5 on the Board's website as soon as possible.

6 I'm looking forward to working with all
7 of you today and hearing your discussions. This
8 week's meeting represents like the third full
9 meeting of the Board since November, so I'd like
10 to acknowledge the Agency's efforts to complete
11 all the internal FACA procedures and public notice
12 requirements to facilitate the Board's ambitious
13 schedule.

14 I also would like to thank the Energy
15 Program and Director Leiton who is here with us
16 today for being here to lend her knowledge and
17 expertise to the Board's discussions and for
18 providing the case-specific data that will be the
19 substance of much of that discussion.

20 And on that point, I just want to make
21 sure that everyone is aware that the information
22 that has been provided to the Board Members contains

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a lot of personally identifiable information, and
2 please be cognizant of that when you are having
3 discussions and talking about these cases so that
4 you are aware that we have to be very careful about
5 not disclosing information that is personal and
6 proprietary.

7 And with that, Mr. Chairman, I convene
8 this meeting of the Advisory Board of Toxic
9 Substances Worker Health.

10 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Thank you and
11 welcome. Welcome to the Board Members for coming
12 and attending the meeting, and welcome to the public
13 as well, including the public that might be on the
14 phone listening to us or watching through WebEx.

15 Can you hear me in back? Okay.

16 So I want to thank Doug Fitzgerald and
17 Carrie Rhoads and Kevin Bird for all of the support
18 for this meeting and for our efforts in general.

19 We were going to -- we went to Savannah
20 River Site and I want to thank DOL and DOE Greg
21 Lewis for arranging for that excellent tour
22 yesterday.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Anyway, when we were driving there and
2 I was driving with Carrie Rhoads, and she was
3 following Doug Fitzgerald in the car and I said
4 to Carrie, I said, don't worry, Doug's not going
5 to lose you because if he lost you, then Doug would
6 have to do all the work that you do by himself.
7 But thank you for -- (Laughter.)

8 And thank you for the Department of
9 Labor personnel who are here today, Ms. Leiton,
10 Malcolm Nelson, Amanda Fallon, and if there's
11 anybody else.

12 I think Ms. Leiton will be here
13 throughout the day, but she won't be here tomorrow.

14 So if there are questions that the Board Members
15 have, clarification or whatnot, we should raise
16 them today.

17 We may have access to John Vance
18 tomorrow. Not quite sure whether we'll need that
19 access, but in any case, just be aware of that
20 because it's very good to have Department of Labor
21 officials from the program in attendance and
22 available by phone, certainly for clarification.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I just want to say that the Board
2 received materials in the last couple of weeks,
3 and people have made efforts to review those
4 materials as much as possible. I suspect we
5 haven't had a complete opportunity to review all
6 the materials, which is just fine.

7 I want to encourage Board Members to
8 participate in the meeting even if there's some
9 uncertainty about what you've read, or uncertainty
10 about your understanding about what you've read.

11 Because what we want to do is get as much
12 clarification as we can during the meeting, so don't
13 be shy about raising issues, asking questions or
14 the like.

15 We're going to start with introductions
16 with the Board Members, and then with everybody
17 else in the room actually briefly, and then we'll
18 move onto review of the Agenda.

19 I'm Steven Markowitz. I'm an
20 occupational medicine physician. I'm an
21 epidemiologist and a professor at the City
22 University of New York, and I run the largest Former

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Worker medical screening program with support from
2 the Department of Energy. Mani.

3 MEMBER BERENJI: Good morning. I'm
4 Mani Berenji, occupational medicine physician at
5 Boston University School of Medicine and assistant
6 professor. Pleasure to be here.

7 MEMBER DEMENT: I'm John Dement. I'm
8 an industrial hygienist and epidemiologist. I'm
9 at the Duke University Medical Center. I also have
10 participated with the Building Trades Medical
11 Screening Program since about 1998.

12 MEMBER DOMINA: I'm Kirk Domina. I'm
13 the Employee Health Advocate for the Hanford Atomic
14 Metal Trades Council in Richland, Washington. I'm
15 also a U.S. DMBU (phonetic) member. I'm an active
16 worker. I've been out there 36 years. I guess
17 that's it.

18 MEMBER SILVER: Ken Silver, Faculty
19 and Environmental Health at the College of Public
20 Health at East Tennessee State University. It
21 feels like a lifetime ago, but I was very closely
22 involved with Los Alamos families in advocating

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for the law and making sure the people who spoke
2 out early on got paid under this program.

3 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: I'm George
4 Friedman-Jimenez. I'm an occupational medicine
5 physician and an epidemiologist at New York
6 University School of Medicine, and I run the
7 Occupational Medicine Clinic at Bellevue Hospital
8 in New York City.

9 MEMBER POPE: Duronda Pope, United
10 Steelworkers Emergency Response Team, but also a
11 former worker of Rocky Flats, 25 years.

12 MEMBER TEBAY: I'm Calin Tebay. I'm
13 the Hanford Site beryllium health advocate and the
14 Hanford Workforce Engagement Center
15 representative.

16 MEMBER REDLICH: I'm Carrie Redlich.
17 I'm an occupational medicine and pulmonary
18 physician on the faculty at Yale of Professional
19 Medicine, and at the Medical School, and I'm
20 director of the Yale Occupational and Environmental
21 Medicine Program.

22 MEMBER MAHS: Ron Mahs. Approximately

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 20 years at all three plants at Oak Ridge, and that's
2 about it.

3 MEMBER MIKULSKI: I'm Marek Mikulski.
4 I'm an occupational epidemiologist with the
5 University of Iowa. I direct the Former Worker
6 program for the former nuclear weapons workers from
7 the State of Iowa.

8 MS. LEITON: Hi. I'm Rachel Leiton.
9 I'm the Director of the Energy Compensation
10 Program at the Department of Labor.

11 MS. SPLETT: I'm Gail Splett. I'm
12 with the Department of Energy at the Hanford Site.
13 I'm the EEOICPA program manager there.

14 MS. WHITTEN: Diane Whitten with the
15 Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council.

16 MS. SLAUGHTER: I'm Jenny Slaughter
17 with United Energy Workers.

18 MS. SHAVLIN: I'm Sarah Shavlin with
19 United Energy Workers.

20 MS. JERISON: Deb Jerison, Energy
21 Employees Claims Assistance Project.

22 MS. BARRIE: Terrie Barrie, ANWAG.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. VLIENER: Faye Vliener, former
2 member of the Advisory Board on Toxic Substances
3 and Worker Health, charter member of Cold War
4 Patriots, and a worker advocate.

5 MR. ARTZER: I'm Josh Artzer. I'm the
6 current chairman of the Beryllium Awareness Group
7 out at Hanford, and also the Hanford Workforce
8 Engagement Center Representative.

9 MS. BUTLER: I'm Debra Butler, manager
10 of the Savannah River Resource Center.

11 MR. BALLARD: I'm Chris Ballard and I'm
12 with Critical Nurse Staffing, the Vice-President
13 of Regulatory Affairs.

14 MR. NELSON: Good morning. I'm
15 Malcolm Nelson. I'm the current ombudsman for the
16 Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation
17 Program.

18 MS. FALLON: Good morning. My name is
19 Amanda Fallon. I'm a policy analyst in the Office
20 of the Ombudsman.

21 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Pretty exciting
22 agenda, I think. We're going to review the agenda.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Let's just take a look at the agenda. I think
2 members of the public had access to a copy of the
3 agenda from outside, right? Okay.

4 So we're going to hear from Ms. Leiton
5 regarding relevant update for Board matters and
6 other remarks that she might like to make.

7 And then Mr. Fitzgerald will go over
8 a few items which are written out on the agenda.

9 Then Mr. Nelson will give us a summary
10 of the Ombudsman report.

11 And then I will just briefly go over
12 the items, the Board items, the action items,
13 recommendations and whatnot from our first two
14 meetings, and the DOL responses that we've received
15 to date.

16 Just a brief update then on the
17 presumption for COPD. And then after lunch -- by
18 the way, times are quite approximate because I
19 really don't know how long conversation will go
20 on for.

21 So after lunch we will talk about the
22 claims we've received for COPD, and then we will

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 hear a report from the working group on
2 Parkinson's-related disorders.

3 We will then discuss some claims in
4 relation to Parkinson's-related disorders. And
5 then we end the day with a public comment period
6 from 4:30 to 6:00 p.m.

7 Tomorrow, after an introduction, we'll
8 have just a brief discussion. It's 45 minutes for
9 that time, Ken, and we won't need that much time
10 just so you know. It's just going to be a review
11 of the issue of the request from DOL to address,
12 really provide assistance with how to look at
13 non-cancer outcomes of various radiological
14 materials.

15 We're going to discuss the public
16 comments within the Board, and then we'll have an
17 update on the presumption for solvent-induced
18 hearing loss, have some time to review Board
19 functioning, operation, structure, working groups,
20 committees and the like with ideas to improve things
21 if needed. And then we'll discuss any new issues
22 that arise, and then make a plan for the next

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 meeting.

2 So are there any suggestions about this
3 agenda? Any additions? Any items people want to
4 add that aren't covered by the topics? Okay.

5 So I would like to welcome Ms. Rachel
6 Leiton who's director of EEOICP. I should say
7 welcome back.

8 MS. LEITON: Can you hear me? All
9 right. Thank you for having me and thank you all
10 for being here. I know that you have put a lot
11 of time and effort into reviewing our cases and
12 reviewing the matters before you, and I know it
13 takes a lot of time so I do appreciate all of your
14 efforts on behalf of our program.

15 I have been asked to cover a few things,
16 so I'm going to do my best to do that. There was
17 a small list of items for me to cover. I'll be around
18 all day if there are follow-up questions or
19 whatever, and anything you want me to come up and
20 help clarify.

21 The first thing that I was asked to do
22 is review the changes from the latest procedure

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 manual chapter which is 3.0. There is a
2 transmittal, that's Transmittal 19-01 that goes
3 through each and every change in quite some detail,
4 so I'm probably not going to read them all.

5 A lot of them are changes from
6 terminology. We used to have what you call a CE-2
7 Unit. We now don't have that. It was a unit that
8 was -- well, it was claims examiners in the district
9 office that worked on matters that were, on cases
10 that were in front of the FAB that weren't related
11 to the FAB. It gets a little bit complicated, but
12 so there were some references to that.

13 We've made some changes to our
14 organizational structure, and I think I've
15 mentioned whether it's here, but we did centralize
16 some of our processes in terms of our medical bills,
17 our home health care, all pre-authorizations, so
18 we created a new Branch of Medical Benefits in
19 National Office. We cover that in 3.0.

20 I also want to mention that we're
21 probably soon going to have a 3.1, so a lot of that's
22 going to be related to some of the changes that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 were made in our regulations.

2 But I will walk through -- I'm going
3 to give you some of the highlights. This is a
4 19-page document, so I'm sure you guys can read
5 anything that I don't cover here.

6 As I said, some of it's just change of
7 terminology, rewording of certain things. The
8 Representative Conflict of Interest Guidance
9 really didn't change, but again, we just kind of
10 reworded it in terms of what we consider a conflict
11 of interest. We have had this in the procedures
12 for quite some time, so it's not really a change.

13 There is something new in chapter 15
14 which we added, and that is we included language
15 regarding the evaluation of an opinion of a treating
16 physician. And it's basically in instances where
17 a physician submits an opinion that a toxic
18 substance exposure was a contributory or
19 aggravating factor in the development of claimed
20 illness specific to the individual.

21 His or her opinion must be determined
22 to be well-rationalized, as that phrase is defined

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 later in this chapter, before the Part E claim can
2 be accepted. In particular, the physician must
3 offer an interpretation of epidemiological or
4 medical health science data that reasonably
5 supports the opinion presented.

6 Moreover, the CE must corroborate the
7 factual presentation of information used in the
8 formulation of the opinion, e.g. medical history,
9 verified periods of covered employment, and toxic
10 substance exposure characterization with evidence
11 available in the case file or obtained through the
12 application of program resources such as the SEM
13 or referral to a medical health science expert.

14 So that is a new section. Chapter
15 15.13, we added some language regarding the CE's
16 responsibility when a causation opinion of an
17 employee's physician is found to be insufficient.
18 And that's basically -- yes --

19 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: I'm sorry, before we
20 move on, can I just ask you a question?

21 MS. LEITON: Absolutely.

22 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: So this new language

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 about establishing toxic substance exposure and
2 causation -- so if you could bring that up, Kevin.

3 MS. LEITON: In the transmittal or the
4 chapter?

5 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: It's higher up. It
6 precedes what we're looking at on the screen.
7 Okay, that's it. So this language, this isn't
8 entirely new?

9 MS. LEITON: No, it's just placed in
10 this section. So we've got it in other places
11 pretty much saying similar things, but this puts
12 it in the section, makes it very clear they're
13 supposed to be evaluating for it.

14 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: So is it new that the
15 treating physician "must offer an interpretation
16 of epidemiologic or medical health science data
17 in support of their opinion." Is that new, because
18 I don't remember seeing that.

19 MS. LEITON: The language itself might
20 be new. In practice, it's something that we've
21 asked for in training, and in addition, when we
22 say must, we often go back and ask for whatever

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 information we can get from the treating doctor.

2 One of the things that we're trying to
3 refocus claims staff on is going back to the
4 treating physician instead of immediately going
5 to a CMC. And so I think this section was put in
6 so that we could kind of drive that focus.

7 Obviously, we're not going to get
8 perfect reports all the time, so we'll do as much
9 development as we can around that.

10 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: You know, my concern
11 is, we've discussed this before and I'm sure you're
12 aware of it, which is that the practicing physician
13 who wants to be supportive of the claimant is
14 unlikely, actually, to be versed in epidemiologic
15 or medical health science data in support of their
16 opinion and would probably not have the time to
17 do the research or to provide the reference list
18 for that opinion.

19 And I understand what the intent is.

20 Maybe in the next version instead of using must,
21 you could soften the language somewhat so that it's
22 suggested that that would be, maybe not an optimal

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 approach, but to the extent possible, the treating
2 physician should provide that kind of information.

3 But to make it compulsory is probably
4 overly ambitious, frankly, for what the
5 practitioner can do.

6 The other question I have is, I was
7 trying to understand what it means that it says,
8 "The CE must corroborate the factual presentation
9 of information used in the formulation of the
10 opinion." So if the physician does an occupational
11 history and gets information about details of their
12 exposure, and that's not -- and the CE then looks
13 at the various sources of exposure information and
14 doesn't fully corroborate that because frankly you
15 have a professional who's interviewing a patient
16 and they're getting additional information.

17 That information that the physician
18 collects and transmits shouldn't be discounted
19 because the claims examiner can't exactly find a
20 replication of that somewhere else. To me, it's
21 an additional source of information rather than
22 something that necessarily requires compulsory

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 corroboration. Do you understand my point?

2 MS. LEITON: Yes, I do. Again, in
3 this language, we're trying to get the claims
4 examiners to review the evidence in the case file.

5 So if we have a statement of accepted facts, we've
6 got an exposure analysis against that report. And
7 if they have questions or issues, to go back to
8 that treating doctor instead of immediately going
9 to a new doctor and saying, here's what we have.

10 You've laid out two years of exposure, we have
11 10, or whatever it might be. So that's kind of
12 the point of this.

13 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Sure.

14 MEMBER DEMENT: I don't know if this
15 thing is on. I think what Steven's talked about
16 with regard to giving additional information, I
17 think we'll hear that as we go through some of these
18 cases. Because in some instances, in my view the
19 case could have been better developed had either
20 an industrial hygienist or physician really gone
21 through and taken a more detailed history of what
22 actually the individual did at a site.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 In some cases, it seems that the SEM
2 sort of pre-empted what was actually in the
3 occupational history itself, and maybe some other
4 pieces of information. So I think it's important
5 that it not be so tightly bound to verification
6 on from site records which sometimes are quite
7 incomplete.

8 MS. LEITON: Thanks. Okay, the next
9 section that I was going to point out is chapter
10 15.13(b). We've added some language regarding the
11 CE's responsibility when a causation opinion of
12 an employee's physician is found to be
13 insufficient.

14 In these situations, the CE is to
15 provide the physician with any employment or
16 scientific evidence that DEEOIC has obtained to
17 establish an accurate factual presentation of
18 exposure.

19 That's what I was referring to earlier
20 is we're trying to push it back to the treating
21 as much as we can.

22 We deleted the section about exposure

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 after 1986 through 1995 because we really want more
2 of a case-by-case assessment of that evidence.
3 I believe that in the prior section it probably
4 talked -- I unfortunately don't have the chapter
5 in front of me -- but it talked a little bit more
6 about the likelihood of exposure during that period
7 of time, and we prefer that they go to an IH for
8 those assessments.

9 The next section we just edited for
10 clarity. The hearing loss, we edited to clarify
11 the process by which a finding can be made that
12 the job is equivalent to the listed job, and to
13 communicate ways in which an IH and SEM can be used
14 to assist in the adjudication of claims.

15 The section that is relevant here, the
16 newest section, is after the list of job categories.

17 We basically said employees often present evidence
18 that they were in a labor category that is the
19 equivalent of one of those listed here.

20 When a claimant makes a claim that a
21 job the employee performed is synonymous to one
22 of the qualifying labor categories listed above,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and the CE conducted some labor category alias
2 search that doesn't provide assistive information,
3 the CE can seek assistance in evaluating the claim
4 through a referral to a SEM mailbox. Our
5 contractors can review the mailbox and provide the
6 claims examiner with additional information, or
7 submission to an IH referral, so we just clarified
8 in the hearing loss presumptions or standards.

9 We also added a section after the list
10 of toxins. The CE can also use the SEM to identify
11 the employee's potential exposure to one or more
12 of the listed toxic substances. They must
13 carefully screen the evidence to apply appropriate
14 SEM search filters.

15 This is something that we've been going
16 around training on. Well, we've often trained on
17 it. But using the SEM properly, filtering through
18 the SEM properly to come up with the widest range
19 of exposures that we can. And the claims examiner
20 must look at each one individually to determine
21 what a person might have been exposed to, each labor
22 category in the SEM and then consult with an IH

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 if there's a question.

2 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: This is Steve
3 Markowitz. This strikes me as an important change,
4 actually. We've heard repeatedly that if the job
5 title -- with regard to hearing loss -- if the job
6 title isn't on the specific list of 22 job titles,
7 then you can't get compensated for solvent-induced
8 hearing loss.

9 And this clearly opens the door to
10 equivalent job titles. It actually may even relate
11 to the recommendation of the Board, but I'd have
12 to go back and look at that.

13 The SEM aliases are expansive but
14 ultimately limited, so this weighing in by the
15 industrial hygienist becomes very important,
16 because the industrial hygienist really can help
17 determine whether the person likely had solvents
18 exposure. So this strikes me as an important
19 change.

20 I'm still curious about 10 consecutive
21 years of exposure prior to 1990, because the Board
22 has made a recommendation about this. And it's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the 10 consecutive years -- I mean I also wonder
2 about the 1990, but it's the 10 consecutive years.

3 Because that's a foreign notion in occupational
4 medicine that a person has to have continuous
5 exposure.

6 I really can't think of a condition in
7 which we look at continuous exposure. For a
8 chronic occupational disease, we require
9 continuous exposure over a period of time.
10 Aggregate exposure, cumulative, right, total of
11 10 years, but that might have occurred over a
12 15-year period because the person changed jobs for
13 a few years.

14 So I'm just curious about how
15 intentional it was, the retention of the
16 consecutive years of exposure rather than changing
17 consecutive to another C-word, cumulative, which
18 would better capture I think the occupational
19 medicine knowledge.

20 MS. LEITON: When our toxicologists,
21 our IH's reviewed this particular standard and
22 through the research, they actually felt or

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 determined that this was a pretty lax standard for
2 solvents in hearing loss and that we were being
3 generous.

4 So, I'm not going to debate that right
5 here with you all, but that's the understanding
6 that I was given. In terms of whether it was
7 intentional, it was intentional to do it at
8 consecutive.

9 And we allowed for the combination of
10 noise and solvents, which was a matter of some
11 debate legally. But we were able to establish the
12 fact that there was some contribution of solvents
13 and noise in the -- we could match that to the
14 standard however in terms of whether or not that's
15 not enough or that we should expand that.

16 That's something that I've been advised
17 by our scientists isn't currently in the literature
18 that we've reviewed however. Obviously, we will
19 listen to whatever you all propose.

20 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Okay. I mean, I
21 don't want to continue this much work. The Board
22 isn't -- I don't think it's our role to weigh in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 on generosity or not, but it is our role to weigh
2 in on how compatible the program guidelines is with
3 current occupational medicine thinking. So that's
4 where we're coming from.

5 MS. LEITON: Sure. Okay, where was I?
6 Okay. Chapter 18, Eligibility Criteria for
7 Non-Cancerous Conditions. This may be a little
8 bit confusing. What we did here, this chapter,
9 this section 18.5(c) has to do with beryllium
10 sensitivity.

11 And what we did was we took out -- there
12 was in the prior chapter, it said, "If exhaustive
13 efforts produce little or no results, and the
14 evidence of record contains the normal borderline
15 LPT result along with a biopsy of the lung tissue
16 showing the presence of granulomas, the CE may
17 accept the claim."

18 In the new section, the new chapter,
19 we basically took out that last section that says,
20 "along with biopsy of the lung tissue showing the
21 presence of granulomas, the CE may accept the
22 claim." We're basically saying that if a doctor

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 says that it's a false-negative and there's
2 evidence of steroid use, we can accept beryllium
3 sensitivity.

4 We still have the criteria for the
5 biopsy in the next section down regarding
6 established CBD before 1993. So the difference
7 is that for beryllium sensitivity, the doctor can
8 say it's a false-negative. You have steroids.
9 Because beryllium sensitivity, we simply provide
10 benefits for monitoring. CBD is a stricter
11 standard, so we require that biopsy if there's a
12 false-negative and evidence of steroid use.

13 MEMBER REDLICH: I appreciate the
14 revisions in the language and including steroids
15 as immunosuppressive therapy. There's a number
16 of other agents that are used that are
17 immunosuppressive in the treatment of chronic
18 beryllium disease and other chronic fibrotic lung
19 conditions such as sarcoid.

20 So in a future revision I think -- and
21 especially with newer immunosuppressive agents,
22 if the wording was simply steroids or other

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 immunosuppressive medications, that would be more
2 helpful to the physicians.

3 MS. LEITON: Okay.

4 MEMBER REDLICH: And I do appreciate
5 because I think this is progress separate from,
6 there are also -- it's acknowledged that the testing
7 on lymphocytes that come from the lung from a lavage
8 are more sensitive than peripheral blood
9 lymphocytes. But that is rarely done now just for
10 multiple reasons, including patient safety.

11 So the blood test using peripheral
12 blood is not as sensitive as lavage lymphocytes.
13 So you can still have false-negatives even without
14 immunosuppressive therapy.

15 MS. LEITON: Okay. Thank you. The
16 next section, Exhibit 21-4, this goes into some
17 information about impairment ratings. Basically,
18 we revised it to be a little more description of
19 what we mean by activities of daily living.

20 We added a section where we basically
21 say reported ADLs must be described in sufficient
22 detail to allow a physician to apply the information

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to the assessment of whole person impairment in
2 accordance with the AMA guides.

3 Basically, when we do impairment
4 evaluations, not all physicians can do them, and
5 so a claimant will go to their treating physician,
6 request that they provide information to us, and
7 we can then send it to a CMC.

8 So we wanted to make sure that the
9 treating is describing those activities of daily
10 living. That is a critical portion of impairment
11 ratings.

12 The next section, Chapter 24 on
13 Recommended Decisions, this is really just about
14 formatting cover letters and what to include and
15 what not to include in terms of it. We used to
16 require that the amount of benefits being awarded
17 be in the cover letter. It's not a requirement
18 anymore because it's listed several other places
19 in the recommended decision.

20 We also deleted the requirement for a
21 wet signature for recommended decisions because
22 a lot of these are being signed digitally. We do

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 sign -- we physically have our hearing
2 representative sign the final decision since that's
3 the one that goes to court. But for recommended
4 decisions and flexibility issues, we took out that
5 signatory line.

6 We added here in Chapter 24.10(g), we
7 included language that allows the use of letter
8 decisions to accept additional claims for skin
9 cancers of the same type under parties. So
10 therefore, instead of going through a whole
11 recommended decision process, we've already
12 accepted skin cancer. We would just allow them
13 to send a letter saying we're accepting more skin
14 cancers.

15 The FAB decisions, this is what I was
16 talking about earlier with regard to the term CE-2.

17 We no longer have these CE-2s. Since our claims
18 have been digitalized, we have a different format
19 for how claims examiners can review cases that are
20 at the FAB when there are other issues at play.

21 Again, the format of the final decision
22 was changed slightly with regard to what sections

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 needed to be where in that final decision format.

2 And changes to the reference to CE-2s throughout
3 a lot more of these.

4 There was a typographical error we
5 changed in reopening. I'll skip to Chapter 29 on
6 Ancillary Medical Services. We added a section
7 on hearing aids just to clarify what's needed when
8 they're billing for hearing aids.

9 And then in the Home Healthcare
10 section, we deleted the whole Conflict of Interest
11 section because we have it somewhere else, and we
12 referenced the chapter that we talk about conflict
13 of interest there.

14 Those are the highlights. If you have
15 other questions about this Chapter 3.0, I'm happy
16 to answer them.

17 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: I have a question.

18 By the way, do you need for the Board Members to
19 identify themselves when we make comments?
20 Whenever possible, okay. It's Steven Markowitz.

21 I just want to go back to Exhibit 15-4,
22 Section 3(b), about asbestos exposure. And I've

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 asked Kevin to find Procedure Manual 2.3 version,
2 because that's where the language is, and it's being
3 deleted. So we need to just look at what's being
4 deleted.

5 So is this the transmittal document or
6 is it -- okay. So if you could go online and look
7 for the procedure manual 2.3.

8 MS. LEITON: It should be in archives
9 of the procedure manual.

10 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: So let me -- I'll
11 talk about it briefly while he's looking for it.
12 So this section, if you remember asbestos, the way
13 that the program approached presumption of exposure
14 was that it looked at two periods of time, prior
15 to 1986 and prior to 1996.

16 So you had this '86 and before, and I
17 can't remember whether it's January 1st, 1986,
18 December 31, 1986, and same for 1995-96. So I'm
19 just going to use shorthand and say '86 and '95-'96.

20 But there was -- this section that's
21 being deleted specifically refers to a presumption
22 of asbestos exposure between 1986 through 1995.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So what will be retained in 3.0, is
2 being retained in 3.0, is the presumption that there
3 is asbestos exposure for certain job categories
4 prior to or through 1986. Okay? So the
5 insulators, the painters, the pipefitters, the
6 carpenters and the like, mostly
7 construction-maintenance titles, will still be
8 presumed to have significant asbestos exposure
9 through 1986.

10 However, what's being deleted is any
11 comment -- if I understand it correctly -- is any
12 comment on what happened between 1986 and 1995.

13 And the old manual said between '86 and
14 '95 that those same labor categories that I
15 mentioned, you know the insulators, painters, et
16 cetera, are presumed to have significant exposure
17 from '86 to '95, but at low levels.

18 But I think the important thing is they
19 were still presumed to have significant exposures
20 through '95. That their significant exposures
21 continued beyond '86 through '95.

22 And that all other labor categories --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I'm quoting here from the 2.3 manual, it's Exhibit
2 15.4 -- actually, let me just hold off a moment
3 because we're almost there. When you get there
4 it's item 3, so you go down another page I think.

5 And you try to read through the superseded -- keep
6 going. It's the next page. Okay, that's it.

7 So it's that Section B we're looking
8 at which is being deleted. So it pertains to
9 asbestos exposure between 1986 and 1995.

10 And you can see item B-1 is what I just
11 mentioned, which is the labor categories cited
12 above, have significant exposure but at low levels.

13 And then Item 2 is that all other labor categories
14 are considered to have exposure to asbestos, but
15 the extent of their exposure didn't surpass
16 established occupational safety and health
17 guidelines, and therefore the level of exposure
18 is not considered significant.

19 So Item B makes partial sense because
20 it removes the presumption that their exposure
21 didn't surpass established occupational safety and
22 health guidelines.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 However it does delete the aspect in
2 which these other labor categories are presumed
3 to have exposure to asbestos. That is to say the
4 ones not on the list, but who worked at the
5 facilities, were presumed to have exposure to
6 asbestos.

7 I'm also concerned in Part 1 where
8 between '86 and through '95 that the group including
9 the painters, the millwrights, the insulators and
10 the like are no longer presumed to have significant
11 exposure to asbestos.

12 And this is important because when you
13 get to the individual diseases, the asbestosis,
14 mesothelioma and the like, and we can see for
15 instance, we can just scroll down under asbestosis.

16 You see under Part 4(b) it says, Exposure. "The
17 employee was employed in the job that would have
18 brought the employee into contact with significant
19 exposure to asbestos."

20 So I'm wondering what the thinking here
21 is, and I'm wondering also what the practical
22 significance or implication of removing this whole

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 time period of presumed exposure to asbestos is?

2 MS. LEITON: I would like to get back
3 to you. I think that there's probably rationale
4 that maybe it's somewhere else or we have -- I need
5 to find out, and I don't want to mis-speak on the
6 record, so let me get back to you if you don't mind.

7 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: No, that's fine.
8 Because what the CE is left with in terms of exposure
9 presumption now entirely pertains just to 1986 and
10 before. And so now the guidance, the document is
11 silent on the period after '86, and I'm concerned
12 that may have some important practical implications
13 for evaluation of claims.

14 So, yes, that would be great if there's
15 some clarification on that, and we may have further
16 comments on that.

17 MS. LEITON: Okay.

18 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Does any Board
19 Member have any comments, something you want to
20 add on this? Okay.

21 MS. LEITON: I will try to get you
22 something before I leave.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Yes, okay.

2 MS. LEITON: So that's 3.0. Yes?

3 MEMBER REDLICH: This is Carrie
4 Redlich. I appreciate the changes in 3.0. Just
5 to point out, which I think we did last time, the
6 tables have not yet been updated to reflect some
7 of the changes in the text or the changes that we
8 recommended. They still include things like
9 specific inhalation challenge testing is a way to
10 diagnose occupational asthma which is not available
11 in the United States.

12 So I would just suggest that a future
13 revision to look at the tables. There are also
14 some other, you know, they're relatively minor
15 suggestions we had made or pointed out. I think
16 they're more than suggestions, but just, you know,
17 factually correct. Such as whether granulomas can
18 be calcified in a patient with sarcoid -- excuse
19 me, with chronic beryllium disease. And they can
20 be calcified.

21 The current text still says that a
22 calcified granuloma is not characteristic of CBD.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And I think it would just be more medically accurate
2 to remove that sentence.

3 MS. LEITON: There are various
4 opinions on that, so we have looked at them. We'll
5 look at them again.

6 MEMBER REDLICH: It was just one
7 example. I think it's definitely improving, but
8 it could still use additional edits.

9 MS. LEITON: Okay, noted. Thank you.

10 MEMBER REDLICH: And one of them is
11 just a question. Recognizing that some of our
12 suggestions have been incorporated, I was wondering
13 how has that been transmitted to -- I realize
14 there's a whole education process -- to the CEs
15 and the CMCs that there have been changes, the
16 training materials. So how often are those
17 revised?

18 MS. LEITON: We're in the process of
19 revising all of our training materials to update
20 them. We have a training lead who's going through
21 them. We were missing one for a while because one
22 of our training leads left, and so we had a gap.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 But we're back to revising all the
2 materials, the basic CE materials, making sure
3 they're in line with the current procedures. And
4 so that's where we are right now with that with
5 our modules; revising and updating them.

6 MEMBER REDLICH: And I realize that's
7 challenging. We would be happy to review the
8 relevant training materials such as related to Part
9 B conditions.

10 MS. LEITON: Thank you. Okay, the
11 next section, the next part that you wanted me to
12 talk about was the status of the December 10, 2019
13 data and claims request. This was the one with
14 regard to COPD and Parkinson's. We did get you
15 some information there.

16 For the other ones, we're going to talk
17 about using a form and getting additional
18 information for those requests. I think Doug's
19 going to talk about that later. If the review of
20 the --

21 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: We can -- after Doug
22 introduces that form then we can come back to this.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 That's fine.

2 MS. LEITON: Yes. Follow-up on the
3 February 28, 2019 recommendation of
4 asbestos-related disease, asthma, and OHQ, we are
5 still in the process of reviewing those. We got
6 them in March. Our policy branch, our medical
7 science unit have been working on those responses.

8 We hope to have a draft within the next
9 couple of weeks, but that has to go through
10 clearance which means it has to go through the whole
11 process of going through the Labor Department.
12 So I can't guarantee you a time, but I have hope
13 that it will be within the next month or so.

14 Follow-up, let's see, review of the DOL
15 responses to the 11/18 requests. So there was a
16 request for information that we provided a response
17 to in February, and you had highlighted some
18 sections. I don't know if you have that up. Do
19 you have that there?

20 Okay. So the first section has to do
21 with the Bulletin 19-03 which provides guidance
22 to staff about reopening cases as a result of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 presumptions that we changed for causation
2 resulting from the Board's recommendations.

3 We do have a report on that. We've made
4 it a priority for all of our claims staff to review
5 these cases, and they're 98 percent finished
6 screening and found -- so they looked at different
7 groups. The first group was mesothelioma, ovarian
8 cancer and pleural plaques. The second group was
9 hearing loss, bladder cancer. And the third group
10 was lung cancer.

11 They have reviewed, as I said 98 percent
12 of all of those groups, and we found about 170 cases
13 that have the potential to be reopened right now.

14 MEMBER BERENJI: I'm sorry. Can you
15 clarify the denominator, 170 out of what number?

16 MS. LEITON: Yes. It's actually a
17 pretty small percentage of cases that are going
18 to probably be reopened. We've looked at all the
19 factors. There were about 1900 cases that have
20 been reviewed.

21 MEMBER BERENJI: And I'm sorry, can you
22 clarify the 170, like what percentage were the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 mesothelioma cases?

2 MS. LEITON: It was pretty even. No,
3 actually, I'm sorry, lung cancer was the highest.
4 There were like 84 of those that were lung cancer;
5 42 were for hearing loss and bladder cancer; and
6 43 were for the mesothelioma, ovarian cancer, and
7 pleural plaques in terms of what we have the
8 potential to reopen right now.

9 MEMBER BERENJI: I'm sorry, that's not
10 very clear. You seem to lump a lot of these various
11 --

12 MS. LEITON: Yes, we didn't separate
13 them out. We lumped them into three categories:
14 mesothelioma, ovarian cancer, and pleural plaques
15 was one category; hearing loss, bladder cancer was
16 another category; and lung cancer was the third
17 category.

18 MEMBER BERENJI: Okay. So can you
19 clarify the lung cancer was 84?

20 MS. LEITON: 84.

21 MEMBER BERENJI: The hearing loss,
22 bladder cancer was 42.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. LEITON: 42.

2 MEMBER BERENJI: And then the third
3 category?

4 MS. LEITON: 43. That was the
5 mesothelioma, ovarian cancer, and pleural plaques.

6 MEMBER BERENJI: Thank you.

7 MS. LEITON: The process moving
8 forward obviously takes into consideration the new
9 presumptions. The next --

10 MEMBER REDLICH: Carrie Redlich. On
11 the subject of reopening cases, as you know, we've
12 been given cases to review and had in the past,
13 many of which we agreed with the final adjudication.

14 For ones that we have questions or
15 disagree with that, have we established any process
16 about whether it's possible for any of those claims
17 to be reopened?

18 MS. LEITON: Obviously, we'll take
19 whatever input you have and evaluate that. If it
20 looks like a case needs to be reopened, then we'll
21 reopen it.

22 MEMBER REDLICH: So from the ones that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we had previously reviewed, it's not a large number,
2 but if there are a few cases that we think should
3 be reopened, could we give you --

4 MS. LEITON: We can look at the cases.

5 MEMBER REDLICH: Okay.

6 MEMBER BERENJI: Yes. That would have
7 to be done in some sort of systematic fashion.
8 I mean --

9 MEMBER REDLICH: Yes, I think that
10 passes and I also think going forward with the cases
11 we were just given. And actually, I think the prior
12 ones since we got rid of them, I actually don't
13 have the identifying information.

14 MS. LEITON: I don't know what to say
15 to that.

16 MEMBER REDLICH: Yes, so I think the
17 going forward with the ones that we have now --
18 we haven't even started to discuss those cases yet.

19 MR. FITZGERALD: I would say as the
20 DFO, I think when you discover things that are
21 questionable and you bring it to the program's
22 attention, they will give it the due consideration

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it should have.

2 It's just like when we do kind of
3 accountability reviews and we do auditing of our
4 own cases when we look at those things, if things
5 are revealed in that audit process that look
6 incorrect, the program will go back and revisit
7 those things.

8 So in a sense, that's kind of what
9 you're doing. It's not the primary role of the
10 Board to do that, but to the extent that you find
11 that sort of thing and share it with the program,
12 they will consider the same. And the same when
13 they would do any kind of audit and review of their
14 work.

15 MEMBER REDLICH: Okay, given that we
16 just got a number of cases to review, it seems like
17 it would be helpful to clarify.

18 MS. LEITON: Yes, if you see something
19 in a case after you've reviewed it, share it with
20 Doug and he'll share it with us.

21 MEMBER REDLICH: Okay.

22 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: So I have a question.

1 Steve Markowitz. I'm just going to use
2 approximate numbers. About 1900 claims fell
3 within the areas of the revised causation standards
4 and required review, and roughly 170 of them deemed
5 to be relevant will require further review for
6 possible change in the decision about those claims.

7 As a suggestion, and it's relevant to
8 what we do, because we've been working on
9 presumptions. And the impact of our
10 recommendations on those presumptions are of
11 interest.

12 So it would seem to be just as easy,
13 when you look at those data, the 1900, to identify
14 them by individual diagnosis, or the most important
15 diagnosis, say mesothelioma or lung cancer or
16 bladder cancer. The total number that have been
17 reviewed, and then give the total number in which
18 it's been deemed they need further review and
19 reanalysis so they don't -- so the bladder cancer
20 and hearing loss aren't lumped together. Because
21 that -- that doesn't mean anything I don't think.

22 MS. LEITON: We can probably go back

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and do a report. This report came from our claims
2 staff. We had asked them to look at them in stages.

3 So we had to group them so they could look at them
4 in stages, and those are the groups we did that
5 we analyzed them through.

6 This report just came to me last week.

7 So we can do some further revisions and look at
8 what further reporting we can do.

9 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: That would be great.

10 By the principal diagnosis, that would be the most
11 sensible. Thank you.

12 MS. LEITON: Okay. Number 3
13 highlighted section where you indicated DEEOIC is
14 developing a report that will identify the total
15 number of Part E claims filed with a final decision
16 to accept.

17 I just got that report yesterday, so
18 we do have a preliminary report on that. I can
19 probably provide it to you. I'd like to do a little
20 bit further QC, but generally we're looking at this
21 by accepted-only cases under Part E, denied-only
22 cases, and accepted and denied cases.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So there are three different categories
2 that we kind of have to look at it through the lens
3 of. Overall, there were about 26 percent of cases
4 referred to an industrial hygienist.

5 Now that's a little lower than I
6 expected, so I want to double-check those numbers.

7 But you have to consider the fact that a lot of
8 cases are either accepted or denied. They might
9 be denied or accepted for other reasons, so that
10 factors hugely into -- they won't go to an IH if
11 there's no survivorship, for example. But I do
12 have a report that we can probably share with you,
13 once I've done a little bit more investigation on
14 it.

15 The next section. You highlighted
16 documentation submitted with requests to make
17 changes in how its effects are provided to Dr. Jay
18 Brown, Haz-Map for evaluation. I'm not sure what
19 the question there is.

20 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: What are we looking
21 at? Do you know which --

22 MS. LEITON: It's right under --

1 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Well, okay. Well,
2 the question about Jay Brown I think is at some
3 point we learned that the program doesn't have a
4 contract with Dr. Brown to work on the SEM or to
5 provide input into the exposure-disease links in
6 the SEM.

7 But there's references at various
8 points in which it would appear that the program
9 continues to use Dr. Brown, so I just wanted some
10 clarification about that.

11 MS. LEITON: Well, Dr. Brown still
12 updates his Haz-Map, and we still utilize that
13 information. So we still have the ability to
14 provide him with information that he then uses in
15 Haz-Map that we can correlate with the SEM.

16 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: I'm sorry, maybe I
17 didn't quite hear everything.

18 MS. LEITON: So he's still --

19 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Is he looking -- do
20 you ask him specific questions about this agent
21 disease links that he weighs in on and helps you
22 and revise the SEM?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. LEITON: My understanding is that
2 we provide him with information that he can then
3 use in the Haz-Map and add to his Haz-Map, which
4 we can then add to the SEM.

5 Now we have other processes in place
6 for adding things to the SEM or through policy
7 changes that we can make of our own volition without
8 the Haz-Map. But that's usually made through a
9 policy determination first and then added to the
10 SEM, so --

11 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Okay. Thank you.

12 MS. LEITON: The second section was
13 also about Dr. Brown, so I think that covers your
14 highlights of this document which was the
15 follow-up.

16 And the last thing you wanted me to
17 cover was the updates to all prior Board
18 recommendations, 2016 to present, on which new
19 actions have been taken.

20 So I went through all of the
21 recommendations you made, all of our responses,
22 and one thing that I found was that you all had

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 done in February of 2018, kind of gone back through
2 all the ones prior to that date. So the '16
3 recommendations, '17 recommendations, and we went
4 through this back-and-forth.

5 So that document, the February 16th one
6 really kind of covers the prior recommendations
7 because you went back through them all. Rather
8 than going through them again, I'd rather just cover
9 that document. And then if you have questions
10 about any other ones, I'm happy to answer them.
11 But I just thought that might be the most efficient
12 way to do this.

13 So in your February 2018 document you
14 went through I think it was 10 different -- nine
15 different recommendations, and kind of gave us
16 responses that we then responded to.

17 MEMBER BERENJI: I'm sorry, I don't
18 have that document so I'm not sure if that's going
19 to be helpful for me.

20 MS. LEITON: It's on the website, your
21 website.

22 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Yes, maybe we can

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 just wait a moment until Kevin can find it. It's
2 under the --

3 MS. LEITON: It's under the
4 recommendations. It's February 16, 2018 response.
5 February 16, 2018. I'm sorry.

6 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: They're usually
7 organized by meeting date.

8 MEMBER BERENJI: Right. I was under
9 the assumption that we're going to go through the
10 answers for the most recent meeting, and I'm still,
11 have questions about these.

12 MS. LEITON: The most recent meeting,
13 we're still evaluating those, so we don't have
14 responses for those. Those need to be cleared.
15 I will have responses once they've been cleared
16 through the Department. So I don't -- I'm not able
17 to respond to those right now.

18 The request to me was to go through all
19 the previous recommendations, so I thought I'd
20 start with the 2018 document if you still want me
21 to do that.

22 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Yes, that's fine.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. LEITON: Did you find it? I've gone
2 over my time, so do you want me to continue?

3 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: That's fine.

4 MS. LEITON: Okay.

5 MR. FITZGERALD: I'll yield my time to
6 you.

7 MS. LEITON: Okay. That's August.
8 August was our response to the February -- yes,
9 yes, that's fine.

10 So walking through this document, so
11 you provided us the February document that we then
12 responded to in August. I was going to kind of
13 just walk through those.

14 So the first one is the comments on
15 recommendation incorporating Agency Health Effect
16 Reviews recommended by IOM reporting to the SEM.
17 The Advisory Board recommends that the program
18 apply different data sources for expanding disease
19 exposure links, including the following: IARC,
20 Integrated Risk Information System, and the
21 National Toxicology Program.

22 So we already used IARC Group 1. With

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 regard to Causal Group 2(a), we will refer to those
2 when we're talking about aggravation of
3 contribution. We defer to a physician on that
4 rather than incorporating it into the SEM.

5 With regard to the application of the
6 IRIS and NTP databases, you've suggested a process
7 for evaluating those. We asked for additional
8 information in terms of how to exactly use those
9 in our SEM.

10 Each database communicates voluminous
11 and complex data on a range of toxic substances
12 and health effect topics. We don't think that
13 adding all of those in the absence of rigorous and
14 comprehensive investigations would be prudent for
15 us. So that was our response here.

16 I'm not sure how much you want me to
17 read through our responses as go through and try
18 tell you if they're action items, so I just kind
19 of highlighted some sections in this.

20 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: That's fine. Just
21 a summary of the responses would be good.

22 MS. LEITON: Okay. You also

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 recommended that we identify a team that includes
2 individuals with competence in toxicology,
3 occupational medicine, and epidemiology to do a
4 rigorous review.

5 While I would like to have the resources
6 to do that, and I think we've talked about this
7 before, it's kind of a catch-22 because our mandate
8 is to evaluate claims on a case-by-case basis.
9 We're not a research-centric organization. OWCP
10 was not built to have that sort of a research arm,
11 and so that's where we have -- we don't have the
12 ability to have that rigorous scientific team as
13 part of our organization. It's not the way it's
14 set up.

15 While I understand and agree that, you
16 know, having such a resource would be helpful, our
17 mandate is and our funding is based on a workers
18 compensation program where we pay for claims
19 examiners and final adjudication branch.

20 We've been able to have our scientists
21 that we do have, and the contractor to help us with
22 individual case-by-cases. But, in terms of a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 research organization, this is not the way we're
2 built.

3 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Dr.
4 Friedman-Jiminez?

5 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: Can you hear
6 me? I would consider that part of the clinical
7 practice of occupational medicine. If you get a
8 case, for example, and you have to review 40
9 articles on COPD and asbestos, that's part of the
10 case. It's not research.

11 Research is finding new knowledge that
12 hasn't been published, that hasn't been found
13 before. So I would say that's part of the clinical
14 practice of occupational medicine. And
15 occupational physicians should be trained and
16 prepared to do that kind of literature review
17 because that's part of what we do.

18 It's not in the textbooks. It's not
19 in, you know, a single document. Sometimes you
20 have to do a broad and deep literature review for
21 a single case as part of the clinical care of a
22 patient.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. LEITON: I agree.

2 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: Or the
3 evaluation of a case.

4 MS. LEITON: I agree in terms of what
5 a physician should be doing when they're evaluating
6 the patient for a claim. Our claims examiners
7 aren't in the business of occupational medicine.
8 They're in the business of reviewing factual
9 information that's presented on a claim, so that's
10 what they're trained to do.

11 In terms of, you know, the
12 case-by-case, yes. We try to obtain as much
13 information as we can on a particular claim from
14 a physician or an authorized rep, or whatever we
15 can obtain from the claimants medically or
16 scientifically. Then we have a contract medical
17 consultant process where we can refer cases out
18 if we can't get information from the treating.
19 We also have our industrial hygienist on a
20 case-by-case basis.

21 But in terms of generally having, as
22 this suggests, a group of people we can go to, to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 provide us with the information that we're talking
2 about here, which is an evaluation of all these
3 different databases and resources that we could
4 use to enter into our SEM, that's the kind of
5 research I'm talking about in terms of doing that
6 in-depth analysis for overall use in the program.

7 We do as much of that as we can in the
8 creation of the SEM and the contracts that we do
9 have. But again, our focus has to be on
10 adjudicating claims on a case-by-case basis and
11 gathering information on a case-by-case basis.
12 That's what our focus is.

13 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: This is Steve
14 Markowitz. You know, I think the Department
15 doesn't fully appreciate how difficult your job
16 is. Because, you know, various compensation
17 programs within the Office of Workers Compensation
18 Programs, EEOICP has to take on tens of thousands
19 of different agents and the entire spectrum of
20 occupational disease.

21 And I know I've said this before, you
22 know, you have black lung which is really, you know,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a very limited set of exposures, a limited industry,
2 limited job titles. FECA I assume mostly deals
3 with traumatic events rather than disease.
4 Longshoremens again probably mostly traumatic
5 events, so-called accidents.

6 But your job within EEOICP is really
7 unique. And for that matter, I can't think of any
8 other compensation program at the state or federal
9 level that has the challenge that you have.

10 MS. LEITON: Yes, well thank you for
11 that. I --

12 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Well, you can say
13 something, but I do want to make a point.

14 MS. LEITON: No, I mean I think you're
15 right in that this is new territory for a
16 compensation program. All of the different
17 exposures, trying to come up with assessments, it's
18 a lot. But go ahead and make your point.

19 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Well, so for
20 instance, we're happy to provide assistance with
21 Parkinson-related disorders. But that's an
22 example of an issue, you know, we're a Board that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 comes and goes, we provide advice and we're happy
2 to do that with respect to that limited issue.
3 But we don't have resources to do much above and
4 beyond that.

5 And you need that internal capacity.

6 I wish the Haz-Map or some other resource out there
7 was totally up-to-date, an agent disease link that
8 you could rely upon. But such a resource really
9 doesn't exist.

10 MS. LEITON: True.

11 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: And so our argument
12 is only that you need a deeper capacity to be able
13 to evaluate, not do research, but to evaluate
14 existing knowledge to make sure the program
15 accurately reflects that existing knowledge.

16 MS. LEITON: I understand. Okay. I
17 do want to note there with regard to the first one
18 that your latest set of recommendation is more
19 specific, and I wanted to note that is something
20 we're evaluating. With regard to the SEM, I think
21 you've gone into more specifics there, so we will
22 be evaluating that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The second set of recommendations is
2 the hiring of former DOE workers to administer the
3 OHQ. The Board also requested specific data
4 regarding the work performed by the former DOE
5 workers. I think we provided that data to you and
6 indicated what we can and cannot do with regard
7 to our contractor, and what we can hire for, what
8 we can mandate versus what we can't mandate.

9 We can put in the contract that we
10 prefer expertise and DOE former workers. But in
11 terms of getting a contract, we are not permitted
12 to mandate that they all be former workers.

13 Number 3, comments on recommendations,
14 claimant information sent to industrial hygiene
15 and medical consultants. The Advisory Board
16 recommends that the program provide copies of
17 entire case files to subject matter experts, such
18 as industrial hygienists and medical consultants.

19 The Advisory Board further recommends
20 that the claims examiner map be filed to indicate
21 where relevant information is believed to be.

22 So I think we've gone back-and-forth

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 on this over the years. You know, one of the things
2 that we -- one thing that I do want to point out
3 in this response from us is that we indicate that
4 it's important that once a decision on one part
5 of the case is made, it's not re-adjudicated and
6 a referral to a specialist on another issue.

7 And that -- there's a tendency to do
8 that when you're looking at everything, especially
9 if we've already put in a statement of accepted
10 facts that a case has been accepted for a condition.

11 We can't really go back and re-adjudicate that
12 in a referral.

13 There's also different types of
14 referrals that require different evidence in
15 payment versus wage loss versus causation
16 determinations. We do try to provide whatever --
17 all the medical evidence to a physician whenever
18 possible and when it's relevant.

19 When it's for an impairment evaluation,
20 sometimes there's going to be less information
21 because we're looking at a particular set of facts
22 that need to be reviewed specifically for an

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 impairment evaluation.

2 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Can I just ask a
3 question?

4 MS. LEITON: Yes.

5 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Steve Markowitz.
6 So having recently looked at claims, I don't know
7 how the other Board Members' experience is with
8 looking at claims, but it's not clear to me that
9 the contract medical physician, the CMC, it's not
10 clear to me what pieces of exposure information
11 they get.

12 They get the IH report, but do they also
13 get the Occupational Health Questionnaire? Or do
14 they get any information that the claimant
15 provides? Do they get an excerpt from the SEM?
16 It's in the overall claims file but, you know, some
17 of those files are 2,000 -- 5,000 pages. So do
18 you know what the CMC gets with reference to the
19 exposure, the various pieces of exposure
20 information?

21 MS. LEITON: Well, they're supposed to
22 -- usually there's supposed to be an assessment

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of the IH, the exposure information that the claims
2 examiner does in the statement of accepted facts
3 that's referred to the physician.

4 Sometimes there's a separate
5 assessment that is the exposure assessment. If
6 it's a lengthy exposure assessment, the claims
7 examiner will send, quoting the SEM, where these
8 sources are from.

9 It really depends on the type of
10 referral to the physician, whether it's a
11 causation. If it's not a causation, that
12 information won't necessarily be in there.

13 But I don't know that every time that
14 we send something to a physician we're including
15 the OHQ. A physician can ask for that in their
16 assessment when they're looking at these cases.
17 But we do try to include our factual assessment
18 of exposure when we refer these to the CMC.

19 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Dr. Dement?

20 MEMBER DEMENT: I guess, so along those
21 lines, I think -- and we're just getting into
22 reviewing these cases so it's pretty early. But

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 certainly a trend that I see in the ones that I've
2 reviewed, and maybe others have seen it as well,
3 is the OHQ is looked at by CE, and many times it
4 doesn't appear that some of the exposures that are
5 actually listed in the OHQ are included in the
6 statement of accepted facts that goes to the CMC.

7 I don't even think the industrial
8 hygienist necessarily looks at some of that when
9 they're assessing exposures. They're told by the
10 CE to assess exposures largely drawn from the SEM.

11 In some cases, that's been helpful
12 because the exposure on the OHQ were very vague.

13 I mean it goes both ways. But I guess one of my
14 concerns is the exposure information is not
15 developed.

16 And it goes back to some of the earlier
17 recommendations is that we feel, and I think this
18 Board feels, has felt, and maybe this Board will
19 have a different feeling that the industrial
20 hygienist particular needs to have access to the
21 claimant to develop the case. And there's some
22 in here which I reviewed that I think, as a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 hygienist, if I had a chance to talk to the
2 individual, I could've figured it out whether or
3 not there were actual exposures beyond what may
4 have been in the SEM, or may be in the SEM, but
5 not defined very well.

6 So see it goes back to, in my opinion,
7 developing the case more broadly. And not all
8 cases, not all claims are going to need that level
9 of detail, but some will. It's sort of developing
10 a triage process to make such a more detailed
11 assessment work.

12 MS. LEITON: Yes, and we've also been
13 back-and-forth on that particular issue as well.
14 Our, you know, we believe that the claims examiner
15 needs to be the one making the factual
16 determinations. And if the industrial hygienist
17 has questions, they can go back to the CE who can
18 obtain that information.

19 There is kind of a legal basis for that
20 chain of command or chain of custody of the case
21 that needs to be with the claims examiner from the
22 legal perspective, and that's kind of our struggle.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 But I understand what you're saying. We --

2 MEMBER DEMENT: I'm an industrial
3 hygienist, not a lawyer.

4 MS. LEITON: I know. I'm aware. So
5 back to our topic. Did you have something else?

6 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Just a quick
7 follow-up question. So as a matter of protocol,
8 when the CE sends a statement of accepted facts
9 and a request for industrial hygiene analysis, do
10 they send the OHQ the EE-3, whatever the claimant
11 affidavit, the results of the SEM, are all those
12 pieces sent to the IH? Because the IH needs that
13 in order to do their work.

14 MS. LEITON: Yes, I believe the OHQ is
15 sent. You know, we do do an assessment, the claims
16 examiners do do an assessment of those that are
17 reported on the OHQ to see how it presents with
18 the other information that we have in the SEM.
19 The SEM is one of the sources that we rely on for
20 that, but we will refer the OHQ to the IH as well.

21 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: So then the second
22 part of that question then is, when a referral is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 made to the CMC, are those same pieces of the
2 exposure data sent to the CMC?

3 MS. LEITON: Usually once it's
4 reviewed by an industrial hygienist and we've
5 confirmed certain exposure facts, that's what we'll
6 send to the CMC versus the actual OHQ unless the
7 physician wants to see the OHQ.

8 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Okay, thank you. Is
9 there a question?

10 MEMBER MAHS: Yes, Ron Mahs. I had a
11 question when reviewing these cases, it kept coming
12 back to me. Is the IH that's doing these claimants
13 in a remote area, or is he at the site where the
14 claimants are working?

15 MS. LEITON: We have a contract with
16 the industrial hygienist that we refer these to,
17 and so they have a variety of different experiences
18 in terms of their history and resumes and that.
19 So they're not on site with the DOE facility.

20 MEMBER MAHS: It seems odd how they get
21 an exposure level without actually seeing the site
22 and knowing what's going on.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. LEITON: Well, they're industrial
2 hygienists. They have expertise in this area.
3 That's why they do this for us.

4 MEMBER REDLICH: I had one related
5 question, just more for the process. And I would
6 second that reviewing some of these claims, that
7 makes me appreciate the challenge of your job.
8 They're really --

9 MS. LEITON: They're long. Some of
10 them are very --

11 MEMBER REDLICH: No, and it's just
12 multiple diseases definitely, and physicians are
13 not always helpful in this process, but I think
14 this is a simple question. There were one or two
15 where there had been a hearing and a taped --

16 MS. LEITON: Transcript.

17 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Transcript.

18 MEMBER REDLICH: -- transcript. How
19 often does that happen, or what stage of the
20 process? Because in just following up on what Dr.
21 Dement said that the worker's description of what
22 they did in that transcript was sometimes helpful.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And I wasn't clear, you know, when and how that
2 happened.

3 MS. LEITON: So we issue a recommended
4 decision at the district office level, and that
5 is conducted by our claims examiner to develop the
6 case and they do all of the initial development
7 referrals to the IH; to the CMC oftentimes. Once
8 they issue that recommended decision, the claimant
9 has the right to appeal it.

10 All cases go to our Final Adjudication
11 Branch who issue the final decision on every case,
12 whether it's accepted, denied, whatever. They
13 issue that final decision, which becomes the
14 decision of record.

15 Before that final decision is issued,
16 a claimant can ask for a hearing with hearing
17 representative. And that's where you'll see the
18 transcripts. They'll meet with them either on the
19 phone or in person and present their arguments.

20 They can also, claimants can request
21 a review of the written record where they submit
22 additional information in writing. That can be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 additional medical reports. It can be whatever.
2 Or they can waive their right to object, and they'll
3 usually do that if they haven't accepted so we can
4 issue a decision quickly.

5 At that stage, after the hearing, the
6 Final Adjudication Branch hearing representative
7 will review all the evidence and issue a
8 determination. Sometimes that determination is
9 to affirm the recommended decision.

10 Sometimes if they get additional
11 information that they feel requires more
12 development, they can remand the case back to the
13 district office and say, conduct additional
14 development before we do a final decision. And
15 they'll issue a new recommended decision after
16 that, which will then go back to the FAB.

17 They can reverse. If there is enough
18 information to accept, then they'll reverse a case.
19 So those are the process stages.

20 MEMBER REDLICH: Thank you. That was
21 very helpful. I guess there's nothing simple about
22 this process. And just a related question, some

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 people have had attorneys involved and others have
2 not. How common is that? And the attorneys seemed
3 to be involved in the process of the hearing.

4 MS. LEITON: Any claimant has the right
5 to an authorized representative. It doesn't have
6 to be a lawyer. It can be somebody that can
7 represent for them. That could be a daughter or
8 something like that. They just have to put it in
9 writing and say this is the person I want
10 representing me.

11 Some of them will hire attorneys. They
12 don't need to. We'll hold a hearing with the
13 claimants. We try to assist them through the
14 process by talking to them. The claims examiners
15 will talk to them. They can go to the resource
16 center.

17 So there are a lot of other ways that
18 they can do this alone, but sometimes they do it.
19 I don't have an exact percentage. I think it's
20 probably less than half to have authorized reps,
21 but don't quote me on that because I'm not sure.

22 MEMBER REDLICH: Thank you. That was

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 helpful.

2 MEMBER MIKULSKI: This is Marek
3 Mikulski and this is a question along the lines
4 of the procedures. In looking at the claims that
5 we have received, I've noticed a lack of consistency
6 in referrals to the CMCs and IH. I was wondering
7 if you could comment on at what level the decision
8 is made for referral of the case to CMC and IH?

9 MS. LEITON: So a claimant --- claims
10 examiner will first develop the case with the
11 claimant and say we need medical information, or
12 we need exposure information. The employment
13 information we go directly to Department of Energy
14 first, and they will provide us with employment
15 information if they have it.

16 But then we'll go to the claimant, ask
17 them for information. If the claimant comes in
18 and doesn't have a diagnosis for example, that's
19 kind of a nonstarter. We won't really go to a CMC
20 at that point because we don't have a diagnosis
21 on which to base anything.

22 But if we get a diagnosis, if we get

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 some indication from the doctor, even if it's, I
2 believe this is related to his work, we'll develop
3 it further to either hopefully go back to the
4 treating doctor, say this is what we know, you've
5 indicated some sort of causal relationship. And
6 if they can't always provide us with information,
7 but we know that there was exposure because we've
8 done exposure assessment, we'll send it to a CMC
9 because their physician couldn't provide us the
10 information.

11 But there's various stages that we have
12 to go through. First, we determine if there's a
13 diagnosis. We determine if there was covered
14 employment. Then we determine whether there was
15 any exposure, if we have any evidence of exposure.

16 And then it goes to a CMC. So it really depends
17 on at what stage, you know, what the facts of the
18 case are to determine whether it's going to go to
19 a CMC.

20 It's not a requirement. Sometimes we
21 can get the information from the treating doctor
22 without doing that. But it really depends on the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 case.

2 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: I'm sorry, Ms. Pope.

3 MEMBER POPE: Duronda Pope. It just
4 seemed like there was some inconsistency in some
5 of the cases that I was reviewing in terms of
6 information from the treating physician was given
7 to the CMC and the IH.

8 And they looked at this information but
9 it just seemed like there was so much information
10 supporting the fact that there was exposure. The
11 illness was verified and confirmed. But at the
12 final adjudication, it just seemed like it wasn't
13 enough. I just didn't understand, you know, the
14 weight.

15 MS. LEITON: I would have to see the
16 case. There's so many varieties and variations.
17 If I saw the case to talk through, I could, but,
18 you know. The determination is based on the
19 evidence that's in the case file and the
20 determination by the claims examiner based on the
21 procedures that they follow.

22 So, you know, in terms of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 inconsistencies, once you guys have reviewed these
2 cases and have questions, I can be in a better
3 position to answer those sorts of questions. It's
4 10:15, you want me to continue?

5 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: What's the sense?
6 Do we want her to finish this or should we -- why
7 don't we take a break for a few minutes. We will
8 reconvene at 10:30.

9 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
10 went off the record at 10:15 p.m. and resumed at
11 10:36 a.m.)

12 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Okay. We're going
13 to get started again. I think Ms. Leiton was
14 reminding us of our requests and DOL responses --
15 or our recommendations and DOL responses, so you
16 can continue.

17 MS. LEITON: Okay. Is it on? How
18 about that?

19 Okay. So, I was on No. 3. I think we
20 talked about the referrals to the industrial
21 hygienist. I think we've beat that one to death
22 already, unless you have further questions.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Yeah.

2 MEMBER TEBAY: I'm Calin Tebay.

3 I -- in reviewing the claims -- and,
4 so you know, just these claims -- working at the
5 HWECC -- for you folks that don't know what the HWECC
6 is, it's the Hanford Workforce Engagement Center
7 -- in a year's time -- and I'll -- this will be
8 relevant here shortly, but in a year's time we've
9 seen 4,000 individuals.

10 Some of those people are repeat at our
11 facility, and a majority of those are EEO/ICPA
12 claimants.

13 And with the new presumption law for
14 the State of Washington, we're starting to see,
15 obviously, more and more go in that direction as
16 well.

17 So, we review claims on a daily basis
18 and we're getting a lot of folks coming in with
19 denied claims or people that are starting claims.

20 But when we talk about the CMCs and the IHs,
21 what's concerning for me --- and I think I'm
22 piggybacking onto several earlier comments, but

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 there seems to be all too consistent reviews by
2 IHs and CMCs almost like the reviews are based on
3 assumption because the information is not in the
4 file.

5 Often we see the review from the IH say
6 that there is significant exposure. The claims
7 examiner says there's significant exposure.

8 Yet the IH's response at the end of that
9 review says, there's no exposure at or above an
10 OEL or a PEL; therefore, maybe the condition or
11 disease is not verifiable, it's not confirmed,
12 whatever that term may be.

13 So, my question is, is that -- we see
14 that often. So; one, I don't believe -- and maybe
15 this is a question solely on the Board -- that just
16 because you're not exposed at or above a PEL, does
17 that eliminate you from having a condition or
18 disease? I don't think so.

19 Or the fact that just because you were
20 exposed at or above a PEL, that doesn't also confirm
21 that you're going to get a disease or a condition.

22 So -- but the information I'm more

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 interested in, is how did the IH come to that review
2 or that piece of information?

3 Is there something in the file that says
4 that individual was not exposed at or above a PEL
5 or an OEL?

6 And if it's not in there, then the
7 summary or the remarks, they're based on assumption
8 because we all know that the records, those
9 exposures -- sometimes the exposures these
10 individuals that are exposed to, they're not even
11 monitored for.

12 So, the actual IH data doesn't even
13 exist to make that kind of a comment. So, that's
14 where I'm confused, right?

15 I just -- it just, for me, on a daily
16 basis seeing this comment, is really concerning.
17 And that's where I think Ms. Dement earlier talked
18 about the IH involvement with the actual employee.

19 Now, what we've started doing at the
20 HVEC is telling people that they need to provide
21 a summary of their work history and the actual --
22 along with the OHQ, provide a summary of their

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 actual work processes they were involved in
2 because, let's be honest, we can tell you that most
3 folks do not understand the exposures or know
4 exactly all the exposures that were involved in
5 that process.

6 The IH data is really sketchy for those
7 processes and those jobs. So, I'm really concerned
8 that we don't -- we're missing that piece, right,
9 that link.

10 And that's not only -- that's not on
11 the DOL, right, or the claims examiner, but it
12 starts at the claimant being able to explain those
13 processes they were involved in; but just because
14 it's not there in the file, doesn't mean it doesn't
15 exist or it didn't happen.

16 MEMBER DEMENT: I'll follow on with
17 that. This is John.

18 I fully support what you're saying.
19 And a number of these cases that I reviewed, here's
20 the phraseology: No available evidence, paren,
21 i.e., personal or area industrial hygiene
22 monitoring data, paren close, to support that after

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the mid-1990s because exposures would have exceeded
2 existing regulatory standards.

3 I looked at the file as well in the DAR
4 and whatever came back. There's no data in there
5 to support this statement.

6 So, if the IH is going to make this
7 statement, he should be required to quote the
8 available data to support it. Otherwise, it's a
9 presumption on his part -- his or her part.

10 MEMBER TEBAY: We -- just to finish up,
11 we often -- and I don't know how all sites do it,
12 but sometimes when we work in groups, maybe one
13 individual in that group is actually assigned some
14 kind of monitoring equipment, right, a personal
15 monitoring equipment.

16 Therefore, the rest of the group, if
17 there is an exposure that's concerning that's at
18 an action level, for instance, not even over the
19 regulatory limit, some of the employees aren't even
20 made aware that that level had been reached. Only
21 the employee wearing the actual monitoring in that
22 group was made aware.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So, all of us could be in the same room,
2 you could be wearing the monitor, but none of us
3 would have been notified that those exposures even
4 existed in that process that day.

5 So, the data doesn't exist when these
6 IHs or these, you know, contracted IHs make these,
7 you know, these summaries or provide these reviews
8 on, really, no IH data.

9 So, my -- I think it's a little unfair,
10 obviously, that an IH can make an assumption against
11 the claimant, but the -- it doesn't work both ways,
12 right?

13 So, I'm a little -- that's where my
14 concern lies. And I know that we talked about this
15 and it's going round and round, but ---

16 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Thank you.

17 Dr. Friedman-Jimenez.

18 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: Can you hear
19 me?

20 Okay. Essentially, what we're talking
21 about is a presumption that there's no exposure.
22 In other words, when you have a workplace where

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 there are variable levels of, let's say, asbestos
2 and the person is a maintenance worker and you know
3 that the levels are varying from day to day or from
4 month to month by some amount, depending on whether
5 it's disturbed or not, how many people are working
6 in the room, but the industrial hygiene
7 measurements are only done either randomly, very
8 infrequently, or not at all, or done in response
9 to some concern after some cleanup was done.

10 You don't know what conditions under
11 which the industrial hygiene measurements have been
12 done.

13 So, essentially, it's a presumption to
14 say that there is no exposure above the standard,
15 and that should be identified as a presumption
16 rather than to say there's no evidence, because
17 you can always say there's no evidence.

18 So, I think it's a little bit unfair
19 to frame the statement in that way that gives a
20 false scientific credibility to it as if there were
21 data that would find the exposure if it were there,
22 because it's not being done.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We know that the sampling isn't being
2 done very frequently and -- in medicine, we refer
3 to it as "sensitivity."

4 In other words, if there's a disease,
5 what's the probability that the diagnostic test
6 will find it?

7 So, in this case, if there's an
8 exposure, what's the probability that industrial
9 hygiene sampling will document it?

10 It's actually pretty low. So, I would
11 say that that kind of a phrase really should not
12 be acceptable in ---

13 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: So, let me just jump
14 in.

15 Circular 15-06 was rescinded and that
16 was stated that there was a presumption that
17 exposures 1995 -- or after 1995 were within the
18 regulatory limits unless there was compelling,
19 probative evidence to the contrary.

20 And the language that's currently used
21 in the claims that we've all seen by reviewing these
22 claims, it seems to be an extension of that circular

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 which was rescinded.

2 So, what's the explanation? I --

3 MS. LEITON: I'm glad you brought that
4 up.

5 So, the Circular that told claims
6 examiners not to go to an IH after -- for cases
7 that were after 1995, we rescinded that so that
8 now they go to an IH.

9 There are going to be presumptions that
10 IHs make without evidence. If you have no evidence
11 that there was any excess, you have no records about
12 the levels of exposure that the person might have
13 had that would be outside of that, then our IHs
14 are going to make some assumptions.

15 If we didn't have IHs, we'd be denying
16 a lot more cases. 26 percent right now, I can tell
17 you, went to IHs and were accepted after.

18 So, before you -- Dr. Dement, before
19 you do that, I just did want to point out that in
20 your recommendations back to us when we talked about
21 this asbestos exposure and such, the Board said:
22 The Board has not yet identified surveillance

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 information that supports use of 2005 as a threshold
2 date for presumed significant exposure -- asbestos
3 exposure. As a default and until such information
4 is identified, the Board recognizes that DOE Order
5 440.1, issued in 1995, likely served as an important
6 stimulus for change in DOE health and safety policy
7 and procedures. The Board, therefore, agrees to
8 the use of 1995 as a threshold date before which
9 sufficient asbestos exposure occurred among
10 maintenance and construction job titles, assuming
11 the temporal requirements noted above, to meet a
12 presumption of asbestos-related disease.

13 So, there are going to have to be some
14 asbestos -- there's going to have to be some
15 presumptions made when we don't have evidence to
16 the contrary.

17 If we have the HWEC information, that's
18 going to help us. The more information we have,
19 the more we can do a better assessment.

20 But if we didn't have IHs at all, then
21 -- we got the IHs to help the claim move forward.
22 We didn't get the IHs to deny claims. We did it

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 so that we could make some sort of exposure
2 assessment, in the absence of any, to help these
3 claimants with their claims.

4 So, you know, this is something we
5 addressed -- this 1995 issue, the Circular issue,
6 we addressed it in our recent response to the
7 Ombudsman's report that you guys probably saw last
8 night.

9 The one that's posted to the
10 ombudsman's report is from 2015. This issue was
11 addressed there. We discussed the fact that the
12 Circular is one thing, but the threshold is a
13 different thing, and that's why you're still seeing
14 that language.

15 We still -- we -- that circular required
16 claims examiners to make that assumption in every
17 case without going to an IH. That is a requirement
18 that was lifted.

19 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Dr. Dement.

20 MEMBER DEMENT: I accept, and I think
21 most hygienists would accept, that experience and
22 knowledge of the hygienist needs to be used when

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 appropriate.

2 But what I really object to is the
3 statement in here that it makes -- it doesn't --
4 the hygienist is not being forthright with regard
5 to, I am assuming -- it makes it appear as though
6 there's no exposures -- there actually is exposure
7 information that will support that statement.

8 What I would like to see is the
9 hygienist just say there's not much with regard
10 to exposure information available; however, in my
11 opinion, or based on my experience, or based on
12 the published literature, exposures after this time
13 frame would likely have been -- likely have been
14 within, you know, regulatory exposure limits, but
15 it doesn't, you know.

16 To me, when this goes to the CMC, the
17 CMC takes that as a bold statement of fact when
18 actually it's an opinion, a learned opinion, of
19 course, but it's, nonetheless, an opinion.

20 MS. LEITON: I can look at the
21 language. I'm pretty sure they say "likely would
22 have been," but in terms of -- we can always look

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 at modification on that language.

2 I do know that they say some of that
3 language, but we can definitely look at it.

4 MEMBER TEBAY: With that, it's so
5 important to -- what that language says, because
6 that -- what happens, is you create a waterfall.

7 The minute that statement is put into
8 place, it changes how the CMC reads it. It changes
9 how -- or the ability for the claimant to respond.

10 Because once that statement is made
11 that it's somewhat fact that it doesn't exist,
12 you're put in a hole to try and rebut that comment
13 to where if everybody knew that was looking at that
14 claim that the reason they made that statement is
15 because there was none in the file, but doesn't
16 mean it doesn't exist, just means that I'm
17 presuming.

18 Well, I can rebut, as a claimant, or
19 help claimants rebut the fact that there's a
20 presumption that there was no exposure.

21 I know claims very well at Hanford that
22 we've used the site occupational medical director

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 or IH on staff to say, this person working in this
2 process as a sheet metal worker would have been
3 exposed to these -- you know, would have been
4 exposed to A, B, C and D significantly, which
5 changes the whole outcome at that point.

6 Now, there's still not any IH data to
7 document levels of the exposure, but that changes
8 the fact that the first IH said that it doesn't
9 exist. So, we have to be very careful with that
10 language going forward.

11 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Dr. Redlich.

12 MEMBER REDLICH: Carrie Redlich.

13 Let me just add one more comment to this
14 whole discussion just from the perspective of a
15 pulmonary or occupational medicine physician, you
16 know, deciding whether the problem is work related,
17 you know.

18 For the past 30 years, I -- we depend
19 and use industrial hygiene input, but what's
20 frequently most helpful is a knowledgeable -- you
21 know, they're all knowledgeable -- an industrial
22 hygienist who's knowledgeable about that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 particular site or process.

2 And frequently it's qualitative
3 information that is also used in addition to
4 quantitative in terms of, you know, the type of
5 process, if it's spraying, welding, heating,
6 enclosed space, the time period, and that -- and
7 an understanding of the process that's being done.

8 And somehow that -- and the
9 questionnaires that the workers fill out, or if
10 they've had a transcript, actually provide
11 sometimes more of that information than the SEM
12 report.

13 But from -- it's almost like it's a
14 higher standard than is the standard of care in
15 which -- in 30 years in my practice, this clinical
16 practice, is almost entirely patients with
17 pulmonary disease with the specific question, is
18 it exposure related.

19 I think the number of times that there
20 has been quantitative exposure data from that
21 workplace that supported -- and I do not just accept
22 everything.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I have a pretty high threshold, but the
2 times that there's actually quantitative data that
3 supports the exposure is so rare it's -- because
4 that's a -- even in a workplace where sampling is
5 done, as the point's been made, it's so sporadic.

6 So, we do want industrial hygiene
7 input, but it's frequently more based on a
8 qualitative understanding of the process and the
9 time period and all that information that we've
10 put together.

11 Unfortunately, most physicians because
12 they know so little about the workplace or exposure
13 data, I think over-interpret sometimes the SEM in
14 a way that it wasn't meant to be interpreted as,
15 like, the definitive word.

16 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Okay. Other
17 comments?

18 Dr. Silver.

19 MEMBER SILVER: I have an information
20 management question about those nuggets of
21 industrial hygiene data that do exist going back
22 to Calin's example of a group of Hanford workers.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Let's say a couple of them at this
2 moment in time have chronic illnesses, they file
3 claims, they don't have any exposure data, their
4 claims are denied.

5 A few years go by and finally that one
6 guy who does have evidence of exposure develops
7 a chronic illness. He files a claim.

8 What happens to that exposure
9 information: A, do you fish it out of his file
10 and post it somewhere so that it can be generally
11 applied to new claims, and; B, will you go back
12 and look at the denied claims of those earlier
13 workers in light of that exposure data?

14 MS. LEITON: Do you want me to answer
15 that or do you want to have follow-up?

16 So, I mean, if I have one case that has
17 a certain set of facts and I have another case that
18 has a certain set of facts, I don't have the same
19 claims examiner reviewing every case.

20 So, I'm not going to know, necessarily,
21 that this person had the exact same fact pattern
22 as this other person and be able to go back to that,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 unless there's something I can apply globally in
2 making a presumption that people in this category
3 -- then we can put it in the SEM and we can go back
4 to the SEM and put that change in there.

5 So, that's the best way that I can do
6 that and go and reopen a case. I can reopen a case
7 at any time if there's new information.

8 So, if that other guy asked for a
9 reopening and said, "I have this new information,"
10 then I can go back to that case file, pull it out
11 and reopen that case and accept it.

12 But unless there's something I can
13 generalize on and go back and put in the SEM and
14 then reopen that set of cases, which we have been
15 able to do, that's the best we can do when it comes
16 to that scenario.

17 MEMBER SILVER: So, if I understand,
18 though, on my first point, you routinely fish
19 exposure data out of individual claimant's files
20 and add the information to the SEM?

21 MS. LEITON: If there's new
22 information that can be added to the SEM, we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 absolutely do add it to the SEM.

2 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: So, do you want to
3 continue with ---

4 MS. LEITON: Yeah. Sure.

5 Okay. So, I think we were -- well, we
6 were still on No. 3 and this was with regard to
7 the information sent to the industrial hygienists
8 and the CMC.

9 Do you have further questions on that
10 one?

11 Okay. The next one is on presumption
12 for asbestos-related diseases. The advisory board
13 recommends that the program add or modify
14 presumptive standards relating to several
15 asbestos-related diseases, the five conditions of
16 asbestosis, asbestos-related pleural disease, lung
17 cancer, and cancer of the ovary and larynx.

18 And the Board also recommends applying
19 the presumption to all DOE workers who worked as
20 a maintenance or construction worker.

21 And it has suggested that the
22 presumption standard use 1995 as a threshold date

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 before which sufficient exposure occurred.

2 So, we did make the changes, as you
3 know, and we've been reopening the cases. We made
4 some of the changes.

5 So, the existing presumption for
6 asbestosis, that the employee must establish
7 diagnosis of asbestosis, significant occupational
8 exposure to asbestos for at least 250 aggregate
9 workdays in a 10-year latency, is what we added.

10 I note that you guys have more
11 recommendations with regard to asbestos, I believe,
12 in your recent recommendations. So, we'll be
13 looking at those separately.

14 Lung cancer, we added the presumption
15 as you have suggested. The same for mesothelioma,
16 asbestos-related pleural disease, ovarian cancer
17 and laryngeal cancer.

18 The labor categories, again, it has
19 been an area we've gone back and forth with you
20 all about in terms of how we characterize them,
21 what we add, what we don't add to that list of
22 presumptions for labor categorizations.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I also want to note that I believe your
2 recent set of recommendations goes into further
3 detail there, so ---

4 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: That's correct.

5 MS. LEITON: -- we'll be evaluating
6 those as well.

7 Let's see. I think that covers that
8 because I'm not going to talk more about the labor
9 categories until we've evaluated your additional
10 information.

11 No. 5, presumption for work-related
12 asthma. The advisory board recommends language
13 changes to procedural guidance relating to these,
14 the presumption for occupational asthma.

15 As part of this recommendation, the
16 Board has offered an alternative definition of the
17 term "toxic substance."

18 Again, you've revisited this toxic
19 substance issue in your most recent recommendation,
20 so we will be addressing those again later.

21 We did make some changes to the asthma
22 language in our Procedural Manual, but, as Dr.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Redlich points out, maybe not all of them. We can
2 continue to look at that.

3 Revise recommendation No. 6,
4 presumption for COPD. The advisory board
5 recommends modifications to the presumptive
6 standards for evaluating claims involving COPD.
7 Basically, this is the issue with regards to vapors,
8 gases, dust and fumes.

9 It also recommends changing the period
10 of exposure necessary to trigger presumption from
11 20 to five years.

12 The SEM has some of the health effects,
13 some of the toxic substances that are included in
14 vapors, gases, dust and fumes that are linked to
15 COPD, and I think that's what we mentioned here.

16 We legally have been having
17 disagreements about the use of that term and how
18 it can fit into our assessments because of various
19 factors and the fact that it's a broad term.

20 I think that you've also addressed this
21 again in your most recent, so we'll be looking at
22 what you've provided to us there.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Right. And we're
2 going to be discussing COPD claims, so some of this
3 will be revisited.

4 Dr. Friedman-Jimenez, did you want to
5 say something?

6 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: Going back
7 to No. 5, the asthma, what is the language that
8 precludes using the NIH definition of a "toxic
9 substance," which, I think, is quite well-accepted
10 worldwide, the National Institute for
11 Environmental Health Sciences.

12 What is it that keeps you from being
13 able to accept this really expert body definition
14 of a very fundamental term?

15 MS. LEITON: The statute, the way that
16 it's written -- my understanding, from discussions
17 with our lawyers -- is that the phrase "toxic
18 substance" comes from the statute and they've
19 defined it a certain way.

20 So, in order for us to -- so, we,
21 therefore, have to define it the way that we define
22 it.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The statute and the rulemaking, they
2 have the force and effect of law. And so, we can't
3 consider how other entities define "toxic
4 substance" because of the way the law is written.

5 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: I mean,
6 we're not talking about just any other definition.
7 We're talking about the NIH, which was created
8 by Congress --

9 MS. LEITON: Yeah. Congress created
10 the ---

11 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: -- defining
12 something --

13 MS. LEITON: -- statute, too, though.

14 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: -- that
15 Congress doesn't have the expertise to overrule,
16 I think.

17 MS. LEITON: Well ---

18 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: So, I'm just
19 wondering what exactly is the language that
20 prevents you from using this better and more widely
21 accepted definition?

22 MS. LEITON: It's the language in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 statute. I can provide that to you separately.

2 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Thank you.

3 MS. LEITON: Okay. So, on to No. 7,
4 the OHQ.

5 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Right. That was
6 subject that we made a further recommendation about
7 the OHQ.

8 MS. LEITON: Right.

9 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: So, you can skip
10 that.

11 MS. LEITON: And then the last -- I
12 think it's the last one. The last one is the
13 quality assessment.

14 The Board recommends improvement to the
15 quality of the CMC auditing. We do audits through
16 the medical director as well as accountability
17 reviews.

18 So, some of the recommendations
19 surround the fact that maybe these CMCs or the way
20 we apply the CMCs aren't being utilized correctly.

21 So, we do have what we have in place currently.

22 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: That's okay. We

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 know we're looking at the CMCs ---

2 MS. LEITON: Yeah. Right.

3 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: -- when we're
4 reviewing these claims. So, I'm sure we'll have
5 further advice.

6 MS. LEITON: Okay. So, then I think
7 that that covers it.

8 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Okay. Any
9 questions/comments from the Board members?

10 MS. LEITON: And I am seeking
11 clarification on that issue that you asked me about
12 from the Procedure Manual. I should hopefully have
13 something soon.

14 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Okay. Thank you
15 very much.

16 MS. LEITON: Thank you.

17 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Mr. Fitzgerald.

18 MR. FITZGERALD: I just want to take
19 a couple of minutes to kind of update the Board
20 on the kind of internal ---

21 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Excuse me.

22 Can you hear in the back?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. FITZGERALD: Can you hear me?

2 Can you hear me now?

3 Okay. All right. I just wanted to
4 update the Board and the public on a couple of,
5 like, internal issues that we're addressing right
6 now.

7 One, is that the Board's charter, as
8 most of you probably know, is a two-year charter
9 and needs to be renewed every two years. So, this
10 July is when the current charter expires.

11 We've started the process internally
12 that the FACA -- the Federal Advisory Committee
13 Act -- process within the Department of Labor to
14 issue a new charter. We don't anticipate there
15 being any significant changes to that.

16 We fully expect the charter to be in
17 place by July when it expires now and I don't think
18 there's anything the Board has to do.

19 It's just kind of an internal process.
20 I just wanted it to be on record that we have started
21 that process and we expect there will be a new
22 charter in place by July.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Also, as most of you are aware, we are
2 shy one board member with the departure of Dr.
3 Victoria Cassano.

4 We are actually going to be putting out
5 -- I think, later this week or early next week in
6 the Federal Register Notice, there will be a
7 solicitation going out soliciting a new member for
8 the Board either from the scientific or the medical
9 community.

10 Because the way our composition of the
11 Board is right now, we can kind of move members
12 around so we can actually entertain the idea of
13 there being a medical person or a scientific person
14 to fill that particular slot.

15 So, that gives us a little bit more
16 latitude in terms of, you know, the universe of
17 people we can consider.

18 That nomination period will be open for
19 30 days. At which time, we will close the
20 nomination process and then start our internal
21 processes for vetting and reviewing the candidates
22 that are being nominated.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And we hope to have somebody in place
2 this summer, so kind of almost in tandem with the
3 charter renewal as well. So, I just wanted to let
4 everyone know that.

5 The third thing I wanted to -- and the
6 last thing I wanted to just advise the Board about,
7 is that, you know, we -- the Board has been around
8 now for several years and we've gone through kind
9 of like a -- probably a little bit of a learning
10 curve in terms of how the Board requests information
11 from the program.

12 At the last meeting, there were a number
13 of requests for data and it kind of elevated the
14 issue to the point where we think that it would
15 really help the Board as well as help the program
16 to kind of regularize the process for requesting
17 data, particularly claims information.

18 The last data request that you all
19 received, you see how voluminous it is and we have
20 to be very concerned about protecting PII and those
21 sorts of things.

22 So, we've actually created a -- kind

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of a very straightforward form that the chairman
2 is going to submit to the program for requesting
3 data, particularly claims data, so that we
4 understand exactly what the purpose is and what
5 the intended use is.

6 And it will help the program, I think,
7 and the Board work together to make sure that the
8 data requested can be fulfilled.

9 Sometimes, I think, we do this sort of
10 request on the fly sometimes during board meetings.

11 It's like, well, we should get claims in on that.

12 And so, it's kind of found in the
13 transcripts of the meetings, so we want to kind
14 of formalize that request process a little bit more
15 so we can actually determine the data that's being
16 requested and then determine a time frame for the
17 delivery of that data to the Board.

18 And I've talked to the chairman about
19 that and I think we're on the same page with that.

20 It's a pretty straightforward sort of
21 thing, but I think it will help kind of formalize
22 and kind of, you know, bring more consistency of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 data requests from the program.

2 And those are the three items I just
3 wanted to bring everybody up to speed on. Any
4 questions?

5 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: So, I think -- this
6 is Steve Markowitz.

7 I think -- I don't know, Carrie, do you
8 have a copy of that form that -- okay. We're trying
9 to bring that up so people can look at it. You can
10 see what's being requested.

11 That's fine. We will, I think, be able
12 to complete those forms for -- well, here's a
13 question, actually: We made a data request --
14 claims request December 10th. So, that's four and
15 a half months ago.

16 Do you want us to fill out that form
17 for -- with reference to that data request?

18 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. In fact, I've
19 asked Carrie to actually do kind of a first -- a
20 first cut at that request based on the commentary
21 that we heard from the last board meeting.

22 A lot of that -- the request, I think,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 was kind of, like, cobbled together in terms of,
2 like, just a general statement, we need this and
3 we need that.

4 The form will help us kind of, like,
5 break that down into its component parts and so
6 we can address it one at a time.

7 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: But if we're talking
8 about how to facilitate the process, so we need
9 to know what the -- understand what the challenges
10 are in assimilating the data requests.

11 And if the problem is lack of
12 specificity on our part, then we need to hear
13 directly from the -- or however you want to handle
14 it, we need to hear where the specific areas of
15 clarity are needed.

16 The form is not necessarily going to
17 settle that issue because there will be -- there
18 needs to be some back and forth.

19 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.

20 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: And so -- but that
21 back and forth doesn't really happen that much.
22 So, the question is, how can we make that happen

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 so that we can -- we all can fulfill the request
2 in a more timely fashion.

3 And then maybe that's a question for
4 Ms. Leiton, I don't know, but I just say, you know,
5 for having submitted a data request four and a half
6 months ago and I haven't received any questions
7 about what particular data we want or -- I don't
8 -- the process is opaque to us.

9 It's a little frustrating because it
10 doesn't, from our perspective, appear to be all
11 that complicated.

12 I'm sure it is, but I should say the
13 first board, we made a similar data request and
14 we got data in a much shorter period of time.

15 And Dr. Dement did some work with this
16 data and they were very illuminating, actually,
17 to our processes.

18 So, I'm all for a data request form,
19 but I don't think that's going to necessarily solve
20 the problem because there needs to be some
21 iteration, some back and forth, so that we can
22 actually get to the -- a solution.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. FITZGERALD: I mean, I would agree
2 and I think that this form actually helps kind of
3 define what those requests are so there can be that
4 kind of back and forth.

5 I would like the back and forth to be
6 as limited as possible, but right now it isn't
7 really happening in a very formalized way.

8 But I think that being able to
9 articulate the request will elevate the issue for
10 the program to be able to say, okay, you're asking
11 for this information, either we have the data, or
12 we don't have data, or it's going to be very hard
13 to extract this data, is this what -- really what
14 you need? We might have proxy data that we can
15 substitute for certain things you're asking for.

16 So, there will be a little bit of back
17 and forth and a little more clarification, I think,
18 of the request. And I think this form will help,
19 you know, facilitate that conversation.

20 MS. LEITON: This is Rachel.

21 I think that part of it is to understand
22 what it's going to be used for, how it relates to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the mandate of the Board.

2 And if we know what it's going to be
3 used for and how -- what you're specifically looking
4 for, we can usually -- we can get the data in a
5 format or in -- the information you're actually
6 trying to get at a little bit easier. So, I think
7 that was kind of the purpose behind it.

8 I'm hoping that we can work with Carrie
9 to facilitate this next step fairly easily.

10 And I think that's what Doug was
11 alluding, is that she can help frame what we're
12 looking for in those requests as examples, correct?

13 So, Carrie will facilitate back and
14 forth, as necessary, for this one and then -- and
15 the additional ones.

16 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: But let me just say
17 that the time frame has to be appropriate. So,
18 if we submit a request December 10 and 2 weeks later
19 we're asked, "What do you need these data for?
20 How is it relevant to your chartered tasks?" that's
21 fine.

22 But, frankly, to be asked that four and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a half months later is not so fine. It doesn't
2 really make sense.

3 So, we just need to shorten the time
4 frames and have whatever back and forth is needed
5 so that we can do the work that we're being asked
6 to do.

7 MS. LEITON: And I'm sure that in
8 future requests it will be a much faster turnaround.

9 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Okay. Normally, we
10 like to get specific and talk about numbers of days
11 and weeks, but we will bypass that for the moment.

12 So, thank you -- oh, this is the data
13 request form, but you can see just briefly
14 delineation of the requested information is the
15 first item.

16 So, I guess -- I think that, if I'm
17 reading that correctly, it just asks for some degree
18 of specificity.

19 The second item is statutory authority.

20 They want us to name what part of the statute,
21 that is to say, which of our four assigned tasks
22 the request relates to.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Whatever -- the third item is
2 supporting rationale. That is to say it supports
3 No. 2. Why it is that what we're requesting is
4 needed to fulfill our function on our chartered
5 mission.

6 And then No. 4, there's a fourth item,
7 which is intended use. So, it's pretty
8 straightforward and I'm sure we can complete that.

9 MR. FITZGERALD: And there's also
10 just the appropriate notification about how this
11 information is, you know, protected under the
12 Privacy Act.

13 So, it's just a good way to document
14 that everybody has been informed about the privacy
15 issues regarding the information that's about to
16 be shared with the Board.

17 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Great. Okay. So,
18 let's move on -- oh, so I would like to welcome
19 Mr. Malcolm Nelson, who will present to us the
20 Ombudsman report 2017.

21 For board members, I just want to point
22 out that sometime, I think, late last night we got

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 -- I think it was late last night we got a -- the
2 DOL response or comments on the Ombudsman report.

3 So, I just want to point out to you,
4 in your email, there is some commentary from DOL
5 about the report.

6 MS. LEITON: (Speaking off mic.)

7 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Okay. Anyway,
8 welcome -- welcome back, I should say.

9 MR. NELSON: Yeah. Good morning and
10 thank you for inviting me.

11 I am Malcolm Nelson, the current
12 Ombudsman for the Energy Employees Occupational
13 Illness Compensation program.

14 As I said before, I want to start out
15 by thanking you for inviting me here today, and
16 I also want to commend the Board for its work
17 reviewing many of the complex scientific and
18 medical issues that underlie this program and to
19 put forth recommendations intended to facilitate
20 the claims process.

21 When I received this invitation, I was
22 faced with a dilemma. And it's a dilemma I have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 every time I'm asked to discuss this program.

2 There's so much I would like to say,
3 and I realize I have a limited amount of time to
4 say it.

5 Secondly, I'm an attorney. I am an
6 attorney and, you know, in law, a brief can be 50
7 pages.

8 I was helped, however, because the
9 Alliance of Nuclear Worker Advocacy Group provided
10 the Board with a letter asking my office to outline
11 certain issues.

12 These issues included examples
13 surrounding the use of the SEM, issues involving
14 the use of the language similar to the language
15 in the now-rescinded Circular 15-06, and issues
16 surrounding the policy regarding claims for
17 bilateral sensorineural hearing loss.

18 For the sake of brevity, I'm going to
19 limit my comments to those issues. However, there
20 is one issue I do think -- or, really, two issues
21 I really do think are important that are not related
22 to those.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 First, one of the biggest problems we
2 see with this program is that claimants -- there
3 are many claimants who still don't know this
4 program.

5 And so, one of the things I want to again
6 commend this board, is for your willingness to come
7 to different locations.

8 And it's always my hope that the
9 publicity or the work being passed around that
10 you're coming to these areas will help pass the
11 word out and disseminate information about this
12 program. So, you know, that's just something I'd
13 like to point out.

14 Secondly, one of the biggest issues we
15 find, is this is simply a complex program and many
16 of the claimants we encounter simply struggle to
17 understand this program.

18 There is an encounter I had very early,
19 as the Ombudsman, and it's one that stuck with me
20 ever since.

21 And in that encounter, someone called
22 me one day to ask about the waiver form that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 claimants receive when they receive a recommended
2 decision.

3 I began to explain the use of that
4 waiver form and, as I was talking, I realized there
5 was just total silence on the other end of the phone.

6 So, I finally stopped and I asked the
7 claimant "Is there something wrong?" And very
8 hesitantly they said, "I really need you to start
9 with the beginning. You need to explain to me what
10 the word 'waiver' means."

11 And that's really, I find, the problem
12 with this program, that very often in this program
13 we begin to tell claimants what to do or how to
14 do it and, yet, they need us to start with the
15 beginning.

16 They need someone to explain to them
17 what a covered illness is. They hear "SEM." They
18 need to understand what is SEM, what is that site
19 exposure matrix. And I think that's one of the
20 biggest problems.

21 We also see that claimants simply do
22 not understand the claims process. They don't

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 understand adjudication, in general, or this claims
2 process and specifics.

3 So, we often find that claimants, you
4 know, we're telling them, "You need to file this
5 paper" or "You need to do this," and they really
6 don't understand how to do that.

7 One of the biggest issues we have found
8 now is that claimants don't understand how to
9 develop evidence.

10 Over the years, we've talked to DOL and
11 I will commend them. They now provide claimants
12 with the reports prepared by the specialists. They
13 give claimants those reports when they receive the
14 recommended decision.

15 But one of the things we found is that
16 claimants have no idea what to do with that decision
17 or those reports. That we often talk to claimants
18 and they have -- and they'll say "I went to my
19 doctor."

20 And we say, "Well, did you take that
21 report with you to your doctor?"

22 And they're like "No. Should I have?"

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And there's just that problem that
2 claimants simply do not understand how to develop
3 claims or don't understand the claims process.

4 And this is a problem we really see as
5 we kind of segue into SEM, is that SEM is this tool
6 and it's often mentioned in decisions, it's often
7 mentioned in conversations with claimants, but
8 claimants have no idea what SEM is.

9 Some of them don't even realize that
10 it's an online tool. And so, you need to start
11 at the beginning and often tell them, "This is an
12 online tool" and to explain to them what it is.

13 Because we find that although SEM is
14 often mentioned in decisions, claimants just kind
15 of glaze over that because they have no idea what
16 the SEM is.

17 In fact, one of the -- and then beyond
18 that, what we find is that once claimants get to
19 SEM, if they do get to SEM, we find that claimants
20 have no idea how to navigate SEM.

21 I can't tell you how many times I've
22 talked to a claimant and they will tell me they

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 have printed out information from SEM and they now
2 know the toxins they've been exposed to.

3 And, yet, when we looked at what that
4 claimant has, all they have done is gone to SEM
5 and they have that initial list of all the toxins
6 that were at the facility.

7 Those claimants don't understand SEM
8 and don't know how to refine the SEM search to start
9 looking at labor categories, buildings and areas
10 and things of that nature.

11 The other problem we find, as we get
12 into SEM, is that many of the claimants question
13 the accuracy of the information found in SEM, and
14 we've already started to discuss some of that.

15 But the issues we hear from claimants
16 is that, as I said before, are things that we said
17 before, but different -- similar jobs were called
18 different things at different facilities. So, there
19 is that equivalency issue by claimants.

20 And so, we always hear claimants say,
21 "Yes, I was a welder, but we did welding differently
22 at my facility."

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Or, more importantly, what claimants
2 tell us is that almost everybody's job or
3 everybody's job description has that phrase at the
4 end "other duties as assigned."

5 And claimants always tell us that they
6 did a lot of other duties as assigned, and those
7 duties simply are not written down anywhere and
8 not recorded.

9 And so, a big problem for claimants is
10 that there really is no process of really
11 understanding what they do and this turns into an
12 issue with the occupational history questionnaire.

13 We find that claimants generally take
14 this history questionnaire very early in the claims
15 process and that basically what the claimant is
16 told to do is tell me everything about your job.

17 And what I find, is that claimants
18 approach that, kind of in my mind, the way you
19 approach your résumé.

20 You talk about -- you talk a lot about
21 the things you're doing now, but you don't talk
22 so much about the things you used to do years ago.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And so, the problem for claimants is
2 that they've done this occupational history
3 questionnaire and now it's going to be used to make
4 determinations, it's given to the IH or these other
5 specialists in making determinations about their
6 job.

7 And the argument by the claimants is
8 that as this case starts to get refined, as you
9 begin to identify the specific toxins or as you
10 begin to focus on certain jobs I have, there needs
11 to be some going back to the claimant so that
12 claimant can now provide more detail about those
13 specific issues.

14 And that's really an issue like, you
15 know, where many claimants say that in addition
16 to -- well, let me move back.

17 The Board has recommended that
18 claimants -- that industrial hygienists should be
19 able to talk to claimants.

20 Claimants agree with that, but
21 claimants go a step further and they think that
22 they should be able to talk to all of the specialists

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that are going to have input in their claims because
2 claimants feel that they can begin to explain to
3 these specialists the very specific things about
4 their job.

5 And, as I said before, and especially
6 as the case begins to narrow -- as we begin to narrow
7 the focus of the case, claimants feel that they
8 can provide that detailed information, information
9 you are not going to give in a general conversation
10 about your job, but information you may very well
11 provide when somebody is asking you about your --
12 this specific job or this specific exposure.

13 The other problem claimants have, you
14 know, they often point out, is just finding records.

15 Most claimants, because they worked at
16 these facilities, they never had access to records.

17
18 So, there is that question from
19 claimants, you know, "You're telling me I need to
20 support -- you know, need to submit more evidence
21 about my work or my exposures. Where do I find
22 records?"

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And for many claimants because they
2 don't have records, they end up having to rely on
3 their own testimony, what is often called
4 "self-reporting evidence," and claimants question
5 the weight that is given to the self-reported
6 testimony.

7 I hear complaints all the time from
8 claimants suggesting that they took a lot of time
9 talking to their claims examiner, telling them
10 about their job, yet that information is not --
11 sometimes it's not even mentioned in the decision.

12 And if it is mentioned in the decision,
13 it's seen not to have had any impact on the decision.

14 It's often suggested -- I've had it
15 suggested that just because the evidence is not
16 mentioned in the decision does not mean that that
17 evidence wasn't considered.

18 The problem for claimants, however, is
19 that if the evidence is not addressed in the
20 decision, they don't know if -- first of all, if
21 it was actually reviewed.

22 And if it was reviewed, they don't

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 understand why it was not accepted, and that leaves
2 claimant in the position of not knowing what to
3 do next, you know.

4 I've told -- you know, the claimants
5 tell us "I've told the CE my job. It did not seem
6 to impact the CE. Do I need to tell them more
7 detail? Did they not understand what I said? Do
8 I need to clarify what I said or is it that I need
9 to go get more information?"

10 The feeling we hear by most claimants
11 is that when it comes to self-reported evidence,
12 that evidence is only going to be accepted if it
13 is supported by other evidence in the record.

14 And, again, this troubles claimants
15 because self-reported evidence is usually most
16 critical in those instances where there either is
17 no other evidence or where they feel that the
18 evidence in the record is inaccurate.

19 So, you know -- and claimants also feel
20 that -- there is a concern that claimants have that
21 because they're often talking to a CE who does not
22 fully understand that work, especially does not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 understand how that work was done 20, 30, 40 years
2 ago, that they would love to talk to someone who
3 has more experience.

4 And that's something that claimants
5 often argue, is that when you're talking about this
6 work -- and this goes even in talking to the
7 industrial hygienist or when the industrial
8 hygienist is reviewing the report -- it's not how
9 that work is done today, it's how that work was
10 done 20, 30, 40 years ago.

11 And not just 20, 30, 40 years ago, but
12 was done in a closed environment behind this gate
13 where oftentimes they were being rushed to do this
14 work.

15 Claimants tell us that in much of --
16 they worked in an environment -- many of these
17 claimants tell us they worked in an environment
18 where getting the work done quickly took precedence
19 over following rules and regulations.

20 And so, claimants say "You have to
21 understand that" -- and that's something I often
22 tell claimants, "I understand."

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Very early in my life I worked for five
2 summers for the Central Intelligence Agency. I was
3 a summer employee because my parents worked here.

4 My job was to install alarm systems.

5 And the things I remember about that is, first
6 of all, working behind that gate there was a whole
7 different world.

8 You -- we did things behind that gate
9 that we would not do outside of that wall because
10 we knew we were in this insulated world.

11 Like, I tell people all the time, I was
12 up on aluminum ladders holding a Coca-Cola in my
13 hand and cutting wires -- live wires because that's
14 how you got the job done, you know.

15 I didn't worry about OSHA coming in and
16 standing over my shoulder because OSHA couldn't
17 get behind that gate.

18 The other problem I realized was that
19 in my old job, the rule was we -- once I started
20 working on that alarm system, when I left, there
21 had to be a working alarm system.

22 And I'm here to tell you I cut corners

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and everything else to get that alarm system
2 working.

3 I went to whatever room I had to go into
4 to get that alarm system working and I did whatever
5 I had to do.

6 And that's what claimants argue about
7 their jobs, is that you look at SEM and SEM has
8 this job -- is based on these job descriptions or
9 these, you know, kind of procedures, and those are
10 the procedures -- those are nice, written
11 procedures.

12 But on a day-to-day basis, they did not
13 follow those procedures. They were being rushed
14 to get that job done.

15 And to do that job, they went anywhere
16 and everywhere they had to go and they feel that
17 there's simply not enough consideration to that.

18 Another issue we often hear from
19 claimants regards smoking history. It's been
20 often suggested that smoking history is not a factor
21 in decisions, yet claimants often come to us with
22 decisions where the CE -- and maybe sometimes the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 specialist, the CMC -- has specifically referred
2 to the claimant's smoking history and has concluded
3 that it was the smoking as opposed to these other
4 exposures that caused the claimant's illness.

5 And claimants just really want a
6 clarification, you know, on exactly what does it
7 mean and what consideration should be given to
8 smoking history in these cases.

9 When it comes to the language in
10 15-06 -- and, again, this is something we've already
11 talked to -- it's been noted that -- and I think
12 Ms. Leiton has already said it, that while this
13 circular was rescinded, it does not mean that the
14 use of 1995 as a threshold to indicate general
15 exposures would not have been within regulatory
16 limits, was not a factual statement.

17 The problem that claimants have is that
18 -- and I think it was a question that one of the
19 board members has already raised, is what is the
20 impact of the fact that your exposures were within
21 regulatory limits.

22 Under this program, you could be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 compensated if your exposures caused, contributed
2 or aggravated your illness.

3 And I guess the question that claimants
4 have is, are we saying that an illness cannot be
5 contributed to or aggravated by regulatory -- by
6 exposures within regulatory limits? Is that an
7 absolute rule? And that's just the question that
8 claimants have with that issue.

9 And also, if I can just say from my own
10 experience, when you talk about presumptions, there
11 are both positive presumptions as well as the
12 negative presumptions.

13 Positive presumptions are those more
14 common presumptions where you assume that if a
15 person has X number of years and has certain
16 exposures, you may presume that their illness was
17 caused by those exposures.

18 Negative presumptions are not that
19 common where you try to say, "Well, if you don't
20 have this and you don't have this, then you can't
21 have any exposures or your illness cannot be
22 exposed."

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Those are fairly rare and really have
2 to be supported by a lot of evidence, at least in
3 my experience.

4 In this regard, we also see an issue
5 that claimants have -- and, I think, again it's
6 been -- everything I've said has been referred to
7 already, but you see these industrial hygienist
8 report where the industrial hygienist starts out
9 by saying the person had significant exposure; but
10 then they provide a table rating the exposures for
11 various toxic substances.

12 And those toxic substances they rate
13 by the extent and level of exposure. So, it could
14 be frequent or, you know, not frequent and high
15 or low exposures.

16 And from that, the CE concludes that
17 the exposure is either caused or not caused --
18 caused or did not cause the claimant's illness.

19 And claimants want to know what really
20 are the guidelines that the CE has, and any
21 industrial hygienist has, in determining even
22 though you had a significant exposure, that somehow

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 this frequent or low -- you know, there's just --
2 it's really not very clear to claimants, you know.

3 Most of the claimants we talk to, they
4 -- as soon as they see the word "significant
5 exposure," they're like, "I had significant
6 exposure."

7 So, what does that "frequent" and "low"
8 mean and how is the CE to apply that in a case?

9 The hearing loss policy also continues
10 to be a concern for claimants. And here, I must
11 acknowledge that; one, the Board has been -- is
12 already looking at this issue, but claimants
13 question, why, if they do not meet those -- the
14 three criteria that's been outlined by DOL, they
15 are not given an opportunity to at least try to
16 establish that their hearing loss was nevertheless
17 caused, contributed to or aggravated by exposure
18 to the list of specific toxins.

19 We hear this with a lot of hearing loss
20 claims, but we especially hear it where the decision
21 recognizes that the claimant had exposure to one
22 of the listed toxins and had exposure for ten or

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 more consecutive years; yet, the claim was denied
2 because the claimant did not work in one of the
3 enumerated job categories.

4 Over the years, this has troubled
5 claimants who noted that, again, their job was --
6 that similar jobs did not always go by the same
7 name at different sites, as well as by those who
8 noted that while their job description may not have
9 included work similar to that performed by those
10 in enumerated job categories, they -- these were
11 duties that they were assigned, nevertheless.

12 So, essentially, claimants question
13 whether the information concerning these job
14 categories was so complete that it absolutely
15 precluded the possibility that someone working in
16 another job category could not have had hearing
17 loss associated with the exposures.

18 Now, as it's been noted, DOL has just
19 released a new version of a Procedure Manual and
20 this version outlines a procedure for the CE when
21 the claimant makes a claim that the job that the
22 employee performed is synonymous to one of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 qualifying labor categories.

2 Yet, the concerns raised by claimants
3 still apply to those who do not have the ten
4 consecutive years of employment in a qualifying
5 job category prior to 1999.

6 Claimants want -- you know, claimants
7 have raised that same question about why must it
8 be ten consecutive years?

9 Does the medical evidence that exists,
10 is it that clear that a claimant who has
11 accumulative more than ten years, but somehow
12 somewhere had a break, that there can be absolutely
13 no impact to hearing loss?

14 But we see cases all the time where the
15 claimant had, you know, six, seven years of
16 exposure, then there's a break maybe of six months,
17 maybe a year, two years, and they go back to work
18 for maybe another seven, eight years and claimants
19 just do not understand why that break, six months
20 or whatever it is, is so impactful that it should
21 say that they don't get to proceed with their
22 hearing loss case.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We also hear similar issues about that
2 1990 date, and we especially hear this from
3 painters.

4 And painters come to us all the time
5 and try to -- and tell us -- or ask us to try to
6 tell us -- tell them what happened in 1990 that
7 all of a sudden that same paint that they were using
8 that they applied the same way, all of a sudden
9 now it doesn't have an impact on them.

10 So -- and I think, as it's been said,
11 you know, while this may be a generality or a
12 presumption, claimants feel that they should have
13 the opportunity to rebut their presumption and to
14 show that, in their jobs, there was nothing --
15 nothing changed in 1990.

16 Because the Procedure Manual has been
17 revised a couple of times, the approach to hearing
18 loss has changed somewhat.

19 But one of the things that continues
20 to confuse claimants is that some of the most recent
21 versions, on the one hand, say that a claimant --
22 that the claims examiner can review or should review

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the case even if the claimant does not have -- does
2 not meet the criteria outlined for hearing loss.

3 But then those provisions of the
4 Procedure Manual go on to say that if the claimant
5 wants to challenge the criteria, the claimant has
6 to show -- and let me try to find my language.

7 They have to show that -- the claimant
8 has the burden of establishing through the
9 submission of probative scientific evidence, that
10 the criteria used by the program do not represent
11 a reasonable consensus drawn from the body of
12 available scientific data.

13 First of all, claimants don't -- the
14 way the most recent provisions -- I mean, of the
15 PM about hearing loss have been written, claimants
16 really aren't sure of what they're supposed to do
17 if they want to challenge a hearing loss denial.

18 But, secondly, to the extent that most
19 of them read this as saying that they have to now
20 show that the criteria is not based on a reasonable
21 -- a reasonable consensus drawn from the body of
22 available scientific data, claimants feel that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that's placing a very high and costly burden on
2 them.

3 On the one hand, claimants feel that
4 that means that they're going to have to go find
5 specialists who can make -- who can address that,
6 which first means that they're going to have to
7 get all of the evidence or all the data the DOL
8 has relied on.

9 And, secondly, you know, claimants feel
10 that with the give and take that will often occur
11 when you're debating medical science, that it can
12 get very costly to try and engage with those medical
13 professionals.

14 I could go on and on -- like I say, I
15 could go on and on, but I'm going to stop here to
16 see if there are any questions that anyone has.

17 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Comments?
18 Questions?

19 Dr. Silver.

20 MEMBER SILVER: Thank you very much for
21 a concise, punchy, provocative presentation.

22 Your remarks about smoking set off a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 little light bulb for me. One of the COPD cases
2 we received involved a worker whose claim was
3 denied.

4 Nowhere in the chain of evidence did
5 anyone dispute that she smoked one to two cigarettes
6 a day.

7 And we all know people like that, right?
8 After a meal, on a break or just part of their
9 daily habit.

10 Yet, when it came to the CMC's report,
11 there was an elaborate paragraph about the
12 contribution of smoking to COPD, and I began to
13 wonder whether that was a cut-and-paste,
14 boilerplate paragraph that goes into every one of
15 the CMC's opinions on COPD.

16 Have you seen inappropriate
17 boilerplate language in these claims?

18 In the Parkinson's case that I looked
19 into, there was an analogous paragraph that was
20 all about the histopathology of Parkinson's and
21 said something about genetic risk for people under
22 50.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Well, this guy was 82. So, is that
2 going on where --

3 MR. NELSON: Unfortunately --

4 MEMBER SILVER: -- there's kind of a
5 mass production event that CMCs are cutting and
6 pasting?

7 MR. NELSON: Unfortunately, my office,
8 we don't often see a lot of the information in the
9 claim file.

10 Every case with us is different in terms
11 of how much information we see and are able to
12 review. So, I'm really not in a position to try
13 to say, oh, there's this pattern going on.

14 What we do have - I mean, we do hear
15 from claimants with very similar - and I hope maybe
16 it's even the same claimant, but we hear from
17 claimants with a similar argument, is that the
18 smoking history that seems to get passed on to the
19 specialist, they take exception with that, you
20 know, they say they may have smoked, you know, a
21 lot of cigarettes in the past, but they often try
22 to stress to the -- you know, in the occupational

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 history that they had not smoked very heavily in
2 the last 20, 30 years and somehow it all got kind
3 of reduced to a heavy smoking history.

4 So, I think there are claimants who do
5 challenge the interpretation of their smoking
6 history.

7 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Questions?
8 Comments?

9 Ms. Pope.

10 MEMBER POPE: Yes, I too want thank you
11 for your support and help with these claimants with
12 their claims.

13 I also see the similar problems and
14 concerns when claimants are trying to -- the burden
15 of proof is just overwhelming in terms of them
16 supplying all this information, but having an
17 advocate there at the resource center or in the
18 process of these claimants trying to provide all
19 this information, not to mention trying to navigate
20 through the overwhelming process of trying to
21 figure out how to submit this information -- so
22 they're going through the history of their job

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 description and I notice, during one of the claims
2 that I was reviewing, that the security guard --
3 he was a security guard, but the CMC had -- seemed
4 like the CMC had this assumption that he was not
5 exposed to the different things that the claimant
6 was saying that he was exposed to like welding fumes
7 and diesel fumes and how he could possibly come
8 down with the types of illness that he had presented
9 to the claim.

10 But I think it's important to have
11 someone to have some knowledge of that site to add
12 to the claimant's information in order to have a
13 -- for the CMC to have that information in the case
14 to help to support what that claimant is trying
15 to present.

16 MR. NELSON: It is. I mean, again,
17 you're having this -- what I hear from claimants
18 in the occupational history questionnaire when
19 they're engaged in that, you know, they've been
20 told to talk about their jobs, but, as I said, they
21 have no idea what the -- what anybody wants, you
22 know.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I worked for the Government for 43
2 years. If you start asking me, you know, I'm sure
3 there's a lot I would just leave out because I have
4 -- you know, there are things I think are important,
5 but, you know, may not be what you're looking for.

6 And that's the problem I think the claimants have
7 at least initially.

8 And then as the claim goes on, no one
9 ever tells the claimant "Why don't you go back and
10 update your occupational history questionnaire
11 because now you can see that they're focusing on
12 this issue or they're asking you about these dates.

13 Go back and focus on those dates."

14 One, many claimants don't think about
15 that. That doesn't even enter their minds.

16 Secondly, a lot of claimants have
17 honestly told me they're afraid to do that because
18 they're afraid if they go back and try to clarify
19 the history questionnaire, they're going to be
20 accused of now trying to make up stuff to get
21 benefits.

22 So, they feel like they're kind of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 caught in this catch 22, but -- you know, and that's
2 why I said many claimants feel if they could talk
3 to the IH, if they could talk to the toxicologist,
4 here is somebody who at least has some expertise
5 in these areas.

6 And as they begin to talk to them, they
7 can explain, like -- you know, very often the SEM
8 will say this person was not exposed to this toxin.

9 The claimant can tell you how they --
10 not only that they were exposed to it, but they
11 will explain to you how they work with it.

12 And they feel if I can talk to someone
13 who has a basic understanding of this job and how
14 it was carried out, I can explain to them how I
15 can be exposed to this.

16 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Well, you know --
17 Steve Markowitz -- we have from -- even from the
18 previous board, recognized -- as DOL has the
19 limitations of the SEM and have tried to make some
20 recommendations to improve the exposure
21 information available for the decision-makers,
22 including improving the OHQ and encouraging that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the industrial hygienist could speak directly to
2 the claimant. So, those would be concrete ways
3 in which the exposure information could be
4 improved.

5 I have a question -- and actually it's
6 not about the work of the Board per se, but the
7 first point you raised about people -- claimants
8 not really understanding some of the communication
9 they get and understanding the process.

10 So, I can express some of the claims
11 I've read that the final decision is pretty
12 comprehensive, actually, not written at the
13 appropriate literacy level for many claimants.

14 And -- but the cost of being
15 comprehensive and detailed is that it gets into
16 language which is not readily understandable.

17 Do most people have authorized
18 representatives?

19 Do the authorized representatives
20 serve that function of translating those kind of
21 communications for people?

22 Is that part of the system functioning

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 well?

2 MR. NELSON: I can only talk about the
3 claimants my office encounters. The majority of
4 the claimants who I -- my office encounters either
5 do not have an authorized rep, or if they have an
6 authorized rep, that authorized rep is a family
7 member who themselves really do not understand the
8 program.

9 But beyond that, another problem that
10 claimants have -- and I'm glad you asked that
11 question. It was something I wanted to say and
12 had forgotten.

13 The other problem is that even when
14 claimants have an authorized representative, that
15 authorized representative does not always assist
16 the claimant with every issue in the case.

17 We -- I have a guess as to why, but what
18 we often find is that authorized representatives
19 will help claimants in what I call get the initial
20 benefits, but they tend to drop out of the case
21 when those cases get to issues like medical benefits
22 and billing issues.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And the feeling is the way the statute
2 is written, the statute is very clear that that
3 AR gets paid for certain services and assisting
4 the claimant with billing issues and with home
5 healthcare-type issues, the statute is not clear
6 or doesn't really address how that AR gets paid.
7 So, the ARs just stay away from those issues.

8 There has also, you know, quite
9 honestly, has been the feeling by many claimants
10 is that because of the way the statute is written,
11 the statute limits the amount of money that an AR
12 will get paid in a case.

13 And so, that ARs tend to participate
14 or represent claimants in the easier cases and they
15 tend to avoid the complex cases.

16 So, what we tend to find is that
17 claimants cannot find an AR in the very cases where
18 they most need the help, which are the complicated
19 cases.

20 And lastly -- I mean, two other things.
21 One, as you realize, under the statute, if the
22 claimant utilizes the services of an AR, the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 claimant has to pay that AR.

2 And many claimants have told us they
3 simply don't have the money to pay the AR, and I
4 know people come back and say, well, you'll get
5 some money from the claim.

6 And claimant's response to that is,
7 even if they get that money, that money generally
8 does not cover all the costs that they paid on these
9 claims or paid, you know, for their -- on their
10 health so that any money they have, they need for
11 other purposes.

12 So, many claimants just don't even
13 pursue an AR because they don't want to have to
14 pay.

15 And lastly, and this is one I talk
16 about. I think it gets overlooked all the time
17 or people don't understand, but the people we --
18 the majority of these people who worked at these
19 facilities, the generation they come from, they're
20 very proud people and they're very proud about that
21 work that they did at those facilities, and they
22 don't want to fight the government.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And so, they don't want to go get an
2 AR because they interpret going to get an AR as
3 going to get an attorney.

4 And they see that as fighting the
5 government, and they just don't want to be viewed
6 as fighting the government.

7 So, all I've got to say, in my
8 experience, a lot of the claimants I encounter do
9 not have an AR.

10 If they have an AR, as I said, it's a
11 family member or, for whatever reason, they have
12 an AR and, yet, that AR is not helping them with
13 the issues they are having problems with when they
14 come to us.

15 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: I have one other
16 comment.

17 MR. NELSON: I --

18 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Oh, go ahead. I'm
19 sorry, I didn't meant to cut you off.

20 MR. NELSON: No, this is something I
21 -- you know, again, as I sit here, I'm thinking
22 of things I was supposed to do and I did not do.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And I -- initially, I was supposed to
2 also introduce Amanda Fallon, who is here from our
3 office as well. I didn't want to have to go back
4 to the office without having done that.

5 Go ahead. Sorry.

6 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: That would be
7 unwise, yes.

8 MR. NELSON: Yes.

9 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: I was also struck,
10 reading some claims, that the physicians, the CMCs,
11 usually talk about smoking with reference to COPD,
12 and I don't know if DOL is ever going to be able
13 to stop them from doing that.

14 Maybe later after lunch, Ms. Leiton,
15 if you could address whether DOL actively tells
16 the CMC not to address the role of smoking in, say,
17 COPD or another claim because -- and even if you
18 did, frankly, I would expect the doctors to ignore
19 -- you know, many doctors to ignore that advice
20 because that's what we do, but -- and I can see
21 where that would be confusing to people.

22 I mean, it was confusing to me because

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I'm thinking, well, how does the CMC really thinking
2 about that case -- if they're largely or almost
3 exclusively attributing it to smoking, how are they
4 thinking about the occupational exposures?

5 So, I appreciate that comment, that
6 potential source of confusion for claimants.

7 MR. NELSON: Yeah. And just, in
8 general, another issue that often comes up, SEM
9 really only addresses causation.

10 And so, you know, when the specialist,
11 the industrial hygienist or whatever, when they
12 are looking at SEM, you know, the other question
13 just comes to -- kind of comes to smoking, but all
14 is to what extent are they really evaluating
15 contribution and aggravation?

16 So, once again, you know, when that
17 doctor is saying it's mostly or due to smoking,
18 they're saying mostly due to smoking, you know,
19 are they just ruling out any contribution or
20 aggravation by these other toxins? And that's
21 always the question that really confuses claimants.

22 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Okay. Any other

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 comments?

2 Dr. Friedman-Jimenez.

3 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: When we're
4 talking about contribution to causation of a
5 disease, I think it's completely appropriate to
6 mention smoking and -- when you're talking about
7 COPD, for example.

8 It probably does contribute to COPD,
9 but that doesn't change, in any way, the
10 contribution of other environmental causes of COPD
11 unless there are epidemiologic data to show that
12 smoking prevents the other exposure from causing
13 COPD, and I haven't seen those kind of data.

14 So, I think it's pretty benign to
15 mention smoking, but it's not benign to suggest
16 that -- and somehow the smoking history negates
17 the other causation of COPD.

18 It's the rule, not the exception, that
19 diseases are caused by multiple, different factors.

20 Sometimes they add together
21 additively, sometimes they multiply. Most often
22 they combine in some way in between those two, but

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 they should be considered separately.

2 And I don't think mentioning smoking
3 adds or subtracts from the causation question for
4 the other exposures.

5 But it is used in that way, in some
6 settings, and I think that's what some of us are
7 objecting to.

8 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Yeah, Dr. Silver.

9 MEMBER SILVER: It's not benign to fail
10 to distinguish between vanishingly low levels of
11 smoking and heavy smoking.

12 Lord knows dose-relatedness is a big
13 issue when it comes to chemical exposures.

14 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Are there any other
15 comments or questions? Otherwise, thank you very
16 much --

17 MR. NELSON: Thank you.

18 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: -- for the talk, and
19 you'll be around for the day if people have
20 questions?

21 MR. NELSON: Yes, I will.

22 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So, just a couple of short items before
2 we break for lunch because we've covered these --
3 the action items from our November 2018 meeting,
4 I think, we've discussed, for the most part.

5 We've also discussed the data and
6 claims request from December 10, 2018. We did
7 request a large number of claims for multiple
8 conditions.

9 And when we were asked to try to triage
10 that recently or, you know, in some number of weeks
11 ago -- I can't remember the timing, exactly -- we
12 decided to focus first on Parkinson's Disease and
13 COPD. So, that's where we're at now and we'll
14 continue to pursue those requests.

15 The issue of COPD -- maybe this is the
16 first meeting, but we don't have a reformulated,
17 revised recommendation for COPD.

18 It's -- we're at a bit of a stalemate
19 in terms of the way we view it and the way we think
20 the program should accommodate it, but, more
21 importantly, actually we have claims to look at.

22 And so, we can see actually what sense

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 our recommendations make vis-a-vis the claims and
2 how the -- how, in the real claims, how COPD is
3 actually considered. And that's what we're doing
4 now by reviewing those claims.

5 So, we may yet come up with revised
6 recommendation for COPD, but it will be after we
7 review some claims.

8 Any comments or questions? Otherwise,
9 we are going to break for lunch. It's 12 o'clock.

10 We will resume at 1:00 p.m.

11 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
12 went off the record at 11:59 a.m. and resumed at
13 1:09 p.m.)

14 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Okay. Let's get
15 started. 1:10. I'd like to thank the very
16 faithful public who has stuck around for the
17 afternoon session. Welcome everybody back.

18 All right. So, our next topic is going
19 to be reviewing some claims on chronic obstructive
20 pulmonary disease, otherwise known as COPD.

21 But before we look at individual
22 claims, I'd like to open it up for discussion about,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 sort of, how we should do this, where we might expect
2 to get to today.

3 My own feeling is that, you know, we
4 received these claims about two weeks ago. I know
5 that Mr. Domina has been on the road for the last
6 two weeks and probably hasn't had a whole lot of
7 time.

8 I know that Mr. Mahs has been involved
9 with training activities for the past ten days,
10 and others of us are busy.

11 So, I'm sure we haven't had the
12 opportunity to review all the claims, even the
13 limited number that we were asked to. So, this
14 is an initial conversation and it will be ongoing.

15 I think our observation should be
16 considered provisional in that sense. I'm not sure
17 whether we're going to be able to come to any even
18 reasonable consensus about conclusions, so other
19 comments on how you think we should approach this?

20 Dr. Dement.

21 MEMBER DEMENT: I guess there might
22 be some individual cases that are worthy of a group

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 discussion, and likely are, but I think at the end
2 of the day, as we all go through our cases and we
3 get more experience across the board and we get
4 some underlying observations, it might be worthy
5 of each of us to take the time just to jot down
6 talking points about major observations and then
7 come back at a later date and sort of discuss our
8 major observations and we can use cases as examples
9 to support or not support those observations.

10 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Okay. Other
11 comments?

12 Dr. Silver.

13 MEMBER SILVER: We put a lot of work
14 into recommended presumption for COPD. Even
15 though the Department hasn't accepted it, I think
16 a real important question to ask particularly for
17 the denied cases is, would the outcome had been
18 different had our presumption been accepted by DOL?

19 Or if it were to be in the future, would
20 it have influenced the outcome of the denied COPD
21 cases, building a record for continuing to debate
22 the issue.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Other comments?

2 While you're thinking, just for the
3 moment, I want to remind the Board about our tasks
4 and how they relate to review of claims so that
5 it's clear what our role is.

6 The first task is to look at site
7 exposure matrices. Obviously, those are used by
8 the industrial hygienists and maybe the CMCs.

9 Secondly, we're asked to weigh in on
10 the medical guidance for claims examiners. And
11 this directly pertains to what the claims examiners
12 provide the CMC, certainly, but also I would argue
13 the IHs.

14 And then, finally, Task 4, and for those
15 members who -- of the Board who are new to this
16 board and weren't on the previous board, we did
17 not really address, on the previous board, Task
18 No. 4, which was to evaluate the work of industrial
19 hygienists, staff physicians and consulting
20 physicians, and reports of such hygienists and
21 physicians, to ensure and hear the key words
22 "quality," "consistency" and "objectivity."

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So, when you think -- when we're talking
2 about these claims, focus on the quality. You may
3 not agree with their conclusions, but we would look
4 at the quality of their conclusion regardless, what
5 it's based on.

6 The objectivity and the consistency
7 across claims, although we're usually dealing with
8 different IHS, different CMCs, and so that's --
9 can be a little challenging. But in any event,
10 just keep -- bear that in mind when we talk about
11 the claims.

12 Any other comments?

13 So, who wants to - I think we should
14 start off with COPD denials. Anybody want to talk
15 about it, walk us through a claim and what they
16 saw and what they found?

17 Somewhere I have here a list of who was
18 asked to look at what, but I'll be glad to start,
19 but I need the handouts.

20 So, let me remind people that we do not
21 mention personal identifiers. So, we obviously
22 do not mention the names of the claimants, their

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 addresses.

2 We can certainly mention the site
3 because there are a lot of people who worked at
4 each site.

5 And we don't mention the full claim
6 number because that would identify a person, but
7 we identify claims by the last three or five digits.

8 And so, what I've done, by way of
9 example, is take a COPD denial and we're going to
10 -- I've taken excerpts from the record, from the
11 files.

12 And for those of you present who didn't
13 have the opportunity to look or are not involved
14 with reviewing these claims, meaning the members
15 of the public, the files were anywhere from 500
16 to 5,000 pages long. So, they were quite lengthy.

17 Some of them highly repetitive, the
18 same documents appeared over and over again. They
19 were not indexed, so you basically scrolled through
20 until you found what you're interested in.

21 Sometimes there are multiple documents
22 that appear to be the same. Still trying to get

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 familiar with recommended versus final decisions,
2 but, in any case, took some time to actually
3 identify.

4 And I'm not sure I, for one, have
5 identified everything in each of those files that
6 I needed to look at, but I made an attempt to do
7 so.

8 So, the board members are going to be
9 looking at these excerpts from these claims. And
10 as I walk through them, I'm going to explain what
11 they are so that everybody in the room and anybody
12 on the phone can follow us.

13 So, this was -- the first claim is for
14 someone -- this -- the decision date was March 2019
15 -- we're trying to avoid precise dates because
16 that's -- could be personally identifiable -- and
17 there is a final decision.

18 Now, the COPD in this case was diagnosed
19 2003. So, the person's had COPD for a long time.

20 And the excerpt from the final
21 decision, first, is that -- this is the
22 communication to the claimant and it says that the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 EE-3, the employment history form, indicated that
2 they worked at Oak Ridge at X-10 at K-25 and at
3 Y-12, all three of the DOE facilities.

4 And that, totally, they were employed
5 from 1977 until -- beyond 2010. So, they were
6 employed for a very long time and they had begun
7 employment a long time ago.

8 And their job titles were carpenter and
9 machinist. So, we have a long-term
10 carpenter/machinist from Oak Ridge who began work
11 in 1977.

12 Next page, which is Slide 3, and the
13 final decision mentions the occupational history
14 interview and that they were exposed to -- that
15 that interview indicated they were exposed to
16 beryllium, lead, mercury, nickel, cesium, cobalt,
17 technetium, thorium, uranium, asbestos, silica,
18 fiberglass, wool, mineral wool fibers, PCBs,
19 organic solvents and degreasers.

20 And then the final decision goes on and
21 talks about the SEM and the fact that those job
22 titles I mentioned, which were carpenter and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 machinist, were linked by the SEM to agents that
2 cause COPD; endotoxin, asbestos, chlorine, coal
3 dust, diesel exhaust, phosgene, silica, cement and
4 wood dust.

5 So, here, the final decision is
6 recognizing that the SEM connected the
7 carpenter/machinist job titles to these
8 COPD-linked exposures.

9 And then it goes on to -- this is Slide
10 5 -- saying that the case was referred to an
11 industrial hygienist, and the IH concluded that
12 that person had significant exposure, as a
13 machinist, to endotoxin and, secondly, as a
14 machinist, to endotoxin plus asbestos, diesel
15 engine exhaust and silica.

16 And the IH further concluded that your
17 exposure to those toxic substances after the
18 mid-1990s would have been within existing
19 regulatory standards.

20 And then concluded, as well, that
21 working as a carpenter involved significant
22 exposure to asbestos and silica.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And then there's, again, the standard
2 statement that, quote, however, the IH stated that
3 your exposure to those toxins after the mid-1990s
4 would have been within existing regulatory
5 standards, end of quote.

6 So, the case was referred to a CMC and
7 the CMC decided that the exposure to the
8 SEM-specific COPD agents, right, the ones I
9 mentioned before, which were, you know, cement,
10 chlorine, coal dust, et cetera, diesel exhaust,
11 were not at least as likely as not to be a
12 significant contributing factor.

13 And the CMC concluded that your
14 long-term exposure to tobacco smoke was responsible
15 for the COPD more than any other substance.

16 So, here, we actually have a final
17 decision saying that -- quoting the CMC and saying
18 tobacco smoke was responsible and that the
19 occupational agents weren't responsible.

20 Slide 7 is a handwritten occupational
21 history from the claimant and it's a little hard
22 to make out and I don't want to read the whole thing,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 but basically the person talks about their exposure
2 to wood dust, the conditions under which they were
3 exposed.

4 They removed floor tile, they built
5 forms for pouring concrete, they machine -- worked
6 in a shop machining parts and they described that
7 they breathed in dust on a daily basis, 2000 to
8 2008.

9 So, Slide 9 is the occupational health
10 interview and it says, basically, that the person
11 was exposed to asbestos, silica, coal dust,
12 fiberglass, glass wool and the like.

13 And, in fact, actually, I found an
14 excerpt from the medical examiner at the Y-12 site
15 in which between 1981 and 2000 the person says they
16 were exposed to asbestos, chemicals, dust, noise,
17 gases, acids and the like.

18 And if you look at the SEM for machinist
19 and carpenter at the Oak Ridge facilities, you
20 actually come up with, under a K-25 machinist, 23
21 different toxins; for a Y-12 machinist, 102
22 different toxins; and a carpenter at X-10, 15

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 different toxins and any number of what they call
2 work processes.

3 Those aren't all linked to COPD, but
4 it's a listing of the toxins -- toxic substances
5 they were exposed to.

6 So, 13 just gives you detail on how much
7 time the -- the person was mostly a machinist with
8 limited time -- number of years as a -- well, almost
9 seven years as a carpenter.

10 The IH report concludes that the -- that
11 his work as a machinist at K-25/Y-12, and carpenter
12 at X-10, was significantly exposed to multiple
13 toxins.

14 And then provides a table, which we've
15 seen in multiple claims, in which -- and I'm sure
16 others have seen this, in which the list of agents
17 is provided, and then the frequency and the
18 intensity level is estimated by the industrial
19 hygienist.

20 So, in some cases, it's occasional,
21 some cases it's frequent. Wood dust was frequent,
22 meaning on a daily basis. Endotoxins, frequent.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And the exposure level, say, for wood dust was
2 low to moderate. For endotoxin, diesel exhaust
3 was low to moderate and the like.

4 And then the IH says there's no
5 available evidence to support that as part of this
6 position after the mid-1990s, his exposures to any
7 of these agents would have exceeded existing
8 regulatory standards.

9 Then the IH provides references.
10 Actually, I find the references to be interesting,
11 because the first few references are DOL/DOE
12 documents or databases, but the last four
13 references are textbooks.

14 And I found this repeatedly, I don't
15 know if you've seen this, but the IH routinely cites
16 textbooks.

17 I know these textbooks, for the most
18 part, and they don't -- they don't provide any sort
19 of specificity for job title and level of exposure.

20 So, they really are not the source of
21 their knowledge about what kind of level a machinist
22 -- and how frequently a machinist will be exposed.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The IH may be using their own personal
2 expertise, but it's not -- you don't find that in
3 the textbooks, for those of you that are less
4 familiar.

5 So, I am finishing this. So, only a
6 couple more slides.

7 So, the CMC report is fascinating
8 because the CMC says the latest CAT scan shows no
9 evidence of interstitial lung disease.

10 So, for those of you that don't know,
11 interstitial lung disease is like asbestosis.
12 It's not COPD. It's completely different from
13 COPD.

14 So, the CT scan shows no interstitial
15 lung disease. Quote: in essence, asbestos,
16 cement, endotoxins and silicon dioxide crystalline
17 can be ruled out as agents, as these agents show
18 an interstitial lung disease pattern on chest
19 X-ray.

20 Do any of the physicians in the room
21 agree with that statement?

22 So, let me just finish and that is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 unusual. And then goes on to say there's no
2 evidence of pleural thickening, which occurs with
3 asbestos or with silica exposure.

4 The X-ray didn't show rounded opacities
5 in the upper lung zones, which would occur with
6 coal.

7 Cement dust causes interstitial lung
8 disease, pleural thickening. We don't see that.

9 Wood dust causes hypersensitivity and
10 pneumonitis and we don't see that.

11 So, in short, to summarize, we can rule
12 out COPD in relation to these agents because the
13 X-ray doesn't show these other findings of either
14 interstitial lung disease or pleural thickening.

15 And then he -- she -- I can't remember
16 -- goes on to say, diesel exhaust exposure was only
17 low to moderate and the person was not involved
18 directly in transportation so that this lack of
19 exposure reduces their risk of COPD, ruling out
20 diesel exhaust.

21 And endotoxin produces interstitial
22 lung disease. On X-ray, that's not present, so

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we rule out endotoxin.

2 And concludes by saying, the most
3 likely cause of the COPD was tobacco abuse. So
4 -- and then there's further language, but
5 essentially it comes to the same conclusion.

6 So, a long-term carpenter/machinist
7 with a lot of exposures within the SEM are relevant
8 to COPD, the IH concludes that those levels were
9 of significance, and the CMC uses what I regard
10 as unorthodox knowledge to deny the claim,
11 basically.

12 So, that's -- I don't know if anybody
13 else looked at this claim or has questions about
14 it.

15 If you're looking at the particular
16 language of the CMC and if that makes -- if I'm
17 wrong and that makes more sense to you than to me,
18 then, you know.

19 Any comments? Questions?

20 Yes, Mr. Domina.

21 MEMBER DOMINA: On the -- I just want
22 to make sure on this Slide 19, it has the guy's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 name in it. So, make sure nobody sees that.

2 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Okay. Okay. Thank
3 you.

4 MEMBER DOMINA: This is one that I
5 looked at, you know, and I noticed -- I believe
6 it was in -- let me find it here -- 1987 he was
7 restricted from the carbon graphite shop due to
8 respiratory issues and a rash and swelling of his
9 respiratory passages, that I saw when I went through
10 it.

11 And I, you know, and so that was -- I
12 mean, because this gentleman was still working as
13 of 2018, you know.

14 The guy's like 82 years old, but --
15 yeah, and I saw the same -- like, the smoking thing
16 just like you had mentioned because --

17 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Yeah. So, anyway,
18 to me, the air seems to be concentrated, in the
19 CMC's judgment.

20 And before that, you know, the
21 information moved along in the way that you'd more
22 or less expect.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Comments? Questions?

2 Otherwise, let's move on to another
3 case. We don't need to go into this level of detail
4 in the cases, but I --

5 MEMBER SILVER: Yes. Thank you for
6 providing us with a really good template. Some
7 of us probably saw similar leaps in logic, but we
8 doubted whether we were seeing what we thought we
9 saw and organizing into a framework like this should
10 allow us to nail things down the way you've done.

11 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Yeah. I'll make one
12 other comment, which is I couldn't tell -- and I
13 think this is true from -- I couldn't tell from
14 the IH report and the CMC report what they actually
15 reviewed.

16 The IH doesn't list -- and in subsequent
17 claims in the CE when they made the referral and
18 they developed their questions, I don't see a list
19 of what was provided for them to look at.

20 So, then you don't know what this IH
21 has actually looked at unless they mention it in
22 their report.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The final decision seemed to mention
2 the relevant exposure sources, but more crucial,
3 frankly, is what the IH looked at.

4 MEMBER REDLICH: Are we not mentioning
5 who the CMC is or --

6 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: No, I don't see any
7 -- because -- I don't see any problem with that.

8 Anybody -- Is there any problem with
9 us mentioning - how about the state?

10 Can we mention the state they live in?

11 MS. LEITON: That's okay.

12 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Well, I think the
13 question is if we see repeated issues with one or
14 two people, right?

15 MEMBER REDLICH: That has been a
16 pattern.

17 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Okay.

18 MEMBER REDLICH: So, I thought that it
19 is relevant and that's not providing any
20 information of the patient.

21 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Okay.

22 MR. FITZGERALD: I think it's fair to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 raise that with the program independently of the
2 meeting itself.

3 If you see a pattern, I think that's
4 what the Board here is trying to do, is determine
5 whether there is an ongoing, sort of, pattern of
6 behavior across the CMC community or the IH
7 community that we're trying to remedy in terms of
8 the process versus looking at individuals and
9 calling them out and saying you didn't do this
10 right.

11 MEMBER REDLICH: And then if there is
12 a CMC that we do identify a pattern that we think
13 is maybe concerning --

14 MR. FITZGERALD: You should raise it
15 with the program.

16 MEMBER REDLICH: Okay. And then what
17 would be the process of reviewing that CMC?

18 MR. FITZGERALD: I would defer to the
19 program on that. But in terms of elevating it to
20 the program, I'd go through the chair to --

21 MEMBER REDLICH: Okay.

22 MS. LEITON: We'll look at it.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Any other comments
2 or --

3 MEMBER BERENJI: This is just a general
4 comment. This is Mani Berenji.

5 At least from a CMC's standpoint, I'm
6 pretty sure I've mentioned this at a previous
7 meeting, but it's very important to have at least
8 some sort of standardization in terms of how these
9 CMCs are collected and identified.

10 I know they run the gamut, at least
11 based on the cases I reviewed. They were family
12 medicine physicians.

13 And, again, I feel that there are many
14 competent physicians who are capable of doing this
15 type of work, but making sure that there is some
16 sort of training, at least to be able to complete
17 the review in a systematic matter, you know, taking
18 into account the SEM, but also taking into account
19 a full occupational history.

20 And at least from my perspective -- and,
21 again, please correct me if I'm wrong -- but it
22 doesn't appear that the CMCs actually meet the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 claimants; is that correct?

2 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: That's correct.

3 MEMBER BERENJI: So, to me, I mean, I
4 do disability reviews. I always see the claimant
5 because I feel that unless you see the person right
6 in front of you, it's hard to make a real good
7 assessment as to -- first of all, you always want
8 to make sure that the claimant, you know, is
9 forthcoming and you want to make sure that you can
10 verify, at least to the best of your ability,
11 whether the events that transpired actually adds
12 up to the particular exposure.

13 At least from my perspective and from
14 my experience, it's really important to see these
15 individuals face to face.

16 I'm not sure if there's any discussion
17 among your colleagues at least with respect to,
18 you know, evaluating CMCs.

19 Is there any potential for, you know,
20 at least revamping the process or at least having
21 the CMCs meet with these claimants face to face?

22 MS. LEITON: Do you want me to respond

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to that?

2 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Sure. Could you?

3 MS. LEITON: We have a second opinion
4 process where physicians will see claimants, but
5 the amount of cases we refer to a CMC for a record
6 review, we don't have them all over the country
7 to meet with all these claimants.

8 There's a cadre of physicians in the
9 contract, and so it feasibly is -- would be really,
10 really difficult for us to -- for that to happen.

11 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Yes, Mr. Domina.

12 MEMBER DOMINA: I just -- I was just
13 -- and I'll just defer some of this because, in
14 the State of Washington, we have IMEs and stuff
15 and so there's a process.

16 So, if you have X amount of complaints
17 against one, there's a way to do that. And the
18 same thing -- I don't know if this process allows
19 that and the fact that they're not in for life,
20 they got to reapply every three years.

21 So, is there some kind of a vetting
22 process even though it may be a different contract

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 or has the contract, on a way to verify, you know,
2 the person has been fully vetted and reapplies or
3 a claimant has a way, you know, if they have a
4 problem with the way it's done.

5 MS. LEITON: So, there is -- the
6 contract has a vetting process. They have a
7 vetting process for all their physicians when they
8 come on board.

9 I would have to check on how many times
10 they're recertified annually or whatever it is.

11 With regard to whether we can -- a
12 claimant can object to what the physician said,
13 they can do that through our appeals process on
14 an individual basis.

15 With regard to a determination or
16 multiple -- like, when we do audits, if there's
17 a CMC that has multiple or has more than one error
18 in different cases on a regular basis, then we have
19 -- we will meet with the contractor and take
20 whatever steps are necessary.

21 That may be additional training, it may
22 be worse than that, but there are steps that we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 can take with the contractor.

2 We meet with them on a regular basis.

3 We have teleconference calls with all of our CMCs
4 on a regular basis quarterly, I believe, to talk
5 about new issues, talk about any questions they
6 may have to make sure that they're aware of issues.

7 While I'm up here, I'll just mention
8 the smoking. We do tell them that smoking is not
9 something they should be taking into consideration,
10 but, again, they're going to take it into
11 consideration as physicians in cases like -- as
12 Dr. Markowitz mentioned.

13 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Dr. Berenji.

14 MEMBER BERENJI: Mani Berenji.

15 So, again, I apologize if I
16 misunderstand the process when it comes to the
17 industrial hygienist.

18 These are folks who work with DOE; is
19 that correct?

20 MS. LEITON: No. The industrial
21 hygienists work for us, for the Department of Labor.

22 MEMBER BERENJI: Okay. So, I know

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that there's a process to identify CMCs.

2 Has there been any thought about, you
3 know, at least having some sort of industrial
4 hygienist panel at least to be able to review the
5 SEM, go through the occupational health
6 questionnaire?

7 Because at least based on my review of
8 both the approvals and the denials of the respective
9 claims -- and I know Dr. Dement already alluded
10 to this, but I feel that a lot of times the
11 industrial hygienist is following a boilerplate.

12 And at least based on my review of the
13 eight cases that I had the opportunity to review,
14 it seems that, you know, that's one data point from
15 this one particular industrial hygienist.

16 But at least from my perspective, I
17 think it might be something worth considering in
18 the future -- and, again, this is up for debate
19 -- if there is a way to get some sort of consensus
20 among industrial hygienists across the country from
21 different disciplines, you know, both with clinical
22 experiences, industry experiences.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I'm going to leave it up to the Board,
2 but at least from my perspective I think that would
3 be instrumental to provide a counterpoint to the
4 industrial hygienists from your end. Thank you.

5 MS. LEITON: Okay. I will just say
6 that we have a contract with industrial hygienists.

7 Every IH report goes through our
8 federal -- we have two federal employees who are
9 industrial hygienists.

10 You will see the format being repeated
11 because that's what they were taught to do in that
12 format. But aside from that, I'll let you guys
13 --

14 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: One comment on this
15 case, by the way, the issue of cigarette smoke,
16 it was one thing for the CMC to ascribe it to smoke,
17 but actually in the final decision, which obviously
18 is written by DOL, it said that -- quoting the CMC
19 that it --

20 MS. LEITON: That's because they're
21 quoting the CMC who provided an opinion on causation
22 and included that as part of his opinion.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Now, if they say significant amount of
2 it is a result of the smoking, it's not something
3 we can ignore, you know.

4 We -- unless they were -- you know, it's
5 very difficult to separate that out once the
6 physician has already gone there.

7 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Well, it makes it
8 look like you were endorsing that and that could
9 be very confusing to a claimant, but I'll move on.

10 Dr. Silver.

11 MEMBER SILVER: I think we heard in a
12 previous meeting that the claims examiners are
13 encouraged to limit the number of substances
14 considered to seven substances, and there was a
15 memo in the COPD case that I reviewed spelling that
16 out.

17 It came from headquarters telling the
18 claims examiner to keep it to seven toxins. And,
19 sure enough, in this case, if you look at Slide
20 20, it's exactly seven substances.

21 And if you look back all the way to Slide
22 8, 10, 11, a few of them bit the dust or fell out

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of consideration.

2 Fiberglass didn't make the cut. Gases
3 didn't make the cut. Beryllium didn't make the
4 cut, mercury and arsenic.

5 Now, maybe those are not the most
6 relevant substances for COPD, but if we're going
7 to ever have a meeting of the minds of vapors, gases,
8 dust and fumes, you have to relax this seven
9 substances rule, I think.

10 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Yeah. I mean, that
11 wasn't the challenge in this case, but I take your
12 point.

13 Dr. Dement.

14 MEMBER DEMENT: I think your review of
15 this case points out some interesting issues. When
16 you look at the SEM for this job category, it lists
17 many, many exposures. I think you've listed them
18 on your slide. So, obviously there are many
19 exposures that -- if you meet the job category.

20 So, the two criteria for the CE to
21 actually refer these exposures to the IH and
22 ultimately to the CMC, one is the job category has

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to be right. The other is the claimed disease has
2 to also be in there.

3 So, only a few of the exposures that
4 this individual would have had even from the SEM,
5 not restricting it to seven, because it would be
6 many more actually even made it to an assessment,
7 when, in fact, I think the majority of the published
8 literature suggests that for COPD we look more
9 broadly at their cumulative exposures to these
10 vapors, gas, dust and fumes.

11 I guess the other thing, and the
12 clinicians need to answer this, but it relies --
13 this opinion and some others that I looked at relies
14 heavily on -- either on CT and -- more on chest
15 X-ray changes, a requirement that those actually
16 be present to support an attribution to the
17 exposures.

18 I'm not aware that that's an actual
19 requirement for COPD. The clinicians can answer
20 that.

21 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: They're not -- I
22 mean, they're certainly not for the diagnosis of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 COPD -- for the diagnosis of other conditions, but
2 I've never read that you need -- any of these other
3 conditions are prerequisites for COPD -- for
4 ascribing COPD to the occupational agent.

5 MEMBER DEMENT: And, in fact, this is
6 the first place I've ever seen that done.

7 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: By the way, this was
8 a board certified occupational medicine physician.
9 So, that didn't help us in this one.

10 Anybody have another COPD denial they
11 want to talk about?

12 You don't have to do it in this level,
13 but that's -- you shouldn't, actually, because
14 we'll never get through, but -- yeah, George.

15 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: I can
16 present a case quickly that illustrates one point.

17 This is Case No. -- 14286 are the last five digits.

18 So, a 79-year-old woman worked as an
19 electrical mechanical inspector at the Kansas City
20 plant from 1979 to 1981 -- 1991, 50-pack-year
21 smoker, diagnosed with COPD in 2012 and was agreed
22 to have had significant exposure to asbestos;

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 however, the question of asbestosis was raised.

2 She had several X-rays on record and
3 apparently also had a CT scan, but the CT scan was
4 not in the record. And so, the CMC said that it
5 wasn't clear whether she had asbestosis or not.

6 There was pleural parenchymal scarring
7 mentioned on one of the chest X-rays, but it didn't
8 say "asbestosis."

9 And so, because there was no CT
10 available, the CMC denied the case and said that
11 we need to have the CT, but the CT had already been
12 done.

13 So, this raises the question of should
14 a case be pursued and come to a final decision when
15 not all of the medical evidence is present?

16 In this case, it would have just been
17 a matter of getting the result of a chest CT, which
18 had been done fairly recently.

19 If that hadn't been done, I would argue
20 that it should even -- there should be a mechanism
21 by which it could be ordered and that the case not
22 be decided until you have a proper evaluation.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And apparently, the CMC just signed off
2 on the case and said there's -- denied it because
3 there was no evidence of asbestosis because there
4 was no chest CT on record.

5 So, the question is: what is the process
6 by which a necessary diagnostic test can be either
7 gotten -- obtained that's already been done, or
8 ordered, if it hasn't already been done, in order
9 to complete the evaluation for a necessary
10 decision?

11 This wasn't about asbestosis per se,
12 it was about COPD and whether asbestos contributed
13 to the COPD.

14 And it's somewhat different literature
15 if someone has asbestosis than if they don't have
16 asbestosis.

17 And so, it would have been an important
18 thing to have in the record. So, that's the
19 question I wanted to raise with this case.

20 MS. LEITON: So, this is Rachel.

21 If it was a CT scan that was referenced
22 -- you said you knew there had been a CT scan --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 how did you know that there had been a CT scan?

2 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: It was
3 mentioned in, I think, a PFT report.

4 MS. LEITON: Okay. So, the CMC, at
5 that point, could have easily gone back to us and
6 said there's reference to a CT scan. We could go
7 to the claimant and ask for it if it had relevance
8 to the question being asked. There is a process
9 for that.

10 With regard to requesting that a test
11 be done, we run into problems for cases that we
12 haven't accepted yet. We can't guarantee that
13 we're going to pay for that test because they're
14 submitting it.

15 So, it could be a suggestion that the
16 CMC makes and said, you know, if this person were
17 to have a CT scan, they might be able to verify
18 it, which we could relay to the claimant.

19 And if the claimant then wanted to go,
20 you know, and get that CT scan on their own, they
21 could, but we couldn't require them to do that or
22 pay for that to be done.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: So, that's
2 really the issue that we're raising here, is how
3 can we make sure that a proper evaluation is done
4 before these decisions are made? Because that does
5 involve paying for the diagnostic testing.

6 And this is a catch 22 we often run into
7 in occupational medicine. To establish a case,
8 you need to do a test that would need to be paid
9 for by --

10 MS. LEITON: And if we did accept the
11 case, we could retroactively pay for it, but that's
12 hinging on whether or not we end up accepting the
13 case, because we go retroactive to the date that
14 they file.

15 We can pay for whatever is related to
16 what we accept, but that's only after the fact and
17 it's only if we accept it.

18 MR. FITZGERALD: Let me just say that's
19 standard practice in all worker's compensation
20 systems.

21 We don't generally get -- we generally
22 don't pay for diagnostic testing until a case is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 accepted. And that's pretty much common practice
2 in worker's compensation.

3 MEMBER REDLICH: Yeah, I also -- Carrie
4 Redlich -- I also reviewed this case and I agree.

5 So, I think one issue that has come up sometimes
6 is when the claim is placed for one disease. And,
7 in this case, it was for COPD.

8 And so, I've got a couple issues. And
9 then there is the evaluation suggests that there
10 may be another occupational relevant disease which
11 is not the one that the claimant had put the claim
12 in for.

13 And in those situations, I -- usually
14 the CMC's been asked a very specific question, you
15 know.

16 They've been asked not does the person
17 have a work-related respiratory condition, but do
18 they have work-related -- you know, do their
19 exposures contribute to COPD?

20 I think an easy solution would be they
21 can answer that question and then is there evidence
22 of any other relevant work-related condition,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 because I have seen several where the question was
2 COPD when there was evidence of asbestos pleural
3 plaques or another condition.

4 In this person, the concern I had is
5 it seems like the diagnosis, from what information
6 we had, was likely COPD.

7 The smoking history was variable, but
8 the -- this -- it was at this Kansas City plant.
9 And I just quickly Googled what this Kansas City
10 plant did out of curiosity.

11 I would have called up John Dement and
12 see if he could fill me in on -- because the person
13 was an electrical mechanical inspector from 1979
14 to '91.

15 And this plant was made -- I have my
16 little notes here, but it basically was initially,
17 starting in 1942, a Pratt & Whitney plant that made
18 engines and made the non-nuclear warheads.

19 So, it -- and there was a little other
20 information that it sounded like there was a lot
21 going on in this plant besides asbestos for -- and
22 in the period of time from '79 to '91, it sounded

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 like there was machining operations to different,
2 you know, plastics and adhesives and a whole range
3 of activities that -- and it was unclear what sort
4 of inspector.

5 She -- the questionnaire that the
6 person filled out was not that helpful in terms
7 of, you know, had sort of possibly checked off
8 almost every exposure you could have, which -- but
9 there was the question, did you -- should
10 respiratory protection have been provided? The
11 person answered yes.

12 It seems that some better idea --
13 somehow the SEM that produced only asbestos as a
14 relevant exposure was what caught my eye.

15 And knowing more about what was going
16 on in a place that's been -- an old facility doing
17 engine machining -- you know, making engine parts,
18 seemed like there was potential opportunity for
19 exposures beyond asbestos that might be relevant
20 to COPD and hopefully an industrial hygienist would
21 be able to determine that.

22 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: But there was an IH

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 report in that case.

2 MEMBER REDLICH: Yes, but I think it's,
3 again, this issue of the job category. I think
4 a phone call or brief conversation with this person
5 and a better understanding of what their job tasks
6 were -- you know, if the person had only worked
7 there for six months, I'd say let's not spend more
8 time on this. It's unlikely that that's
9 contributing.

10 But when we have a, you know, 20-year
11 period of time in a, you know, facility like this,
12 it seems that that warrants more attention.

13 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Other comments?

14 Yeah, Calin.

15 MEMBER TEBAY: This is Calin Tebay.

16 I'm still -- I want to go back to your
17 -- the lack of the CT or the -- that it was overlooked
18 that the CT existed.

19 One, this is, Doug, for your
20 information, in worker's comp, often the tests are
21 paid for by worker's comp to aid diagnosis often
22 before the claim is accepted. Not in Department

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of Labor, right, but in worker's compensation at
2 the State level.

3 But in this case, it doesn't really
4 matter for the simple fact that you know going into
5 the claim that you may or may not get reimbursed
6 depending on if the claim is accepted.

7 So, I don't quite know how we got on
8 the conversation of why it was relevant to if we
9 were going to pay for it or not when the simple
10 fact is everybody knows that you're not going to
11 get reimbursed if the claim is not accepted.

12 But I go back to the fact that if the
13 doctor recommended denial based on the lack of a
14 CT, why didn't we stop there and say we're missing
15 this CT scan, let's not deny the claim or --

16 MEMBER REDLICH: Well, I --

17 MEMBER TEBAY: -- force the person into
18 an appeal process, because appeal processes are
19 almost impossible for a claimant to get through
20 for the simple fact that the time frames are so
21 short often the claim will be recommended denial
22 and denied at the final -- at the FAB before you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 can even get an appointment to get that extra scan
2 -- to get a CT scan for a claimant that needs a
3 pulmonologist and needs to get it ordered.

4 I think -- and I don't know about in
5 anybody else's area, but in our area it can take
6 weeks.

7 By that time, the recommended decision
8 has been done, the final decision is done, and then
9 you got to appeal the final decision, and then you
10 got to go through the reopening of the claim process
11 to prove that you've -- I mean, so look what --
12 the waterfall effect of creating or providing a
13 recommended decision or a final decision based on
14 the lack of a test for the claimant to try to go
15 through, then, is nearly impossible to recover once
16 that final decision or recommended decision is
17 made.

18 The appeal process is not easy at all,
19 and it's not time-friendly to a claimant. So, I
20 guess my point is, is that's a claim where if we
21 know that happens, why doesn't -- why aren't we
22 stopping instead of saying, "Well, you can appeal

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it if you can get that test in the time frames we
2 allow you before we provide a final decision."

3 Because often claims examiners just
4 move right on forward, they don't give you extra
5 time to go get those tests.

6 And I understand you can't just leave
7 them all hanging, right? You can't just say,
8 "Okay, everybody's got as much as they want to get
9 all the information."

10 But on the other hand, when you -- you
11 kind of -- it's not okay to deny the claim based
12 on that was overlooked.

13 MEMBER REDLICH: I just -- one other
14 -- I mean, and this -- one other point I did want
15 to bring up, was that it was a CMC that there has
16 been a pattern of -- I question some of the CMC's
17 decisions.

18 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Other comments on
19 this case?

20 Other COPD denial?

21 Dr. Dement.

22 MEMBER DEMENT: Okay. This is a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 individual -- a claim of COPD. Worked as a graphic
2 -- worked as a graphic illustrator at Fernald a
3 couple periods of time, '86 to '91 and '92 to '93.

4 His occupational history questionnaire
5 suggests that he was a photographer who obviously
6 did things -- illustrative photographer, but he
7 actually went into the facilities and did work in
8 the facilities taking photographs of different
9 equipment and operations. So, he had a fair amount
10 of time within the facilities.

11 Doesn't go into great detail, and at
12 some suggestion, at least, in terms of his work
13 as a photographer, he may have had some other work
14 that's directly related to that particular task.

15 That wasn't very well-developed either
16 in the occupational history or in the claims
17 process, so basically the process was to go into
18 the SEM and look for this particular job category
19 and some aliases of this job category.

20 And what they found was the possibility
21 of diesel exposure, I guess, just being around
22 diesel equipment. I don't know exactly how that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 would happen, but I guess all of us have some diesel
2 exposure.

3 Anyway, that was what was established
4 from the SEM. It went to the IH who -- for
5 consideration.

6 The IH basically said that diesel
7 exposures would have occurred, but back with the
8 same comment about not approaching regulatory
9 limits.

10 So, this claim was denied and it may
11 well have been appropriate to have denied this
12 claim.

13 It was -- I think this person was a
14 smoker, but a half pack a day since age 25. That
15 didn't come into the picture, as I could tell, in
16 the final decision to deny.

17 I guess what I take away from this, is
18 the -- neither the occupational history
19 questionnaire or the development of the case, I
20 think, actually went back to the individual --
21 allowed the individual to elaborate on exposures
22 that he may have had either going into these

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 facilities and buildings or as doing the task of
2 processing and developing film as they had on site.

3 So, it was denied and I think this is
4 one where maybe some additional information would
5 have informed that decision better.

6 I don't think there's any other points
7 here about this exposure. He had two -- was
8 actually exposed to two incidents at the plant;
9 one for plutonium and hexafluoride.

10 So, there was an exposure incident
11 while he was actually in the plant doing his work.

12 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: It sounds like a case
13 where the industrial hygienist couldn't really have
14 used the job title for --- to be very informative
15 about diesel exhaust.

16 MEMBER DEMENT: No.

17 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Right. So, in other
18 words, the only way he could understand potential
19 dose --- or likely dose is through interview.

20 MEMBER DEMENT: Yes. I don't know ---
21 this is not a job category that if you asked me,
22 do they have diesel exposure, I would have said

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 yes.

2 So, for me to have assessed this
3 exposure, I would have had to ask questions, like,
4 how were you exposed to diesel?

5 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Right.

6 MEMBER DEMENT: So, I don't -- to me,
7 it just wasn't developed. The case wasn't
8 developed.

9 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Comments?
10 Questions? Other COPD denial cases?

11 MEMBER MAHS: I have one that was
12 originally a denial and then it was accepted this
13 year.

14 In 2012 -- this was a 77-year-old former
15 worker at --- I lost it. Pantex, I think it was.

16 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: I'm sorry, what kind
17 of worker was he?

18 MEMBER MAHS: He was a truck driver.

19 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Okay.

20 MEMBER MAHS: He was a truck driver at
21 Hanford. He was exposed to arsenic, asbestos,
22 beryllium, diesel exhaust, nickel, silver,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 stainless steel, and something else there. I can't
2 read my writing.

3 He worked 19-plus years as that, but,
4 as a truck driver, even though he was a truck driver,
5 his work assignments included digging, spraying
6 weeds for weeks at a time, digging in the tank farms.

7 So, he was exposed to quite a few different things.

8 And I think the first time they looked
9 at it, he was just exposed to asbestos, is the only
10 thing they found to start with.

11 And, anyhow, in 2012 he filed a claim
12 for benefits. He identified chronic COPD and
13 asthma as a medical condition related to your
14 covered employment.

15 Submitted employment history and they
16 confirmed that he worked at DOE for several
17 different contractors over the years.

18 And the SEM revealed that he was exposed
19 --- potentially exposed to asbestos, is the only
20 one they found, as for a truck driver.

21 Medical consult, CMC, to obtain an
22 opinion as to whether it's at least likely as not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to exposure asbestos during your covered employment
2 at Hanford with significant factor in causing or
3 contributing or aggravating. And the CMC reviewed
4 his case and decided it was not at least as likely.

5 They denied his claim for COPD and
6 asthma in June of 2005. In -- November 2nd, 2017,
7 though, his authorized representative requested
8 a reopening of the claim for COPD and asthma to
9 raise the -- he had additional medical evidence
10 and they said Department of Labor erred when they
11 forwarded the claim to the CMC for review.

12 She noted that the CMC concluded the
13 medical evidence supported a diagnostic --
14 diagnosis of asthma, however, it did not support
15 a diagnosis of occupational asthma.

16 Your authorized representative stated
17 that its referral to the CMC, the DOL should have
18 asked the physician whether occupational exposure
19 to a toxic substance contributed or aggravated,
20 claim. She maintained that this was an error.

21 The District's order was issued in
22 December 17th, which vacated the final decision

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 on the 2012 that the condition, COPD only, and not
2 the asthma.

3 The District office reviewed the source
4 of documents and checked the SEM again. And with
5 the labor category of teamster, the SEM lists COPD
6 as a possible specific health effect of asbestos,
7 diesel exhaust, silicon dioxide and crystalline.

8 In the IH report, your exposure to
9 asbestos was significant and would have been
10 frequent and at low levels. However, after 1986
11 through the mid-'90s your exposure would have been
12 occasional, and at very low levels. After the
13 mid-'90s, there's no evidence to support that your
14 exposures would have accepted the existing
15 standards.

16 I don't know what that had to do with
17 --- exposure to diesel exhaust was significant and
18 would have been frequent and at very low levels
19 through the mid-'90s. And after the mid-'90s,
20 there is no evidence to support your exposure
21 exceeded the standard.

22 Silicon/crystalline was significant

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and would have been frequent and at very low levels
2 also.

3 In a report dated May 9th, 2018, the
4 CMC concluded that it is at least as likely as not
5 that your exposure to asbestos, diesel exhaust,
6 silicon dioxide during your employment at Hanford
7 was a significant factor contributing to your COPD.

8 And they recommended acceptance of the
9 case this time in --- I lost the page, but there
10 is also a page where the IH had stated the exposure
11 to diesel exhaust would only be in passing. He
12 was a truck driver.

13 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: But COPD was
14 accepted, ultimately?

15 MEMBER MAHS: The second time around,
16 yes.

17 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Based on asbestos,
18 diesel exhaust ---

19 MEMBER MAHS: They added a few more
20 chemicals that he was exposed to and a little more
21 medical evidence.

22 And the error --- I guess they explained

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 they reopened it due to a possible error with the
2 CMC report --- or what the CMC received.

3 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Comments?
4 Questions?

5 MEMBER POPE: I had a similar case.

6 My --- the case that I reviewed was a
7 security guard, 44-year employee, COPD --- was
8 claiming COPD, kidney disease, and those other
9 illnesses were not recognized, but he was
10 originally denied and then it was reversed.

11 Let's see. Denied in May, reversed in
12 June. The only reason why, I believe, that it was
13 reversed, is because his AR --- his attorney had,
14 at the hearing --- there was a hearing --- had
15 brought up the fact that there was a step that was
16 missed between the information being passed along
17 to the CMC and the step that was missed that they
18 did not confer with the treating physician. And
19 that's a step that was brought forth during the
20 hearing.

21 Now, had his attorney not brought that
22 information up, I'm sure that this case would have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 remained denied.

2 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Comments?
3 Questions? Dr. Redlich?

4 MEMBER REDLICH: Yes, I agree. I also
5 reviewed that case.

6 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Use the mic, please.

7 MEMBER REDLICH: Sorry.

8 Yes, I also reviewed that case and I
9 agree with Duronda that it was a security guard
10 for 44 years and I --- the two treating physicians
11 and another physician had decided that the COPD
12 was work-related, but --- and gave a rationale for
13 why it was work-related, but then the case was
14 referred to a CMC who decided it was not
15 work-related.

16 And it was only reversed after a hearing
17 representative and then the final decision was
18 accepted. However, it seemed that --- and this
19 just raised the question of when you refer to a
20 CMC. If you have a treating physician who gives
21 a rational --- you know, that the diagnosis is
22 clear, they give a rational reason for why they

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 think it was related to the, you know, work
2 exposures, then would that --- did that need to
3 go to a CMC?

4 And the SEM, I think, again came ---
5 I'm trying to remember this one. I can't read my
6 notes whether --- it was also one when you read
7 the transcript of the description of what this
8 security/police officer did at the Y-12 plant for
9 40 years, it sounded like there were inhalational
10 exposures, but I don't think the SEM had come up
11 with much.

12 MS. LEITON: I just wanted to make a
13 comment about that.

14 I think I mentioned earlier today that
15 we're trying to encourage CEs to go to the treating
16 first -- to follow up with the treating first,
17 before going to a CMC.

18 And one of the things that we've also
19 reiterated in recent training to them, is that
20 causation is a much different standard than
21 aggravation and contribution.

22 So, if a treating doctor is coming in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 with medical rationale for
2 aggravation/contribution, we're looking at those
3 in a different way than we would if they're just
4 simply trying to say it was caused by. So, we're
5 seeing more of that going back to a treating,
6 clarifying, trying to understand whether they --
7 you know, whether it's contribution, aggravation,
8 those sorts of things.

9 I also did want to mention, I looked
10 back at my notes from one of your recommendations
11 early on from the previous board on talking ---
12 the IH having the ability to talk to claims
13 examiners --- I mean, to the claimants. And one
14 of the things we said there, was that we would be
15 able to allow that as long as the claims examiner
16 was involved.

17 So, I need to look back and see if we
18 actually got specific procedures for that. I'm
19 pretty sure we've advised the IHs, but I'll go back
20 and follow up on that particular issue because it
21 is possible. It's just that we need to have --
22 make sure that CE is involved.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER REDLICH: I guess just in terms
2 of some of the themes that we had, this is another
3 example where the occupational questionnaire, the
4 occupational history that his treating physician
5 had, and then his transcript of his hearing, gave,
6 I think, a more accurate picture of his exposures
7 because the SEM came up with no exposures that could
8 cause COPD, but there was a description of welding
9 fumes, unloading coal dust, various other exposures
10 that had not come up in the SEM probably because
11 a security/police officer --- but that his
12 transcript described more accurately what he had
13 done.

14 And his physician, actually, which is
15 rare, had an occupational history that also
16 described it.

17 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Just commenting on
18 the issue of IH interview, we made that
19 recommendation and your response was that the CE
20 should be involved and we absolutely agreed that
21 made sense. And so, we would like to know the
22 progress because that was --- that happened some

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 time ago.

2 MS. LEITON: Yes, it did. It might be
3 in there or it might be instructions to our Ihs.
4 I need to check, but I will definitely get back
5 to you.

6 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: I mean, the IHS
7 presumably are used to not doing that, they're used
8 to --- and it's easier for them just to do a paper
9 review and do what they always do.

10 So, you may need to encourage, or there
11 are some circumstances that they do this, to get
12 them over that hump.

13 MS. LEITON: Could I just make one more
14 comment?

15 I want to go back to something that I
16 --- that Dr. Friedman-Jimenez had mentioned with
17 regard to the definition of toxic substance. I
18 also went back to check on that.

19 What --- we did define it in the
20 regulations a specific way. The statute doesn't
21 have a definition of it, but the reason that we
22 defined it the way we did is when we got Part E

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in 2005, the prior process was for a --- Department
2 of Energy used to have a panel of physicians.

3 And when they had --- they would refer
4 cases to that panel, and that panel would recommend
5 yes or no on whether or not it was related to
6 exposures. There was a definition used then.

7 So, when we took over those cases and
8 we got Part E, there was a push to be consistent.
9 They didn't want us to have a different definition
10 than DOE did, because then we would be treating
11 the cases differently.

12 So, that was the underlying reasons for
13 it being put in the regulations the way it was.
14 I just wanted to clarify that.

15 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: Could I just
16 put in a plug for looking at the definition that
17 the National Toxicology Program has for toxic
18 substance and considering changing your --- since
19 it sounds like you're not bound by law to have that
20 definition that you have, I think it's very, very
21 justifiable to use the NIH definition that the
22 National Toxicology Program has on their website

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and have published.

2 They really know toxicology and they
3 know what a toxic substance is. And I think that's
4 the strongest way to go to make this a --- and if
5 you want to unify the definition, that would be
6 what you want to unify it to, I think, and it makes
7 sense. It's a very well-accepted definition of
8 toxic substance.

9 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Yes, let me just
10 comment. Steve Markowitz.

11 So, you take workers who are operations
12 or production or maintenance or laboratory or
13 construction. The SEM, their occupational health
14 questionnaire are full of toxic substances.

15 There's no shortage of --- as DOL
16 currently defines. So, there's no shortage of what
17 is called potential exposure to toxic substances
18 for, probably, the vast majority of job titles
19 within the complex.

20 So, I --- you know, I know this has been
21 an issue we've gone back and forth with, but even
22 on their own terms there's plenty of exposure that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 could be used to make decisions.

2 Dr. Dement?

3 MEMBER DEMENT: But the real stopping
4 point here is the link to the outcome. They could
5 have the job -- well, there's two places.

6 Making sure the job is searched with
7 regard to all the different ways it could be called,
8 and there's some --- you know, there's some places
9 where some of these jobs are described in the
10 presumption, for example, there's a list of jobs.

11 It's not sometimes quite clear how
12 those are mapped back into the specific jobs in
13 the SEM, and I think they should be. So, you have
14 to pass that hurdle.

15 But, then, in order to get referred for
16 even consideration in some cases, you have to have
17 that disease link, which we've argued for and needs
18 to be expanded.

19 And in some ways, it does relate to the
20 definition of what toxic substance is, really.

21 MEMBER REDLICH: Well, other comments?

22 Questions?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER REDLICH: I just have one other
2 question as far as --- this is Carrie Redlich ---
3 as far as the process, because it seems that there
4 have been a number of claims that eventually get
5 to what appears to be a reasonable, final decision,
6 but, you know, they go through multiple appeals.

7 And does the Department sort of maybe
8 review those cases and say, you know, what will
9 we learn from this so that moving forward we could
10 have come up with that decision sooner. Because
11 it's a lot of time and money for each one of these
12 denials and appeals and the like.

13 So, in this case, the hearing
14 representative agreed that the, you know, treating
15 physician had provided a well-rationalized medical
16 opinion, originally, and then agreed that it
17 accepted both claims.

18 So, is there a process where claims have
19 sort of been reviewed and appealed and then
20 eventually accepted to sort of, you know, as sort
21 of a quality control to look and see whether moving
22 forward that could have been avoided.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. LEITON: Well, we have quality
2 control. We have reviews on an annual basis of
3 cases. Some that have been reopened, all final
4 -- or a final decision, samples of final decisions,
5 recommended decisions.

6 So, there's an audit process, but we
7 also have 400 claims examiners around the country
8 and they're all going to make different --- they're
9 not all going to be exactly the same decisions.

10 Individual cases are going to then be
11 -- they're always reviewed by a second reviewer.
12 That's when things are caught sometimes that might
13 not have been caught the first time. Some other
14 reasons for reopening a case might be we got new
15 evidence or something changed in the law. So, it's
16 --- we don't have a system for trying to --- since
17 they're all so case-specific, it's really hard to
18 generalize in that manner.

19 So, we don't have a system like that,
20 but we do --- if things like --- if there are obvious
21 things that a hearing rep will see, oh, and this
22 has been happening more than one time where we can

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 make note of that, we're small enough to be able
2 to do that and bring it to the attention of policy,
3 but a lot of these are just really case-specific.

4 MEMBER REDLICH: So, maybe -- after we
5 finish going through, maybe, if we are able to
6 identify some common themes, then that would be
7 potentially something that could be ---

8 MS. LEITON: You could bring it to our
9 attention.

10 MEMBER REDLICH: Yes.

11 MEMBER BERENJI: Right. I'm sorry,
12 this is Mani Berenji. I just wanted to add on to
13 Dr. Redlich's point.

14 Having some best practices among all
15 the claims examiners, you know, looking at, you
16 know, specific claims with respect to respiratory,
17 with respect to neurologic conditions, I mean, I
18 think this is something that could help educate
19 all the claims examiners.

20 And looking at, you know, cases that
21 were initially denied, but then approved --- I mean,
22 I feel that there are common themes that could

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 potentially be identified in trying to ensure that
2 all these cases are reviewed in a timely manner
3 just to improve efficiency. Thanks.

4 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: I have a COPD denial
5 claim in slide 22 if you want to follow along.
6 I'm going to try to do it a little bit more
7 succinctly.

8 This was a long-term instrument
9 mechanic at X-10 in Oak Ridge. So, an instrument
10 mechanic, 1967 to, at least, 1986. And this was
11 a recent case. Recently --- final decision March
12 2019.

13 So, the occupational health
14 questionnaire lists about 20 different exposures.

15 The SEM identified asbestos as the target toxin
16 of interest.

17 And interestingly, the --- I looked at
18 the SEM for instrument mechanics at X-10 --- X-10
19 is Oak Ridge National Laboratory --- and under ---
20 in the SEM it said asbestos, but it also said cadmium
21 as an exposure --- or potential exposure. And then
22 I looked at the SEM for toxic substances related

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to COPD and it also listed Cadmium. Cadmium oxide.

2 So, there was an agent, which however
3 we feel about it, whether cadmium causes COPD, is
4 listed in the SEM as both being a potential exposure
5 of this job title, instrument mechanic, and linked
6 to COPD.

7 It was never addressed in the claim
8 review. The focus was on asbestos --- by the way,
9 I think asbestos is recurrently the target because
10 the Procedure Manual has some specific guidance
11 on asbestos. And so, it tends to, as a magnet,
12 attract attention even though many of us would think
13 that asbestos is probably the least of the issues
14 with COPD.

15 In any case, this person worked as an
16 instrument mechanic, 1967 to 1986. What that
17 means, is that he had 20 years of exposure as an
18 instrument mechanic.

19 And under the Procedure Manual, in that
20 time period, that's a job listing that is said to
21 have significant asbestos exposure.

22 And by the --- if you look at 34 ---

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 slide 34, page 17, I took an excerpt from the
2 Procedure Manual and it says, COPD --- this is the
3 exposure presumption.

4 20 years of exposure, employed -- this
5 is in item 1, employed in any of the labor categories
6 that are listed on Exhibit 15-3 --- 4-3 or whatever.

7 Instrument mechanics are listed and he had
8 aggregate of 20 years of exposure prior to the end
9 of '86.

10 Now, actually, I'm not recalling all
11 the details. It may be that he --- instrument
12 mechanic wasn't listed. I'd have to check that,
13 but there's a second way in which you can qualify,
14 which is the IH looks at the exposure history.
15 And with the 20 years of significant exposure to
16 asbestos, than that should qualify under this set
17 of presumptions.

18 In any case, the fact is the person did
19 meet these 20 years and the CE sends it to the IH.

20 The IH confirms it, actually, and the IH conclusion
21 on slide 32 was that, quote, it is highly likely
22 that Claimant X, in his capacity as an instrument

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 technician at the X-10 plant, was significantly
2 exposed to asbestos. And then goes on to say that
3 it would have been frequent --- that is to say on
4 a daily basis --- between 1967 to 1986.

5 So, the IH confirms what -- follows the
6 Procedure Manual guidance, returns that to the CE.

7 At that point, that should have been enough to
8 call it --- to accept the claim. They had gone
9 to the IH, the IH, following the Procedure Manual
10 appropriately, kicked it back to the CE with that
11 opinion. The CE instead refers it on to the CMC,
12 and the CMC concludes otherwise that it's not ---
13 it's not connected.

14 So, the errors here, one, was that
15 cadmium was overlooked despite it being in the SEM.

16 And, secondly, that the Procedure Manual guidance
17 followed by the IH, not followed by the CE.

18 And then the CMC, I think, didn't
19 consult the Procedure Manual because, frankly, if
20 he had --- it was an occupational medicine
21 physician. If he had, he would have seen that this
22 person should be accepted under -- specifically

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 under the asbestos guidance.

2 Are there any other denials?

3 Yes, Carrie?

4 MEMBER REDLICH: Yeah. There was one
5 denial that was a secretary at a plant who had also
6 --- it was a denial for COPD. They also had a claim
7 for skin cancer. And it looked like the major
8 concerns were more radiation focus than concerns
9 for COPD. So, I thought it was an appropriate
10 denial.

11 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Thank you.

12 MEMBER DEMENT: Steve, are the
13 references that were included in the IH report the
14 same references that were included in the prior
15 report?

16 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Yes. Yes. Yes.
17 There's a definitely cut-and-paste mode of action
18 on the references.

19 The industrial hygienist is obviously
20 using their own information or their own expertise
21 to make a decision and --- are there any accepted
22 cases that --- Dr. Friedman-Jimenez?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: There is a
2 denial here that's Case No. 22846. And I'm not
3 going to go through it in detail. I don't think
4 it's a particularly illustrative case except for
5 one thing that we've been talking about, and I'd
6 like to raise this formally as an issue.

7 This is the statement --- the recurring
8 statement, and I'll quote, there is no available
9 evidence, i.e., personal or area industrial hygiene
10 monitoring data, to support that, as part of this
11 position after the mid-1990s, his exposures would
12 have exceeded existing regulatory standards.

13 That statement I found so many times
14 in ---

15 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: It's a chorus,
16 actually. It's the chorus.

17 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: I'm sorry?

18 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: It's the chorus.

19 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: Yes. Well,
20 I think it's problematic and it overstates the
21 confidence that we actually have in the nonelevated
22 levels, and I see two problems here.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The first problem is that the frequency
2 and the conditions under which sampling is done
3 --- in other words, area or personal measurements
4 of the toxic substance in the workplace are not
5 --- don't necessarily ensure that this is a
6 representative sample, that it's a good estimate
7 of the day-to-day exposures that that worker is
8 going to experience or has experienced over time.

9 There are not a lot of quantitative
10 samples that are available that have been done.
11 And, John, you know these data probably better than
12 any of us and, please, correct me if I'm wrong on
13 this, but my sense is that there's not a lot of
14 sample size and, also, they're not done necessarily
15 under random timing or conditions or active
16 sampling that would allow us to use those as an
17 estimate of the actual day-to-day exposure. Is
18 that accurate?

19 MEMBER DEMENT: I think that's
20 accurate. I think --- well, the issues you've
21 discussed, I think, are clear.

22 I think that the problem --- and we've

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 discussed this before this morning in here, is that
2 it's a presumption that the IH is making about what
3 the exposures would have been in that time frame
4 without stating his rationale for his decision,
5 really --- his or her decision.

6 And that, you know, judgment comes into
7 play in all of this, but the basis of the judgment
8 needs to be explained in the process of defining
9 what this is. So, the CMC and the CE knows the
10 limits of confidence they can place on the fact
11 of no exposure.

12 The other aspect of this, even for a
13 particular job and location, there aren't likely
14 to ever have been very many samples ever taken.
15 And the one thing that's always problematic is
16 taking a job and inferring an individual's exposure
17 from that job itself because we never know how
18 people actually do work. And how they do work is
19 a big factor sometimes.

20 People doing the same work can have must
21 different exposures. Depends on how they do it.

22 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: Yes, the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 inter-worker variability in the exposure may be
2 substantial.

3 MEMBER DEMENT: Yes.

4 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: So, that's
5 one problem.

6 The second problem I see is that these
7 standards are regulatory standards. These were
8 developed through a scientific and medical and
9 political and financial process for regulation of
10 groups of people.

11 And they were developed with, what I
12 would say, is a fairly obsolete concept of single
13 agent causation --- in other words, how much of
14 the substance does it take to cause the disease?
15 Rather than a more modern and scientifically valid,
16 I think, concept of toxic substance of interest
17 being one of a multiple set of component causes
18 that contribute to the causation -- to a sufficient
19 cause of that disease.

20 And we're understanding, I think, a
21 little better in the last 20 years of epidemiology,
22 how causation works and how the causal mechanisms

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 work.

2 And so --- but most regulations don't
3 reflect that kind of concept of causation. And
4 so, the standards have been set for single agent
5 causation rather than contribution to causation
6 of the disease or aggravation of the disease.

7 And so, they aren't necessarily valid
8 and completely protective standards for that
9 particular disease.

10 So, I think that this phrase, which --- you
11 know, I have nothing against cut-and-paste. I do
12 it all the time. I think it saves time. It's good.

13 But to use it as sort of a pathway of saying that
14 there's no significant exposure, I think, is --
15 it's sloppy sometimes and I think it does the whole
16 process injustice. I think it's not appropriate,
17 and it's pervasive. I've seen it in multiple
18 reports, the same exact
19 wording.

20 I mean, it's -- and I think that we want
21 to strive to be medically and scientifically
22 accurate in this process, and we also want to be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 perceived by both Claimants and the Department of
2 Labor as having a fair and unbiased process. And
3 I think this does a real disservice to both, so
4 I would -- I would recommend that that phrase not
5 be used as a standard phrase.

6 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: But, see, here's the
7 issue. The industrial hygienist doesn't feel
8 comfortable --- I'm thinking the industrial
9 hygienist doesn't feel comfortable with what really
10 went on after '95.

11 They don't really have data before '95
12 to support their points of view, right, by and
13 large, because those data don't exist, but they're
14 comfortable in saying there was some level of
15 exposure. Sometimes very low, could be low, could
16 be moderate.

17 So, they're making their decisions
18 pre-'95 based on --- not on data, but on their
19 knowledge of the facilities, their knowledge of
20 industrial hygiene, their knowledge of what those
21 people do in industry by job title, right? But
22 it's not based on data.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Post-'95 because of DOE Order 440.1
2 when things were supposed to improve, right? Now
3 they no longer feel comfortable using their own
4 industrial hygiene knowledge and are --- want data
5 which don't exist.

6 So, what phrase -- what do we think
7 would be an appropriate statement about post-1995
8 exposures? Something like no data, either
9 personal or area monitoring, exists for this job
10 title or for conditions relevant to this individual
11 that shed any light whatsoever on levels of
12 exposure, period.

13 In other words, don't frame it in terms
14 of regulatory levels. Don't suggest that the lack
15 of data means there's lack of exposure. Just say,
16 we don't have any data. Is that the solution?

17 Dr. Dement?

18 MEMBER DEMENT: Well, I think that's
19 the appropriate approach. I mean, the lack of data
20 doesn't mean there's no exposure so ---

21 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Right.

22 MEMBER DEMENT: The way it's phrased

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 now, it suggests there actually is data supporting
2 the fact there's no exposure, and I don't think
3 that's what a hygienist really means.

4 So, yes, I think, you know, a fair
5 presentation of the information would be --- you
6 know, there's no actual exposure information for
7 this particular job site. If they want to refer
8 to, you know, when standards came into place and
9 some published literature about how exposures
10 dropped after implementation of standards, that's
11 fine, but don't make it a statement of fact when
12 it's really not there with the supporting data.

13 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: I think
14 saying, no data, is somewhat overstating the case,
15 also, because they're not clouds of dust visible
16 in the air. That's data, that you can actually
17 not see the dust.

18 But there are not sufficient data to
19 make a reasonable estimate of what --- a
20 representative estimate, of what the exposures were
21 from day to day, and I think we should be honest
22 about that because we just don't know. And to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 suggest that we do know that they were low, I think,
2 is overstating it.

3 MEMBER DEMENT: Yes. I don't have a
4 problem with saying, you know, conditions approved
5 after 1995 with implementation of this thing that
6 DOE cites. I mean, that's perfectly fine.

7 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: Sure.

8 MEMBER DEMENT: And we know there's ---
9 you know, things don't happen overnight and changes
10 take time, so ---

11 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: You know, I ---

12 MEMBER DEMENT: -- present it as it is.

13 MEMBER POPE: I think by stating
14 there's no data, though, just means that this claim
15 is even more so denied when you say that there is
16 no data to support your claim of your illness.

17 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: I agree. I think
18 some CMCs are going to interpret no data, well ---

19 MEMBER POPE: No data, you know, no
20 help.

21 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Dr.
22 Friedman-Jimenez?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: I think
2 there may not be area or personal monitoring, but
3 the data that are used are from published,
4 peer-reviewed research that has done studies and
5 found either a disease correlates or actually done
6 air measurements in other settings.

7 So, I think there are --- there is some
8 information available and I think the industrial
9 hygienist can interpret that information, but we
10 should be honest that this is an opinion of the
11 industrial hygienist based on published studies
12 of other populations or whatever it's based on,
13 but this particular wording I find potentially
14 misleading and potentially biased, and it's
15 perceived by most of us as being boilerplate that's
16 not appropriate.

17 MEMBER POPE: I think it's kind of one
18 in the same. Low -- referring to it as low doses
19 or no data means denial, to me.

20 If you're saying your doses are low and
21 environmental --- how they state it, means that
22 there's no data --- it would mean the same thing,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to me, as saying there's no data available.

2 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: I mean, you know,
3 much of this activity is for the CMC. The CMC is
4 going to look at post-'95 and say, I've got no basis
5 on which to say there was any significant exposure,
6 so I'm going to rule it out. When the fact is we
7 don't know what happened, right?

8 Dr. Silver?

9 MEMBER SILVER: Two things. Correct
10 me if I'm wrong, but you have other faculties you
11 can draw upon. The natural history of the disease
12 is sometimes known from other case reports or case
13 series, and sometimes there's a prodromal syndrome
14 that's followed later by the onset of symptoms and
15 it appears classically in persons of a certain age,
16 after a certain duration of time in a profession.

17 Wouldn't a CMC who was drawing upon
18 everything they learned in school, be able to infer
19 causation even without quantitative industrial
20 hygiene data, in some cases?

21 MEMBER BERENJI: Not necessarily. I
22 mean, among my own colleagues, and I'm sure my

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 occupational medicine friends here can opine to
2 this as well, I mean, it runs the full gamut.

3 I mean, some of my colleagues are very
4 black and white. And obviously to be able to do
5 this type of analysis, you have to look at nuance.

6 And with these cases, there is a lot of nuance
7 and, again, this begs the question --- and I
8 apologize for my ignorance on this front, but at
9 least for the CMCs to be able to do this type of
10 work, there needs to be some sort of guidance
11 document with the, you know, understanding that
12 a lot of times there will not be a sufficient amount
13 of quantitative evidence to be able to make a direct
14 connection.

15 And I think we have to be able to, you
16 know, make sure that the CMCs are given some sort
17 of, you know, didactic -- a guidance document, at
18 least some sort of basic understanding of the work
19 that they're getting into with the understanding
20 that there may not necessarily be, you know, a
21 slam-dunk connection.

22 Otherwise, I feel that this is just

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 going to keep repeating itself. We're going to
2 keep having these conversations. We're going to
3 keep meeting at this table. We're going to see
4 the same pattern.

5 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Comments?
6 Questions?

7 MEMBER BERENJI: Do we have time to
8 discuss one more approval or ---

9 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Sure. And then
10 we'll take a break.

11 MEMBER BERENJI: Okay. So, I actually
12 had a case that was approved, and I thought this
13 was a very good case because, at least from my
14 perspective, everything was done right.

15 So, let me just go ahead and provide
16 the case ID. Last four digits, 2509. Date of
17 birth, 1930.

18 So, this was an individual who was
19 working as an installer for telephone lines. And
20 he worked at two different plants.

21 One was at the Portsmouth GDP, and one
22 was at the GTE -- which I don't know what that stands

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for, but these are two different sites in Ohio.
2 And he worked -- at least his work experience was
3 from 1953 to 1992. So, that's over 40-plus years
4 of cumulative exposures.

5 So, I felt that this case was evaluated
6 right because a lot of things were done
7 systematically, which I thought that was a good
8 thing.

9 The occupational health questionnaire,
10 I felt that, you know, there was a lot of good text,
11 lot of good pretext information. The SEM did cover
12 a lot of different exposures, including asbestos,
13 cement, arsenic, chromium, silica. And, again,
14 it's not necessarily covering all the potential
15 exposures, but I thought at least compared to the
16 other cases I reviewed, there was a greater capture
17 of exposures.

18 And then I'm not sure if this is done
19 systematically --- I may have missed how this got
20 done, but there was a connection to the NIOSH
21 radio/epi program. So, I'm not sure how many ---
22 what percentage of the cases are they sent over

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to this particular NIOSH program. I'm not sure
2 if there's any data on that, but they actually did
3 dose reconstruction and they actually did do
4 telephone interview, which I thought was good.

5 So, again, there are cases, at least
6 in this particular instance, where I felt that there
7 was a systematic way of collecting information.
8 The telephone interview, I thought, was
9 appropriate.

10 And this case ended up getting accepted
11 and I actually thought the CMC did a good job on
12 this one, too. The CMC provided the report stating
13 that the claimant had sustained multiple toxic
14 exposures over the decades.

15 And the CMC did actually account for
16 the fact that this individual was a smoker. I
17 forget the number of pack per day, but, again, he
18 had actually, you know, used a well-rationalized
19 argument that, even though it was a confounder,
20 just given his breadth of experiences, 40-plus
21 years at these two different plants, you know, he
22 was actually able to come up with a good consensus

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that the exposures did explain a lot of his
2 pathology.

3 And this individual was applying for
4 not only COPD, by the way, but also for -- looks
5 like he had lung cancer because it looks like
6 there's a lung mass excision. And he also had
7 multiple skin cancers.

8 So, complicated case, lot of different
9 points to cover, but this was actually at least
10 a good example of how incorporating various,
11 different data points from the industrial
12 hygienist, the NIOSH folks --- and I can't belabor
13 this point enough, but actually doing the telephone
14 interview, actually making contact with the
15 claimant, getting the human side of the, kind of,
16 picture, I think, really helps to solidify the case.

17 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Dr. Dement?

18 MEMBER DEMENT: I have a question about
19 the case.

20 Did --- was there chest X-ray or CT data
21 used to support the asbestos exposure in COPD?

22 MEMBER BERENJI: In this particular

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 case?

2 MEMBER DEMENT: Yes.

3 MEMBER BERENJI: I did see a chest
4 X-ray. I don't recall the CT scan, but I'd probably
5 have to go through the file again.

6 MEMBER DEMENT: Yes. I had a similar
7 case and --- it won't take me just a moment. I
8 had a similar case and it was an individual who
9 worked at Fernald, you know, laborer and chemical
10 operator for 10 or 12 years and some other work.
11 But anyway, he had multiple claims --- COPD one
12 of them -- but he also claimed for asbestosis and
13 some skin cancers.

14 Originally, the asbestosis was denied,
15 because he really had pleural changes. And so,
16 that finally was accepted at least for medical
17 monitoring for the pleural changes. And then the
18 COPD came --- case came later and it was actually
19 accepted for COPD, but largely based on the fact
20 that he had chest X-ray changes demonstrating
21 asbestos exposure.

22 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Dr.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Friedman-Jimenez?

2 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: This is very
3 interesting.

4 I didn't look at this case, but could
5 you tell us a little more about the dose
6 reconstruction, what they did and how ---

7 MEMBER BERENJI: I'm going to be
8 honest, I kind of skimmed through the dose
9 reconstruction, but I probably have to go back to
10 do a more detailed analysis.

11 At least based on my initial review,
12 they were actually able to collect various data
13 points to be able to make a consensus as to
14 understanding the exposures that this particular
15 individual had.

16 Again, I wish I could kind of explain
17 more of the nuances. I probably have to get back
18 to you on that.

19 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: This was the
20 asbestos dose that the ---

21 MEMBER BERENJI: I believe this is for
22 asbestos as well as for the arsenic.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: It was for
2 arsenic?

3 MS. LEITON: The dose reconstruction
4 would have been done on the cancers. NIOSH only
5 does dose reconstruction for cancers, and it's only
6 for Part B cases. And so, that had a Part B
7 component and the ---

8 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: Radiation?

9 MS. LEITON: Radiation. Radiation
10 for lung cancer. Just radiation for lung cancer
11 --- or for other cancers.

12 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: (Speaking
13 off mic.)

14 MS. LEITON: No. They don't do the
15 dose reconstructions for ---

16 MEMBER BERENJI: Oh, really? Okay.
17 I thought that was the case for ---

18 MS. LEITON: For any of the Part E
19 conditions, just the cancer for radiation.

20 MEMBER BERENJI: Just for the
21 radiation. Okay. Got it.

22 (Simultaneous speaking.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. LEITON: There would have been a
2 dose reconstruction for skin cancer and lung cancer
3 probably.

4 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: One more minute.
5 Just bear with me for one COPD accept. You'll see
6 why I want to mention this case.

7 Long-term machinist and other job
8 titles, sheet metal laborer at Rocky Flats. This
9 was an accepted COPD case.

10 The various exposures were recognized
11 by the industrial hygienist as being significant,
12 was not sent to the CMC because the claims examiner
13 looked at the personal physician and the former
14 worker program medical reports.

15 The personal physician said the COPD
16 was related to work and identified some exposures,
17 ammonia, asbestos, diesel exhaust, endotoxin, but
18 here's, I think, what was the deciding factor.

19 The former worker program letter, and
20 this is from National Jewish Medical Center, said,
21 quote, in my opinion, it is at least as likely as
22 not that exposure to dust, fumes, gases, vapors

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 during your work at Rocky Flats aggravated,
2 contributed, or caused your diagnosis of COPD.

3 And apparently that won the day, so I
4 want to assure you that there is at least one claims
5 examiner out there who is listening to us.

6 (Laughter.)

7 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Let's take a break.
8 We'll be back at 3:00.

9 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
10 went off the record at 2:48 p.m. and resumed at
11 3:07 p.m.)

12 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: We are going to get
13 started. Let's get started. Okay, we're next
14 going to switch to Parkinson's Disease. And first
15 we'll -- Marek Mikulski will give us a summary of
16 the work that he and the working group have done
17 on this. And then we will discuss claims for
18 Parkinson's-related illnesses.

19 MEMBER MIKULSKI: It did work a few
20 minutes ago. Can everybody hear me? Thank you
21 so very much for this opportunity to speak at
22 today's meeting. I wanted to give you a brief

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 update on Parkinsonism and Parkinson's Disease as
2 it relates to the request the Board has received
3 from the Department of Labor. Let me start with
4 some clarifications in terms of terminology that
5 we're going to be using today here during the
6 presentation.

7 What is Parkinsonism? Parkinsonism is
8 actually a generic term that is used to describe
9 a group of clinical motor symptoms that include
10 slowness of movement, stiffness and tightness of
11 the limbs, and involuntary shaking movements that
12 are most commonly present in the upper limbs,
13 specifically in the hands and often described as
14 pill-rolling.

15 Parkinson's Disease is actually the
16 most common cause of all Parkinsonism cases in this
17 country. It is estimated that up to over 2/3 of
18 all Parkinsonism cases are the cases of Parkinson's
19 Disease with some genetic factors that have been
20 identified in the last few years responsible for
21 an early onset of the disease under the age of 50.

22 By rough estimates, these add up to roughly 10

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 percent of all Parkinson's Disease cases.

2 There's a whole spectrum of known agent
3 exposures in diseases that present with clinical
4 symptoms of Parkinsonism. And these include
5 response to anti-psychotic and anti-anxiety
6 medications, infectious agents, metabolic
7 disorders, brain injury, as well as some
8 occupational exposures. Studies have also
9 identified cases of Parkinson-mimicking disorders
10 that mimic the clinical symptomatology of the
11 disease. However lack the response to the current
12 available treatment.

13 From a pathologist standpoint,
14 Parkinsonism is actually a very diverse group of
15 symptoms. It is believed that the hallmark of the
16 disease is the loss of dopaminergic neurons in the
17 part of mid-brain called substantia nigra. This
18 loss of neurons leads to a reduction in levels of
19 dopamine, which is the main chemical
20 neurotransmitter in the dopaminergic system that
21 amongst all controls reward seeking fine muscle
22 movements, as well as addictions. A few in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 last years of research on the molecular level has
2 identified two potential mechanisms involving
3 abnormal accumulation of proteins,
4 alpha-synucleins and tau-proteins that are now
5 believed to be responsible for most of the
6 Parkinsonism and Parkinson's Disease cases.

7 According to the most recent tenth
8 revision of the medical classification list by the
9 WHO, Parkinsonism and Parkinson's disease are
10 actually coded under the same medical diagnosis
11 code. The difference is beginning with coding of
12 known secondary causes of Parkinsonism. This
13 ICD-10 is somewhat similar to a previous coding
14 list, ICD-9 except for major differences in
15 recently identified causes of Parkinsonism.

16 Under the previously accepted and used
17 Parkinson's Disease Society brain bank, diagnostic
18 criteria for Parkinson's Disease, Parkinson's
19 Disease is actually a diagnosis of exclusion which
20 is supported by the response to the dopamine
21 replacement therapy. These diagnostic criteria
22 were put in place in late 80s originally for years

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in the pathology series studies. But they have
2 been subsequently adopted by the clinical
3 community, as well as research community. These
4 criterias have been widely used in epidemiologic
5 studies that look at rates and potential risk
6 factors of Parkinson's Disease.

7 The new diagnostic system has been
8 introduced just a few years ago by the International
9 Parkinson and Movement Disorder Society. And it
10 is somewhat similar to the old system as it requires
11 a diagnosis of Parkinsonism first, which is now
12 supported by the Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating
13 Scale. And has been designed to help the physician
14 assess both motor and non-motor symptoms associated
15 with Parkinson's Disease. This new system also
16 introduces two levels of certainty, which are the
17 clinically established diagnosis of Parkinson's
18 Disease that maximizes the specificity of these
19 criteria versus the diagnosis of probable
20 Parkinson's Disease that sort of balances between
21 the sensitivity and specificity.

22 Parkinson's Disease as I mentioned

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 before is the most common cause of Parkinsonism,
2 but the exact risk factors are still very poorly
3 understood. Most of the cases are termed
4 idiopathic if no known etiology has been
5 identified. Research studies have focused on
6 identifying personal characteristics that form
7 genetic makeups and markers, but also on exposures
8 that may increase the risk of Parkinson's Disease.

9 Amongst those exposures are exposures that were
10 federally at the DOE side.

11 PCBs have been widely used throughout
12 the mid-70s due to their excellent physical
13 chemical properties. Used in electrical
14 equipment, starting fluids for fabrication of metal
15 weapons parts, and has components of paints,
16 coatings, adhesives, and gaskets. PCB exposure
17 has been shown to result in decrease in dopamine
18 levels in both animal models and experimental cell
19 lines.

20 Higher concentrations of PCBs have also
21 been found in pathology series of individuals with
22 Parkinson's Disease as compared to controls. And

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a population-based study of mortality experience
2 of workers from three electrical components plants
3 has shown an almost threefold increase in mortality
4 from Parkinson's Disease as an underlying cause
5 of death amongst highly exposed female workers from
6 three electrical capacitor producing plants. This
7 finding was later confirmed in another pathology
8 series that showed marked differences between the
9 concentrations of PCBs in brain tissue of female
10 subjects as compared to controls.

11 MEMBER BERENJI: I'm sorry. Can I ask
12 a question?

13 MEMBER MIKULSKI: Sure.

14 MEMBER BERENJI: Can you back to the
15 previous slide please? So I wasn't sure if you
16 went through that last bullet about the dose
17 reconstruction feasibility study.

18 MEMBER MIKULSKI: Yes. This is part
19 of the Oak Ridge Reservation health study that was
20 primarily conducted to reconstruct the radiation
21 dose and PCBs have been identified as persisting
22 in the environment with potential sources of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 exposure -- historical exposures in all those
2 processes.

3 MEMBER BERENJI: Is this published or
4 is this just based on --

5 MEMBER MIKULSKI: This is available as
6 public information. There is no publication as
7 far as I know. But this can be found and I can
8 provide you with references for the initial
9 preliminary reports.

10 MEMBER BERENJI: Thank you.

11 MEMBER MIKULSKI: Solvents. Solvents
12 have been extensively used throughout the industry,
13 as well as the Department of Energy complexes
14 primarily as degreasing agents in cleaning parts,
15 machining equipment and in paint thinners. Most
16 commonly solvents used at the DOE complex include
17 the trichloroethylene, toluene, acetone, hexane,
18 and carbon disulfide, which has been previously
19 addressed as potential risk factors for
20 Parkinsonism in the DOL procedure manual.

21 The majority of the population-based
22 studies to date have not looked at individual --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the effects of individual -- exposure to individual
2 solvents. They were mostly presented as single
3 entity, rather than any specific exposures.

4 There are a few cluster reports to date.

5 Clusters of Parkinson Disease that present on
6 Doppler evidence of increased risk of Parkinson
7 Disease in those highly exposed to TCE. TCE --
8 Oh, I'm sorry. TCE exposure has also been shown
9 in animal models to result in loss of dopaminergic
10 neurons and reductions in the levels of dopamine.

11 A 2012 research from UCS and
12 Parkinson's Institute in California has shown that
13 every exposure to trichloroethylene on at least
14 one hour per week basis may result in sixfold
15 increase in risk of Parkinson's Disease when
16 compared to non-exposed control. And this last
17 study was part of a -- of a World War II Veteran
18 National Academy of Sciences twin study that has
19 been going on since the 1960s. This study was
20 particularly important as it offered advantages
21 in adjusting for different genetic makeup between
22 the individuals exposed to solvents.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Metals have been widely used throughout
2 the whole industry, but the most prevalent, the
3 most common exposures at the DOE complex would have
4 been through metal fumes or metal dusts generated
5 during welding or machining operations. Welders
6 have been at particular risk for exposures to a
7 spectrum of metals in welding fumes including
8 manganese that has been looked as a risk factor
9 for Parkinsonism. And have been addressed in
10 multiple epidemiologic studies before.

11 An increased risk are iron and copper.
12 Let me start with those two. Iron and copper
13 exposures have been found -- have been linked to
14 reduction in dopamine levels in animal models.
15 In a study from 1997 and 1999, an increased risk
16 of Parkinson's Disease has been found among workers
17 with 20 plus years of occupational exposures to
18 copper and iron/copper combinations.

19 Finally pesticides. There's been a
20 lot of research interest in pesticide -- in effects
21 of pesticide exposures and the increased risk of
22 Parkinson's Disease amongst the farmers and in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 general, in agricultural industry. Pesticides use
2 was not that common at the DOE complex. However,
3 there was a potential for bystander exposure as
4 multiple sites have had farming operations going
5 on during their normal production.

6 There's several classes of pesticides
7 including insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides
8 have been again linked to reductions in dopamine
9 levels in experimental cell lines, as well as in
10 animal models. Significantly higher
11 concentrations of organochlorides, a class of
12 insecticides have been found alongside the PCBs
13 and brain tissue of patients diagnosed with
14 Parkinson's Disease when compared to non-disease
15 controls. In pooled data analysis -- in
16 meta-analysis studies, the risk for Parkinson's
17 Disease has been shown to be elevated for two
18 classes of pesticides; for insecticides and
19 herbicides, as compared to those never exposed.

20 I wanted to finish here and open the
21 floor for discussion, questions.

22 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Thank you, Marek.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 That was great. So perhaps for the benefit of some
2 of the non-physicians in the room, we should just
3 say that there is no particular -- you may have
4 covered this, but maybe I missed it. There's no
5 blood test. There's no urine test. There's no
6 radiology study. There's no way of making the
7 diagnosis while persons -- of Parkinson-related
8 disorders -- while the person's alive, except for
9 the clinical diagnosis. Meaning listening to the
10 patient, doing a physical examination, and seeing
11 how they respond to therapy. Is that right?

12 MEMBER MIKULSKI: That's correct.
13 There are however several clinical tests that have
14 shown an association with Parkinson's Disease.
15 One of them being the loss of sense of smell has
16 been shown to be present in over 95 percent of every
17 case of Parkinson's Disease.

18 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: So that means that
19 reasonable doctors can disagree about the
20 diagnosis, particularly when it's relatively early
21 in the course.

22 MEMBER MIKULSKI: That's correct.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Are primary care
2 clinicians able to make the diagnosis of
3 Parkinson's Disease with reasonable accuracy?

4 MEMBER MIKULSKI: It has been shown
5 that the clinical accuracy is the highest among
6 specialists in movement disorders. Primary care
7 physicians are probably lacking the proper
8 training. And possibly these guidelines that have
9 just been issued have not been updated on the most
10 recent state of knowledge.

11 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: So Ms. Leiton, can
12 I ask you because you know, we looked at a limited
13 number of -- we're going to discuss those claims,
14 but I'm sure the causation is a question. But is
15 the question of the diagnosis of -- you know, the
16 claims examiner is sitting there looking at medical
17 records making some effort to decide whether to
18 accept the medical diagnosis of Parkinson's
19 Disease. Has that been a problem?

20 MS. LEITON: Yes. Part of the problem
21 is that it's been called different things. And
22 so we have certain presumptions in the procedure

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 manual. I think it's for Parkinsonism or
2 Parkinson's Disease. They don't know whether
3 they're synonymous. And then there's, I think one
4 other term that is used for Parkinsonism. And it
5 gets a little confusing for us. That's part of
6 the reason we wanted you guys to kind of help clarify
7 that for us.

8 I did have a question. You said a
9 specialist in movement, what would that mean for
10 us if we were going to try to, you know, look for
11 a specialist who actually would need to help clarify
12 this? Because, would it be a neurologist?

13 MEMBER MIKULSKI: It would be a
14 neurologist with training, especially in these last
15 --

16 MS. LEITON: Wow --

17 MEMBER MIKULSKI: -- most recent
18 guidelines at this point.

19 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: But Parkinson's
20 Disease is bread and butter for the average
21 neurologist. Right?

22 MEMBER MIKULSKI: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER REDLICH: My father died of
2 Parkinson's, so I think anyone who's had a relative
3 is going to be more knowledgeable about this
4 disease. There are some cases that are very
5 classic in presentation with the various --

6 FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Your mic.

7 MEMBER REDLICH: Oh, I'm sorry. I was
8 just saying that just having a relative who passed
9 away from Parkinson's, I became much more familiar
10 with the disease even though I'm not a neurologist.

11 There's just a wide spectrum of presentations in
12 the realm of different movement disorders. And
13 there's some cases that are sort of quite classic.

14 And then there are others that there's an overlap
15 that may take a neurologist years to diagnose.
16 So it's really more I think a spectrum of diseases.

17 So I'm not surprised that it's challenging to
18 diagnose. Challenging enough that I told Steve,
19 could he please review my Parkinson's cases.

20 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Thank you. Dr.
21 Silver?

22 MEMBER SILVER: A non-physician with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a maybe simplistic question. So if a worker has
2 the three categories of motor symptoms, but their
3 condition does not improve with drug therapy,
4 Levodopa, does that tilt in favor of xenobiotic
5 exposure causing the movement disorders?

6 MEMBER MIKULSKI: Possibly. I don't
7 think that this would be -- in favor of diagnosing
8 Parkinson's Disease, but definitely some other
9 secondary agents.

10 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: And that would be
11 categorized as Parkinsonism.

12 MEMBER MIKULSKI: As a secondary
13 Parkinsonism panel.

14 MEMBER SILVER: Thank you.

15 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Dr.
16 Friedman-Jimenez?

17 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: How strong
18 is the evidence for PCBs? I noticed that you had
19 the PCB slide, the Chorigon study. The numbers
20 were the same for the PCBs and for the
21 organochlorines. Is that for PCBs? And how
22 strong a study is that because there were small

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 numbers.

2 MEMBER MIKULSKI: That was actually a
3 pathology series that was a very small case -- a
4 very small study. I believe roughly between ten
5 and 20 cases. And those were actually identified
6 parallel and parallel. So PCBs and
7 organochlorines in the brain tissues and of the
8 same cases of Parkinson's Disease.

9 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: I wasn't
10 able to tell how strong it was from the numbers
11 that you had. The second numbers in the
12 parentheses, were those tissue levels?

13 MEMBER MIKULSKI: There were no tissue
14 levels.

15 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: What was
16 that 70 to 85 versus 50 to 72?

17 MEMBER MIKULSKI: Those were the age
18 ranges.

19 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: Oh, those
20 were the age ranges. Okay.

21 MEMBER MIKULSKI: And the ratio of male
22 to female subjects. They have had -- They've

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 extended the age range to include younger controls
2 as well. The cases of age of death was anywhere
3 between 70 and mid-80s as I recall. But for the
4 controls, they used several subjects younger than
5 that.

6 MEMBER BERENJI: I have a question --
7 I'm sorry.

8 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Yes, Dr. Berenji.

9 MEMBER BERENJI: Do you have any data
10 about the use of imaging, specifically PET imaging
11 to be able to diagnose early signs of Parkinson's?
12 Because I know the data has been equivocal, but
13 I wasn't sure if you had any specific information
14 on that.

15 MEMBER MIKULSKI: I have not come
16 across any of this.

17 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Dr.
18 Friedman-Jimenez?

19 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: Another
20 question on manganism. Okay, that's the Parkinson
21 presentation due to manganese. And I've read
22 studies that have found imaging changes in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 globus pallidus on MRI that aren't found in
2 Parkinson's Disease. What's your -- What have you
3 found on that? Is there anything new on that or
4 any developments in imaging that can distinguish
5 manganese from primary Parkinson's Disease?

6 MEMBER MIKULSKI: I honestly have not
7 looked at the effects of manganese specifically.
8 We assume that since this is also covered under
9 the cards on files and we're not going to do any
10 more research in that area. But certainly this
11 is something to look into in the future. Manganese
12 is a very controversial exposure, at least to say
13 some studies have found a correlation where some
14 others have not. So this is definitely something
15 to be cautious about and possibly look into it in
16 the future.

17 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: But the DOL approach
18 to this class of disorders is to -- if I understand
19 the procedure manual correctly is to include all
20 the relevant ones with the ICD codes that contain
21 Parkinson as being equivalent. So they don't carve
22 out manganese as a separate diagnosis. If at all,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 they're erring on the side of being inclusive --
2 very inclusive in at least the way the procedure
3 manual reads.

4 You know the -- I'm having -- I can't
5 -- I'm having a hard time imagining a CMC second
6 guessing the diagnosis of a primary care physician
7 of Parkinson's Disease. A neurologist, that's easy
8 because the neurologist is the expert. The primary
9 care physician has fairly frequent contact with
10 Parkinson's Disease because it's fairly common.
11 They may or may not be correct in the diagnosis.
12 But I'm trying to imagine a CMC doing a paper review
13 being more correct than the primary care doctor
14 who's seeing the patient for this condition. So
15 I'm wondering if you -- what your view of that
16 because you've been thinking more about this than
17 I have.

18 MEMBER MIKULSKI: I think it all
19 depends on the level of expertise of CMC. Most
20 CMC probably -- most CMCs probably have not had
21 that level of expertise to be able to question the
22 neurological degenerative disorders. I'd

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 probably caution against using a CMCs opinion as
2 a cardinal or final opinion in making this
3 diagnosis, especially where there is evidence of
4 medical deficits presented and diagnosed by the
5 primary care physician who honestly at this point
6 may not be using the most recent classification
7 as this is so recent. And still operating under
8 the old guidelines, which are perfectly fine in
9 terms of clinical accuracy.

10 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Well these
11 guidelines that you went over, the new ones, these
12 are very complicated for the clinician because you
13 have to have certain positive findings. You can't
14 have -- certain findings absolutely rule it out.

15 Other findings serve as red flags and argue against
16 it. It's --

17 MEMBER MIKULSKI: And another
18 complicating factor here is that these are
19 guidelines formulate by the organization that's
20 specifically interested in erring on the side of
21 diagnosing Parkinson's Disease. As an example,
22 this unified scale of Parkinson's is a scale that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 helps assess the both motor and non-motor symptoms
2 of Parkinson's Disease is something that you
3 actually have to purchase before you can start using
4 it. Which sort of shows the direction that this
5 may be going on in terms of clinical diagnosis.

6 I don't know how well will this be
7 adopted in the future. There's really no say.
8 There are validity studies. Studies that look at
9 the external validity of the scale versus the old
10 scale and compared to the gold standards of
11 diagnosis being the pathology series. But I think
12 it's really too early to sort of limit yourself
13 to this -- to this particular one set of criteria
14 that are now being recommended by an organization
15 that is vitally interested in the -- in the
16 potential outcome.

17 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Any other comments
18 or questions? Otherwise, we'll move to reviewing
19 the claims for Parkinson's Disease and we can
20 reiterate the same discussion. Yes, Dr. Silver?

21 MEMBER SILVER: It may be an
22 oversimplification, but for our population of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 former workers 70 to 80 years old this 2x2 table
2 is jelling in mind. One row is Parkinson's
3 Disease. The other is secondary Parkinsonism.
4 And the columns are yes job exposures, no job
5 exposures. So Parkinson's Disease could be caused
6 by job exposures.

7 MEMBER MIKULSKI: Exactly.

8 MEMBER SILVER: All right? But a lot
9 of it is idiopathic. And then the lower row of
10 the table, Parkinsonism similarly it could be
11 caused by job exposures or maybe drugs, metabolic
12 disorders --

13 MEMBER MIKULSKI: Exactly.

14 MEMBER SILVER: -- and infections.

15 MEMBER MAHS: Anything that can be
16 explained.

17 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: All right. So let's
18 discuss some Parkinson's-related claims. Anybody
19 want to start?

20 MEMBER MAHS: Are these accepted or
21 denied?

22 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Oh yes, sure. We

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 can go with either.

2 MEMBER MAHS: Well since we're here,
3 I've got one on Savannah River that's denied --

4 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Oh, hit the mic.

5 MEMBER MAHS: Since we're here, I have
6 one at Savannah River that was denied. It was a
7 laborist. Worked there a little a little over ten
8 years. Works labor as an inspector. And I'm kind
9 of -- anyhow, she was denied on October 19th. They
10 had her appeal. They denied her claim for
11 Parkinson's Disease and pulmonary fibrosis. Final
12 decision notably does not discuss the testimony
13 provided during the previous hearing in October
14 from her and co-worker concerning the kinds of
15 exposure to toxic substances she experienced at
16 SRS. Further states that after this evidence was
17 submitted, the District Office undertook
18 development of the claim by searching the SEM for
19 potential exposures.

20 District Office determined at a search
21 in December revealed that a Labor, DI mechanic,
22 and Quality Inspector had potential for exposure

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to aluminum, bronze, microtalc, antimony hydride,
2 silica gel, and synthetic vitreous fibers. In
3 December, revealed certain potential exposures to
4 carbon monoxide and stainless steel, which are
5 associated with Parkinson's Disease.

6 The final decision states these
7 potential exposures were referred to an industrial
8 hygienist to evaluate the nature. He opined that
9 there was significantly exposed to stainless steel.

10 It was highly unlikely that she was exposed to
11 carbon monoxide at a level specified in the
12 procedure manual.

13 For discussion, her representative
14 respectfully requested to reconsider the final
15 decision denying her claim which is prematurely
16 and erroneously issued. And the denial of her
17 claim denies due process law as discussed above.
18 Neither her nor her attorney, an authorized
19 representative of record, received the recommended
20 decision. In fact, they were not aware of the
21 recommended decision until they received the final
22 decision. So they had no time to find out what

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the problem was.

2 Failing to give notice of the
3 recommended decision, the Department of Labor
4 failed to properly develop her claim of pulmonary
5 fibrosis. And neither the recommended decision,
6 nor the final decision considered the full extent
7 of exposure related to her employment at Savannah
8 River. She was exposed to including asbestos,
9 aluminum, and other metal dust silicone, dioxide
10 including cement dust, coal dust, loading fumes,
11 exhaust fumes.

12 She had testimony from two different
13 co-workers that she'd worked in the steam plant
14 and was exposed to the coal dust and asbestos and
15 stuff. And it wasn't used in the final
16 recommendation either. The hygiene records from
17 SRS state that as a laborer, she was exposed to
18 cement dust, coal dust, slag, fiberglass, diesel
19 and gasoline exhaust, fumes, asbestos, and coal
20 dust. And that's just about the same thing that
21 the SEM said she could be exposed to.

22 In addition, she ran a jackhammer that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 exposed her to cement dust and diesel exhaust.
2 And again, she was sent to the power house for three
3 years. Her co-workers confirmed it and that
4 testimony was not used, I think I mentioned.

5 However, chronically daily exposure to
6 dust and fumes for more than ten years employment
7 as a labor mechanic. The most prominent hazards
8 at capacity were her exposure to cement, silicon
9 dioxide, coal dust, asbestos, welding fumes, metal
10 dust, aluminum oxide, which she had chronic
11 exposure and likely some instances of acute or heavy
12 exposure.

13 Occupational exposure to the discussed
14 toxin substances was most significant risk factor
15 of her development of pneumoconiosis, however you
16 say that, and resulting pulmonary fibrosis. Also
17 my opinion to a reasonable degree of medical
18 certainly, it's at least as likely as not that her
19 occupational exposure to these hazardous chemicals
20 were possibly responsible.

21 In November 2018, they denied her claim
22 benefit based on Parkinson's Disease, pulmonary

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 fibrosis and the advice of reconsideration request
2 will be assigned to the Jacksonville office. And
3 again, for the reasons stated below, the Department
4 of Energy verified they worked at the plant. On
5 July 6th, 2017, District Office issued a
6 recommended decision to deny your claim under Part
7 E based on a condition of Parkinson's Disease and
8 pulmonary fibrosis because you failed to submit
9 medical evidence, which I just read.

10 On February 9th, 2018, FAB issued a
11 remand order that after you submitted additional
12 medical evidence to support that you were diagnosed
13 with pulmonary fibrosis and Parkinson's Disease.

14 Medical evidence you submitted included medical
15 report, which showed a diagnosis, a CT scan, and
16 reviewed by her MD and showed pulmonary fibrosis
17 -- just repeating itself. And they find that your
18 occupational exposure to airborne particulates,
19 dust fumes including coal, dust, and asbestos
20 caused or contributed to your pulmonary fibrosis.

21 The industrial hygienist on February
22 27th and May 8th of 2018, the potential exposure

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 at Savannah Riverside that you have had to carbon
2 monoxide and stainless steel as an EI mechanic from
3 September 23rd '85 to April '92 to aluminum, bronze,
4 microtalc. And as a laborer from February '85 to
5 September '85 to antimony hydride, silica gel, some
6 synthetic vitreous fibers, metallic as an EI
7 mechanic from September '85 to 30th.

8 He opined that in your job as an EI
9 mechanic you were significantly exposed to
10 stainless steel. Exposure would have been
11 incidental in nature and in passing. Highly
12 unlikely that you were exposed to carbon monoxide
13 at levels specified in the EEOICPA procedure
14 manual. There was no evidence that you were ever
15 rendered unconscious as a result of this exposure
16 to that agent. Do you have to be unconscious to
17 be exposed to carbon monoxide? Pardon?

18 MS. LEITON: It's in our presumption
19 of carbon monoxide.

20 MEMBER MAHS: All right. Anyhow, so
21 in the event that you did ask for an revision because
22 of the problems of things that didn't get turned

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 over or reviewed. And I guess they sent it to the
2 Jacksonville office to see if they're going to
3 review it.

4 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Comments,
5 questions? So do they -- Did they accept the medical
6 diagnosis of Parkinson's disorder and the issue
7 was the exposure?

8 MEMBER MAHS: Yes, well that was her
9 doctor suggesting it was exposure to these fumes.

10 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Right. Her doctor
11 said she had Parkinson's?

12 MEMBER MAHS: Yes.

13 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: But did the DOL
14 claims process accept the medical diagnosis or is
15 that still in contention or was it --

16 MEMBER MAHS: That was another part.
17 He did not submit probative scientific evidence
18 of a fully rationalized medical report showing that
19 your occupational exposure to toxic substance at
20 Savannah Riverside was a significant factor and
21 aggravating, contributing, or causing your
22 pulmonary fibrosis and Parkinson's Disease. And

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 so they deny your claim for benefits based on
2 Parkinson's Disease and pulmonary fibrosis is
3 appropriate. You did not establish that toxic
4 substance exposures was a significant factor in
5 aggravating, contributing to, or causing claimed
6 conditions of Parkinson at least as likely as not.

7 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Okay, thanks.
8 Comments, questions?

9 MEMBER DOMINA: I have a case we can
10 do. It's an accept case. If you still have that
11 handout, if you go to Page 36 or Slide 72. It's
12 not a long case. And it's a chemist actually who
13 worked for 40 years as a chemist at Hanford and
14 PNNL. And was exposed in the IH report to manganese
15 and potassium permanganate at very low to low
16 levels. And the IH concluded that it was highly
17 likely that in his work as a chemist or scientist
18 at Hanford PNNL, he was significantly exposed to
19 multiple toxins, though not after the mid-1990s.

20 He was a chemist for 40 years beginning
21 in the 1960s -- or in actually 1955, so for a long
22 time. And the referral to the CMC was that his

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 exposure to manganese or permanganate as a chemist
2 cause, contribute, or aggravate his Parkinson's
3 disorder -- the disease was accepted -- the medical
4 diagnosis was accepted. That wasn't in contest.

5 It was just the question of exposure.

6 And the CMC said yes, he or she did
7 believe that this person's exposure to manganese
8 permanganate was sufficient. And it was at least
9 as likely as not. And cited some references
10 including several which are specific to Parkinson's
11 Disease and environmental exposures. So a chemist
12 40 years, named exposure to manganese permanganate,
13 recognized by the IH, recognized by the CMC was
14 approved. So that's an example of an approval for
15 Parkinson's.

16 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Yes?

17 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: That was one
18 of the ones you gave me that I looked at also.
19 And I noticed that they also accepted his COPD and
20 his Parkinson's at the same time a few years back.

21 And they deferred his neuropathy and his chronic
22 kidney disease. But also what Dr. Mikulski talked

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 about earlier, he had a loss of smell since 1995
2 in which they denied. And so --

3 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Yes. You're saying
4 that was part of the Parkinson's -- that's an
5 attribute of Parkinson's Disease.

6 MEMBER FRIEDMAN-JIMENEZ: It's a
7 supportive criteria for the diagnosis of
8 Parkinson's according to the most recent --

9 MS. LEITON: This is Rachel and that's
10 part of the reason we need help. Because we don't
11 -- there's not -- That for example is something
12 that we wouldn't have known otherwise. Doctors
13 don't always put it in as a part of Parkinsonism.
14 We've got some of these manganese, carbon monoxide
15 in our procedural manual. But a lot of times they
16 come back and say idiopathic. And you know then
17 -- so those are the jumbles of different issues
18 and problems with he have Parkinsonism, Parkinson's
19 Disease, manganese. All those are kind of jumbled
20 together and they're not as well known. So it's
21 one area of education that would --

22 MEMBER DOMINA: One other thing on that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 case because the guy -- because it showed him from
2 55 to 65 working for GE and there was no records.

3 I mean the case file is 1,415 pages long. And
4 there's no records from 55 to 65 in his case file.

5 And so for me, that's a little bit troubling on
6 some of the things that maybe they denied him on.

7 Because he also talked about working with
8 beryllium and lead basically daily too. And so,
9 because I went back and skimmed through it again
10 when I couldn't find any 55 to 65 records. I
11 thought that was kind of odd.

12 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: And this was kidney
13 disease. And what was the other one you said he
14 was --

15 MEMBER DOMINA: Neuropathy --

16 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Neuropathy.

17 MEMBER DOMINA: -- and his loss of
18 smell, yes.

19 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: I have to confess,
20 I was focusing on Parkinson's.

21 MEMBER DOMINA: Well I know, but see
22 for me it's like you know, these four letter words

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I can work with. And so it's kind of like you know
2 --

3 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: I know. You want to
4 address the whole person. I get that.

5 MEMBER DOMINA: Yes.

6 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Other comments,
7 questions? All right, any other cases? Dr.
8 Dement? Oh yes, of course. Dr. Mikulski.

9 MEMBER MIKULSKI: Yes. So I have a
10 denied case of Parkinson's Disease that looks like
11 it's been in the works for a good decade or so.
12 The Case ID No. is 7158. And this is a 65-year-old
13 gentleman at the time of diagnosis of Parkinson's
14 Disease, now 77, who worked almost 20 years --
15 non-consecutive years as a project engineer and
16 construction engineer at the Portsmouth GDP.

17 His initial claim, he has no family
18 history of Parkinson's Disease. His initial claim
19 was denied based on the lack of medical evidence.

20 Further medical evidence was submitted. The
21 claim was accepted for review. And final decision
22 has been the lack of causation given the lack of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 information -- specific job information and the
2 SEM.

3 It looks like the claim examiner had
4 went to great lengths of trying to identify these
5 exposures, but could not find any information in
6 the DOL resources. Accepted the medical
7 condition; however, did not take into consideration
8 the occupational health questionnaire that
9 specifically listed exposures to solvents, metals,
10 and other substances.

11 Anything else about this claim? There
12 was no referral either to the industrial hygiene
13 or CMC in this case. And the case was basically
14 denied by the FAB decision early, early last year.

15 Hence my series of questions earlier today about
16 the level of decision making in terms of having
17 the CMCs look at the available evidence.

18 MS. LEITON: So for Parkinsonism, we
19 do have that -- In Exhibit 15.4, we have some very
20 specific criteria that we're looking for. And so
21 that might be part of -- so he didn't have evidence
22 of manganese or carbon monoxide or certain

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 substances. You said that we couldn't find much
2 either. That may be why it wasn't referred to an
3 IH. There just wasn't enough to refer or it didn't
4 line up with some of our presumptions. So that's
5 one of the variations you'll find.

6 MS. LEITON: He had a medical diagnosis
7 of Parkinson's Disease from both primary care --
8 his primary care physician, as well as a second
9 opinion from the neurologist as well.

10 MS. LEITON: Right. The disease
11 wasn't in question. It was the causation --

12 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Yes.

13 MS. LEITON: -- and exposure.

14 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: What was his job
15 title?

16 MEMBER MIKULSKI: Project engineer and
17 construction engineer. It looks like there were
18 several phases -- plant operations. Because he
19 worked at -- he first worked during the main
20 operations. Then during remediation, and finally
21 when the plant was -- when the plant was on cold
22 standby. He was not part of the medical

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 screenings, so he didn't have any other records
2 available in terms of employment.

3 But what was really interesting is that
4 his occupational health questionnaire was
5 administered by the Resource Center caseworker.
6 Which my impression from looking at the records,
7 had very little expertise with regards to the
8 specific site. And basically just went over the
9 general categories of exposures and flagged them
10 as he was told.

11 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: What was that case
12 number?

13 MEMBER MIKULSKI: 7158.

14 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: But was there any
15 mention in the SAM analysis or in the occupational
16 health questionnaire of carbon monoxide, any
17 manganese-related -- any steel, any welding, any
18 alloy?

19 MEMBER MIKULSKI: No. The only
20 mention was of exposure to radiation, as well as
21 solvents, metals, gasses.

22 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Because as far as I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 can tell --

2 MEMBER MIKULSKI: It was very general.

3 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: -- the ballpark of
4 relevant exposures as in the procedure manual or
5 in the SEM if you look up Parkinson's, are those
6 the ones I just mentioned; CO, a bunch of alloys,
7 weldings, various steel materials, and various
8 manganese or elements that contain manganese? And
9 if you don't have one of those exposures, then you
10 know, you're not going to qualify because you don't
11 -- because there's no relationship according to
12 -- is the way the system seems to look at it. Dr.
13 Redlich?

14 MEMBER REDLICH: You know, this is
15 quite different than the pulmonary cases where
16 we've -- we have, you know, more -- in pulmonary
17 cases where we know that asbestos causes, you know,
18 asbestos and the diseases and causation have been
19 established. So we're just addressing in an
20 individual whether there's, you know,
21 clarification of the disease and if there's
22 sufficient exposure. So it seems here we first

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 need clarification based on the current literature.

2 And that's what you were trying to do is do we
3 think that any additional categories of exposure
4 should be added to the current list?

5 And I mean the other thing as far as
6 the respiratory diseases, there may be some
7 disagreement about the -- We have some idea in
8 addition to what exposures will cause which
9 diseases. We also have some idea of the magnitude
10 of exposure or a ballpark. You know, how many
11 years? You know, we know beryllium, you need less
12 -- potentially less exposure than, you know,
13 asbestosis.

14 So is there -- Do we have a consensus
15 of whether the current list is adequate and whether
16 --

17 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: For myself, I would
18 say not yet. But we're getting there.

19 MEMBER MIKULSKI: We're working on it.

20 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: But I think there are
21 two issues. One's general causation we're trying
22 to address.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER REDLICH: That's right.

2 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: And the other is
3 specific causation. How well is the system working
4 as it defines relevant exposures? Which is similar
5 to what the COPD claims review was. So I think
6 it's legitimate that --

7 (Simultaneous speaking.)

8 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: -- parallel go to
9 both -- go both ways. Comments, questions on this
10 case? Is there another case? Do you have a case
11 Dr. Dement?

12 MEMBER DEMENT: I have one that's sort
13 of -- Let me do this again. It's sort of
14 interesting.

15 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: What number is it?

16 MEMBER DEMENT: It's 0177.

17 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Okay.

18 MEMBER DEMENT: This is a case of an
19 individual who at the time of his case review was
20 in his mid-70s. Was born in 1940. He had
21 Parkinson's, but several other things that were
22 filed for; hearing loss, some skin cancers, a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 thyroid nodule, a lung nodule. And his work
2 history wasn't watched well. He was a pipefitter
3 welder. And that seemed to be well-established.
4 The timeframe, some of it in the early 70s. And
5 then again in the mid-90s. And then a period of
6 '91 to '98, so inclusive.

7 There was some question. Again his
8 work history, whether or not he had more exposure
9 at Oak Ridge. His OHQ was to work in both X10 and
10 occasionally E5. So but that didn't -- the request
11 for records didn't verify that exposure. But
12 nonetheless, there was a question about it. So he
13 had a long experience of being a pipe fitter/welder.

14 Some of which was at Oak Ridge. Some question
15 about how much time. I think they allotted about
16 eight years.

17 So the diagnosis of Parkinson's was
18 accepted and that was from the treating doctor.
19 The SEM was consulted. And the exposures that the
20 SEM identified of course were the things that Steven
21 just spoke of. And those were carbon and stainless
22 steel, as well as welding. And specifically use

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of manganese growing rods. So that was sent to
2 the IH. He reviewed it and said that he concurred
3 that there would have been exposure to carbon and
4 stainless steel, as well as welding fumes and dust
5 during his work history. He saw the same phrase
6 that we've heard all along with regard to regulatory
7 standards after the mid-90s. So that was per the
8 intake -- the review. It didn't really address
9 the welding and rod issue, which I wondered why.

10 It seems like he should have addressed his use
11 of the welding rod with magnesium. The OHQ listed
12 some other metals, specifically lead and mercury.

13 That weren't addressed in the IH assessment or
14 given to the IH for assessment.

15 So the claim was actually -- was denied.

16 And the CMCs review of it, he accepted the fact
17 that Parkinson's was diagnosed. Then he opines
18 that it's only linked to high sustained exposures
19 to manganese in particular. And he stated that
20 seven year of work is a relative short duration.

21 And the estimated baseline from low to moderate
22 levels of exposure is not a high dose associated

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 with the development of Parkinson's.

2 So here we have a situation where in
3 my view, you have a long-term pipefitter welder.
4 Okay, he has those exposures; some of which are
5 at the DOE side. He would be a case that I think
6 if you were to look at his total work history and
7 review it, you would say yes. When you start
8 separating apart and trying to allocate only a piece
9 of it to the DOE side, then this seems like they're
10 falling apart based on the CMCs review. In my
11 opinion, if I were reviewing this case, I think
12 I would just say his Parkinson's Disease is likely
13 caused by his exposures to these materials. And
14 the DOE side exposures contributed to that outcome.

15 Comments?

16 MEMBER POPE: And that was an accepted?

17 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Denied.

18 MEMBER POPE: It was denied?

19 MEMBER BERENJI: I actually had this
20 case as well. And I just wanted to reiterate what
21 Dr. Dement just mentioned. At least from my
22 perspective, I mean I deal with this in my clinical

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 practice where you're dealing with a particular
2 individual who's, you know, coming in, claiming
3 that he or she had this exposure while working at
4 this particular employer site. But if you take
5 a full comprehensive occupational history, it turns
6 out that they worked at various different locations
7 over a period of decades. So at least in this case,
8 I know he was working at this particular location
9 1970 to 1973.

10 I might have missed this. I'm not sure
11 if John may have gotten this. But it would be
12 interesting to be able to parse out what exactly
13 he was doing in those three particular years.

14 MEMBER DEMENT: I believe in those
15 years he was in the same job category; pipefitter
16 welder. He actually spent a lot of time in the
17 fab shop doing a lot of welding.

18 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Right, so at least
19 if -- I'm not sure if that may have made it to this
20 statement of accepted facts or at least made it
21 to the questionnaire, I mean if there's a way where
22 there could be kind of you know, brought up to the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CEs attention, I felt that, that could have helped
2 at least to make a better case for this particular
3 claimant.

4 MEMBER REDLICH: Yes, during that
5 timeframe in particular -- and I think Kirk has
6 pointed out an important point. You weld. You have
7 a variety of different materials that you weld.
8 The base materials, as well as the welding rods
9 that you use, which contribute to the exposure.
10 Then you turn around and you grind the weld off
11 when you get it down to make it nice and smooth
12 and clean. So there's lot of different exposures,
13 rather than just the welding fumes itself.

14 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: This is Steve
15 Markowitz. I just want to point out, John, with
16 reference to the welding rods, the SEM under
17 Parkinsonism relates it to a work process which
18 is entitled, "Use manganese-containing welding
19 rods." And lists welding fumes as at least
20 potential exposure to welding fumes as related to
21 Parkinsonism. Comments or questions?

22 MEMBER SILVER: How old was he when the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 disease was diagnosed, do you remember?

2 MEMBER DEMENT: I don't know if I have
3 it recorded on my notes here. I don't seem to have
4 it on my notes.

5 MEMBER BERENJI: I don't have it either
6 but I can look that up.

7 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Okay, thank you.

8 MEMBER POPE: I'm just having a problem
9 trying to distinguish between the one that you had
10 Dr. Markowitz and that was accepted right?

11 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: The chemist?

12 MEMBER POPE: Yes.

13 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: The chemist was --
14 40 years as a chemist, yes.

15 MEMBER POPE: Forty years and the
16 welder. So the cases that I looked at with the
17 Parkinson's, a lot of the welders were coming down
18 with Parkinson's and a lot of those cases were
19 denied. But I had a problem trying to distinguish
20 why that yours was accepted and theirs were denied.

21 MEMBER BERENJI: Again, I think Dr.
22 Dement already mentioned this. But it looks like

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it has to do with the number of years that this
2 particular individual is working at the DOE site.

3 MEMBER DEMENT: Yes, the CMT basically
4 said that the duration/intensity of exposure wasn't
5 enough for him to attribute to the Parkinson's to
6 the DOE site where -- Yes, I did find it --

7 MEMBER POPE: Maybe that's why it was
8 the chemist.

9 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Yes, exactly.

10 MEMBER POPE: Yes, that was my
11 question.

12 MEMBER DEMENT: It was based on his
13 treating doctor. He was symptomatic since about
14 2005. So would have been about 65.

15 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Well I have another
16 accept case that might help. But I don't want to
17 move on to it unless -- Well this can brief --
18 accepted November 2018. And this was a machinist
19 janitor for ten years, machinist for 23 years.
20 And the claims examiner -- Well let me just move
21 straight to the IH report. The IH said highly
22 likely as a machinist to be significantly exposed

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to multiple toxins.

2 And among those toxins, relevant to the
3 issue of Parkinsonism was carbon steel occasional
4 low to moderate, Bonnell occasional low, steel
5 occasional low to moderate. And as machinist 23
6 years. And the CMC said that's enough. That's
7 enough exposure to manganese and copper. I'm not
8 sure where the copper came in exactly, but I think
9 Marek knows. But in any case, they accepted the
10 case. So there's an example of a different job,
11 the machinist, longer term 23 years. Janitor on
12 top of that, but the steel exposure was probably
13 machinist mostly, which was accepted.

14 MEMBER POPE: Now is there any
15 connection between -- because everybody's
16 different, right -- as far as the disease taking
17 a short amount of time to develop opposed to
18 somebody that has been exposed over a long period
19 of time?

20 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Well I think
21 actually, Steve Markowitz -- I think one of the
22 things we need to do is to look at the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 manganese-related and welding-related literature
2 that demonstrates Parkinsonism. And look at
3 duration of people and intensity of exposure --
4 level of exposure to see what levels it's been
5 documented to be related to Parkinsonism. Because
6 that's where you'd be able to tease out what kind
7 of dose you need.

8 Because clearly that's what's going on
9 in these -- you know, assuming they're all acting
10 in -- the various CMCs are acting in sync. It's
11 a big assumption, but they're calculating dose.
12 Right? And based on job title, based on different
13 exposures. And we need to figure out, I guess,
14 and help advise on what are the dose circumstances
15 that are appropriate for compensation.

16 MEMBER MAHS: I've got a short denied
17 and probably rightly so. It was denied twice.
18 A 77-year-old, had been a project engineer. He
19 was denied in 2015 and again in 2018 for basically
20 the same reasons. They didn't provide sufficient
21 medical evidence to show exposure to toxic
22 substance while employed under covered DOE facility

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 was a significant factor. He was diagnosed with
2 Parkinson's in 2007. And again in 2015, a final
3 decision based on submission of medical evidence.

4 None was submitted that establishes a causal
5 relationship between Parkinson's Disease and
6 exposure. The SEM found no potential link between
7 claim Parkinsonism and any toxins at the Portsmouth
8 Gaseous Diffusion Plant.

9 And again on December 17th and January
10 2018, they notified of the evidence required to
11 establish a claim. We had time to come up with
12 more evidence and didn't. In response, they
13 submitted medical evidence that had nothing to do
14 with showing any causal reasons. So they denied
15 the claim again in 2018 for lack of medical
16 evidence. And he was given time to find some.

17 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Mani's got another
18 one. Dr. Berenji?

19 MEMBER BERENJI: Yes. Thank you, Dr.
20 Markowitz. I do have a case. It was actually very
21 interesting because it's gone through multiple
22 iterations over the years. Let me go ahead and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 give you the Case ID, last four 2701, date of birth
2 1943. So this is a gentleman who was initially
3 working as a "cafeteria helper" from 1966 to '68.

4 Then transitioned over to maintenance mechanic.

5 And he was working in that particular function
6 from 1968 through 2000. And he was working at Oak
7 Ridge X-10 was the primary location.

8 So the occupational health
9 questionnaire revealed a lot of exposures including
10 mercury, lead, arsenic. And then there's a
11 question of trichloroethylene. The SEM was done
12 on this case. And again, I have a hard time reading
13 the SEM. I feel like it kind of -- at least from
14 kind of going through these for the first time,
15 it's very hard to delineate all the various
16 subcategories. But at least I felt that there was
17 a discrepancy between the occupational health
18 questionnaire and the SEM.

19 So this gentleman had the fortune of
20 having an AR, had legal representation, which I
21 think was helpful in this particular instance. And
22 actually had the benefit of having not one, but

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 two very good neurologists, at least with respect
2 to the particular diseases in question.

3 So just to make sure I got the
4 chronology correct. He actually applied for
5 multiple diseases including Parkinson's,
6 neuropathy, hearing loss, restless leg syndrome,
7 insomnia, hypertension. And it's actually
8 interesting that he recently filed for ALS in 2018.

9 And at least based on my review, it looks like
10 there's been a deferred decision on the ALS
11 component of his claim as of March 15th of 2019.

12 So I actually -- again from a clinical
13 perspective, I felt that the records in this case
14 were very well done. Because I felt that there
15 was actually good treating physician notes. From
16 my perspective, it's excellent to have those
17 resources to really gain a sense as to what this
18 particular individual was exposed to.

19 So the first neurologist who was
20 assessing this claimant was really evaluating him
21 for peripheral neuropathy. And I believe this was
22 diagnosed in the early 2000s, I might be mistaken,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 but that was the general timeline on that front.

2 And he had been seeing this particular claimant
3 for a number of years. And he was really -- you
4 know, he did a full work-up and was able to do the
5 EMGs and all the respective testing.

6 He then transitioned on to a different
7 neurologist in the mid 2000 teens. And this
8 particular neurologist did an excellent job. He
9 really took the SEM but took it to the next level
10 by correlating with the claimant's clinical
11 manifestations. And he actually made great
12 references. He was able to do an extensive
13 literature review. And he actually put those
14 references in his clinical notes.

15 So to me, this guy is the gold standard
16 when it comes clinical documentation. And I think
17 this guy is somewhere in Tennessee. But I mean
18 this guy --- at least from a neurologic perspective,
19 this guy should set the standard for occupational
20 neuropathy. I feel he did an outstanding job
21 really getting into the nuts and bolts with respect
22 to carbon steel, looking at the PCBs, n-Hexane.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And he was literally able to find, not
2 only animal studies, but human epidemiological
3 studies that were relevant. And that in
4 conjunction with the fact that this individual had
5 legal representation really kind of helped get his
6 Parkinson's approved. Actually this was recently.
7 This was as of March 15th, 2019.

8 The thing that really kind of gets
9 interesting is the fact that now he's filing for
10 ALS. So I actually did a literature review earlier
11 today just to kind of see what number of individuals
12 who are identified as having Parkinson's actually
13 have ALS. And right now, I mean the jury's still
14 out. It's a very, very small percentage of folks
15 who actually have the pathophysiology because with
16 the individuals diagnosed with Parkinson's, they
17 have the Lewy bodies. But with the folks
18 identified as having ALS, they actually have what
19 are called Veny bodies. So essentially all these
20 expensive proteins in their brain that accumulate.

21 So right now, at least based on the most
22 recent EMG that was done, he did have clinical,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 as well as diagnostic evidence of having ALS, as
2 well as Parkinson's. But as of March 15th of 2019,
3 the DOL has essentially put the ALS kind of on a
4 deferred bucket, if you will.

5 So it will be interesting to see what
6 ends up happening at least from the ALS perspective.

7 I'm sure the neurologist is going to provide some
8 excellent resources and evidence. But I feel like
9 this case is very interesting because there's so
10 many different layers to this individual's
11 presentation. And how his pathology has evolved
12 over the years. And combining multiple
13 neurodegenerative diseases really kind of it makes
14 it an interesting case.

15 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Was this case then
16 ever sent to the CMC or did the treating physician's
17 report suffice?

18 MEMBER BERENJI: I believe there was
19 a CMC, but I mean at least from my review, I really
20 honed in on the treating physicians --

21 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Right, right.

22 MEMBER BERENJI: -- because they did

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 such an excellent job. I mean -- again, I can't
2 remember if there was a CMC involved.

3 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Okay, okay. That's
4 fine.

5 MEMBER BERENJI: In this case, the
6 treating physicians did a stellar job.

7 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Comments,
8 questions? Okay, we're going to take a five minute
9 break and we're going to start up at 4:30, public
10 comment. Well probably if it's all right, the
11 public comment period, there aren't that many.
12 How many people, Carrie --

13 Ms. Rhoads: Four.

14 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Four. So it
15 probably won't be all that long. We might consider
16 continuing while we're on this claims review for
17 a little bit, so that we can come to some closure.

18 But we'll decide in a bit. So 4:30, that's seven
19 minutes.

20 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
21 went off the record at 4:22 p.m. and resumed at
22 4:31 p.m.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Okay, if the board
2 members could take their seats.

3 OPERATOR: Welcome and thank you for
4 standing by. I'd like to inform all parties that
5 your lines have been placed on a listen only mode.

6 This call is also being recorded. If you
7 disagree, you may disconnect at this time. I would
8 now like to turn the call over to Dr. Steven
9 Markowitz. Thank you and you may begin.

10 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Sure, thank you.
11 Welcome to the public comment session. We have
12 four people who -- Excuse me -- five people who
13 have requested time to make comments. So let me
14 give you the orders so you know when to expect to
15 be called to the front. We have two people on the
16 phone. But the first will be -- Hold on, don't
17 come up yet. But the first will be Ms. Terrie
18 Barrie. Second will be Faye Vlieger. Third will
19 be Ms. Vina Colley. Fourth will be Ms. D'Lanie
20 Blaze. And fifth will be Ms. Angel Little.

21 So just to remind public commenters,
22 it's not really a back and forth question and answer

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 session. It's really a statement, which we listen
2 carefully to. So welcome, Ms. Barrie. Oh and also
3 I want to say while you're sitting down is please
4 limit your comments to seven to ten minutes.

5 MS. BARRIE: Good evening, everyone;
6 Dr. Markowitz and members of the Board. It's a
7 pleasure to be here again. And to listen to this
8 wonderful conversation and debates about the issues
9 with the program and your ideas on how to fix it.

10 My name is Terrie Barrie and I'm a
11 founder member of the Alliance of Nuclear Worker
12 Advocacy Groups. I want to thank you for this
13 opportunity to address the Board. And more
14 importantly to thank you for the dedicated work
15 you put in to try to improve this program. I
16 emphasize the word "try" because you cannot
17 possibly fulfill your duties mandated by Congress
18 if the Department of Labor does not provide you
19 with the necessary tools and documents you need
20 to do the job.

21 You've asked for a support contractor
22 twice without the response from Department of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Labor. And you know, recently we just learned that
2 the claims that you requested back in December were
3 only provided to you a few weeks ago. I admire
4 you for getting through them so you can have the
5 lively discussion today about the two types of
6 cases.

7 Which reminds me, do you remember the
8 statement that Ms. Rachel Leiton said to you during
9 the April 26, 2016 meeting? You can find that on
10 Page 92 of the transcript. I quote, "I'm actually
11 really looking forward to having a group of people
12 who have worked there; scientists and doctors, to
13 help us with some of these complicated issues."

14 And Ms. Hearthway did the same thing
15 on November 14th, 2018. "I commend all of you,
16 the past Board, for your future service, the new
17 members for tackling this area. It's critically
18 important and is a difficult area. It's an
19 ambitious area. But I thank you for your public
20 service on this." And I feel that too. But I can't
21 help but feel that this is nothing more than lip
22 service. You've asked for contractors to help you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 review the claims, to help you review the SEM, which
2 still needs, you know, some improvement. And they
3 won't provide it for you -- or to you.

4 And then the issue today of not getting
5 the claims that you asked for 4-1/2 months ago.
6 And the other problem I have and why I think it's
7 lip service is you've made excellent
8 recommendations, you know, some of which have been
9 accepted. You know, and I appreciate Department
10 of Labor for doing that. But they're relying on
11 their experts -- their internal experts who as far
12 as we know, do not have the qualifications that
13 you have. Sorry, I mean that's the basic fact.

14 We have well-educated, you know, the
15 PhDs and you know, multiple whatever that word is.

16 I can't think of it offhand. And it just doesn't
17 seem right that they just say well we're going to
18 rely on our experts because they don't agree with
19 you. They do not give you the reasoning behind
20 that, but say our experts don't agree. However,
21 they don't provide you, well here's the science
22 and the medical literature and the studies that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 my expert -- our experts found that disagree with
2 you.

3 And I understand the Department of
4 Labor is practicing due diligence. They should
5 review your recommendations and not just accept
6 them out of hand. That's their responsibility.
7 But they haven't provided the evidence to refute
8 your recommendations and your findings. And I'm
9 sorry, but that's wrong.

10 The Department of Labor requires you
11 to submit, you know, your authorities. They should
12 have the common courtesy to do the same for you.

13 That way it can be an open debate, you know? The
14 NIOSH Board does this. You know, NIOSH doesn't
15 always agree with the Board's contractor and
16 there's a debate. And the Board comes to a
17 consensus and then makes a recommendation to the
18 secretary. Which the secretary normally accepts.

19

20 But there's a debate before that. And
21 I realize that this Board is different than an NIOSH
22 Board, but you're still -- you still operate under

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 FACA. So there is similarities. You have the same
2 purpose, to advise the secretary. It should
3 operate the same way to a degree.

4 I was kind of disappointed that during
5 the teleconference of February 28th, that there
6 was no one on the call from the Department of Labor.

7 You had a simple question. There was nobody there
8 to answer it. I could have answered it. I had
9 it up on my screen. But that's not my
10 responsibility. It's the Department of Labor.
11 They should be attending each and every one of these
12 meetings and they should be communicating with you.

13 It's just that simple. I'm sorry.

14 When they say that we appreciate
15 everything you do, well they need to show it in
16 action. You request materials. If they have an
17 issue with it, they have to come back to you and
18 say what do you mean by this? Why do you need this?

19 And the form is fine, you know, but you can't wait.

20 They're wasting the Board's time and energy.
21 They're wasting tax payers money because the Board
22 cannot get their work done because they're dragging

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 their feet.

2 And I don't understand the idea of past
3 Board. It's nonsense to me. Congress is sitting
4 at the Board until 2024. DOL owes it to the
5 stakeholders and the Board an explanation and legal
6 justification why they can interrupt the Board's
7 work every two years. There's no continuity.
8 Thankfully a lot of you have been reappointed.
9 I appreciate that and you can catch the new members
10 up. But you should have been working all this time
11 unless there was cause. But nobody understands
12 why there was a break in the Board's work. There
13 is no such thing going on with the NIOSH Board.
14 It shouldn't happen here. You all have important
15 work to do.

16 And so please don't get discouraged
17 Board members. It's obvious to us that the
18 Department of Labor is digging in their heels and
19 they're not cooperating as well as they should.
20 I personally think they're being derelict in their
21 responsibilities to the Board for their support.

22 And normally I would call upon DOL to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 improve the relationship with the Board and to
2 attend the Board meetings without a special
3 invitation. And provide resources to the Board
4 when they request it in a timely manner. But I
5 think that request would also fall on deaf ears.
6 If DOL didn't listen to the Board and the hundreds
7 of individuals from the public on the final rules,
8 I doubt they would listen to this request.

9 So instead, I call upon Congress to
10 intervene. I want Congress to investigate this
11 program, tighten or expand the statute as needed.
12 Hearings need to be held. The workers who develop
13 disabling and often fatal diseases in their work
14 to protect their country deserve nothing less.
15 They were exposed to toxic substances without their
16 knowledge and sometimes without proper protection
17 by the DOE contractors.

18 I would like to remind Department of
19 Labor that this compensation program was intended
20 to correct the decades of injustice perpetrated
21 against the workers and their survivors. It must
22 return to the congressional intent. And

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 apparently the only way to get that done is to have
2 Congress involved.

3 And one thing I forgot to mention that
4 was in the body of this. Since Department of Labor
5 has not provided the Board with their citations
6 of scientific studies that they used to reject some
7 of your recommendations, ANWAG will file a Freedom
8 of Information Act request for that. And I also
9 have here some correspondence between Secretary
10 Acosta -- well ANWAG and Secretary Acosta about
11 providing the Board with what they need if anybody
12 would be interested in that.

13 So thank you again. And I appreciate
14 the work. Thank you.

15 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Thank you. Next is
16 Ms. Faye Vlieger.

17 MS. VLIEGER: Good afternoon.

18 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Good afternoon.

19 MS. VLIEGER: Good afternoon.

20 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Good afternoon.

21 MS. VLIEGER: As I introduced myself
22 at the beginning of the meeting today, I am Faye

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Vlieger, a former Member of the Board, and I work
2 as an advocate under EEOICPA.

3 I'm disconcerted about the lack of
4 weight and consideration given to the previous
5 Board's recommendations. I would ask the current
6 Board to add to its agenda tomorrow the re-approval
7 of all of the open recommendations sent to the
8 Department of Labor by the previous Board.

9 I have been instructed that that is
10 allowed and that will ensure that those
11 recommendations are actually looked into and
12 replied to.

13 Of note and discussed earlier today is
14 the Department of Labor's non-adherence to the
15 rescission of Circular 1506, Occupational Toxic
16 Exposure Guidance.

17 The Circular was rescinded on
18 February 2nd, 2017, the Circular 1704. Despite
19 the revision of Circular 1506, the Department of
20 Labor still uses the language of the Circular to
21 deny claims.

22 This either represents the cavalier

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 attitude that the Department of Labor holds for
2 the Board, and the EEOICPA worker claims, or the
3 Department's inability to understand the
4 instructions of the Advisory Board.

5 While I was on the Advisory Board,
6 myself and other Members worked diligently and
7 succinctly to demonstrate that the language of
8 Circular 1506 was not based in fact.

9 To that point, it was shown to the
10 Department of Labor that they were not -- that there
11 were not only toxic exposures after the mid-1990s
12 above regulatory standards, but also that there
13 was no evidence to support the Circular in
14 scientific studies.

15 While I was on the Board, evidence was
16 presented to the Department of Labor that DOE was
17 not consulted in the creation of the Circular.
18 Nor did they provide any input to the Circular's
19 creation.

20 In addition, DOE's own audits of safety
21 and toxic exposure issues from that period of time
22 show that while it was issued, it issued the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Regulation 440.1 to limit toxic exposures on
2 September of 1995, it was not being instituted or
3 followed.

4 You remember Mr. Domina's comments that
5 you have to have money to do these things. And
6 while they instituted the rule, there was no money
7 for the instruction, implementation, and the
8 scientific instruments to do it.

9 This is why the Board proposed that the
10 Circular be rescinded and it supposedly was. But
11 was it? In my opinion, no. Sorry. IH and CMC
12 reports are still using this language as fact and
13 using it to deny claims that you all read in the
14 claims that you were given.

15 No basis is given for the denial other
16 than that flat statement of fact, which in fact,
17 is not fact. I'm not satisfied with Ms. Leiton's
18 explanation of how the rescission of Circular 1506
19 did not affect the use of this exclusionary
20 language.

21 I would like an active question placed
22 before Department of Labor. What exact references

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 are the IHS and CMCs using to justify these
2 boilerplate statements?

3 If the scientific evidence is not
4 forthcoming, I would like assurances from the Board
5 and the Department of Labor that all of the claims
6 denied using this language will be re-adjudicated.

7 I'm also concerned that the selection
8 in which toxics should be evaluated for a claim,
9 are submitted, are shunted and reduced by a small
10 group of contractors who appear to have a conflict
11 of interest. A case in point, is a claim I am
12 currently reviewing.

13 When the contractor who administers,
14 updates, and manages the site exposure matrix named
15 Paragon was also asked to provide their opinion
16 on which toxin should be sent to the IHS/CMC to
17 be considered for particular claim, Paragon's
18 recommendation was used and the claim was denied.

19 The issue then becomes that a
20 contractor that sets the list of which toxins are
21 present at a DOE site should not then be allowed
22 to decide which toxins are considered for an

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 individual claim. It's very much, as I told you
2 before when I was on the Board, like letting the
3 fox watch the hen house.

4 In conclusion, I want to commend the
5 Board on its continued diligence. I am concerned
6 that the good works and recommendations of the
7 Advisory Board are being ignored, subverted, and
8 sidestepped with Departmental wordsmanship in
9 order to blunt any affect that their decisions would
10 have.

11 It is disingenuous to the Advisory
12 Board and the affected workers under EEOICPA for
13 the Department of Labor to continue to face
14 claimants with platitudes of support, but when
15 you're out of sight, undermine the program and
16 individual claims. I thank you for the opportunity
17 to present my comments.

18 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Thank you. Next we
19 have Ms. Vina Colley on the phone. Ms. Colley?

20 MS. COLLEY: Here.

21 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: You're welcome.

22 MS. COLLEY: Thank you for allowing me

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to speak on behalf of National Nuclear Workers for
2 Justice and Portsmouth-Piketon Residents for
3 Environmental Safety and Security. We wanted to
4 ask this Board and DOL, again, to hold a meeting
5 here in Portsmouth, Ohio.

6 You have a lot to learn about this site.

7 And as I listened today, it's very obvious, that
8 you have not been told about the facility --

9 (Telephonic interference.)

10 MS. COLLEY: -- by getting turned down
11 from the SEC site. We were one of --

12 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Ms. Colley, hold on,
13 hold on one second because we're getting some
14 feedback. Can you turn your phone down a little
15 bit?

16 MS. COLLEY: Yes. I can try.

17 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Yes, yes, that's
18 better.

19 MS. COLLEY: Does that help?

20 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Yes, that's good.

21 MS. COLLEY: Portsmouth is one of three
22 sites that was an SEC site. Workers are getting

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 --

2 (Telephonic interference.)

3 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: We're getting some
4 more feedback, actually.

5 OPERATOR: This is the Operator, do you
6 have, do you have a TV or another phone, or a radio
7 on in your background?

8 MS. COLLEY: This is the only phone I
9 have.

10 OPERATOR: Okay.

11 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Are you, Ms. Colley,
12 are you on speaker phone?

13 MS. COLLEY: Yes.

14 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Could you just get
15 directly on the phone? Maybe that'll solve it.

16 MS. COLLEY: Okay. Is that any
17 better?

18 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: So far, so good.

19 MS. COLLEY: Okay. I can hear
20 something in the background. I said -- okay. I
21 think I've lost my concentration.

22 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: That's okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. COLLEY: Anyway, anyway. We would
2 like to invite the Board to come to Portsmouth,
3 Ohio and the Department of Labor to come and talk
4 to these workers. I don't think they have a true
5 understanding of what Portsmouth is.

6 We also would like to know if DOE and
7 DOD have turned over the secret documents to help
8 get these claims approved. We just released
9 records about plutonium and transuranics on the
10 site on March 19th, here in a public forum.

11 Saturday, the Health Department is
12 holding a meeting about neptunium being in the local
13 schools. Many children have died from cancer that
14 attended that school. What happened to the ---
15 we would like to know what has happened to the
16 records that the union put together for the sick
17 workers in the SEM database at Piketon. They
18 worked for hours on what was in each of the
19 buildings.

20 One big problem is we don't have anyone
21 in the Resource Centers that, that can help put
22 the sick workers claims together before it is turned

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in and turn down.

2 There should be an advocate person
3 there who can help look at these workers' records
4 and make sure that they have their ducks in a row
5 before the claims are turned in.

6 What happens when consultants are given
7 misinformation? My case, the consultants were
8 told lies about me. One, and I will read you part
9 of this thing that I wrote.

10 Dr. Dhara, D-H-A-R-A, claimed that I
11 worked at the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant.
12 I have never worked at the Paducah, this Paducah
13 plant. I was employed at Piketon, Ohio.

14 Dr. Dhara claims I smoke one pack of
15 cigarettes a day for 20 years. I have never smoked
16 cigarettes in my life. And if there is any mention
17 in my medical records stating otherwise, it is
18 false.

19 Per Dr. Dhara's letter, it states, a
20 Dr. Rhodes' report has, not having any documents
21 on my pulmonary edema. In the absence of a
22 diagnosed documentation, my claim for toxic

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 exposure could not be verified.

2 However, I had been treated, and
3 currently still treated for 30-some years for
4 pulmonary edema. Also, Dr. Rhodes' report was
5 declared non credible in 2008 by Dr. Marvin
6 Reznikov, and DOL's third-party Dr. Christopher
7 Vrenenman [sic].

8 So this is just one example of how our
9 records are being falsified, or not completely
10 given to the CMC to, to give us a proper diagnosis
11 or our claims. We had a fire a couple of weeks
12 ago in the X-320 -- I, I can hear a lot of feedback.

13 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: No, no. You're
14 going --

15 MS. COLLEY: Is it still kicking back
16 like this?

17 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: You're, you're
18 coming through loud and clear.

19 MS. COLLEY: Okay. I don't know. I
20 think there's one, one, big problem is, we don't
21 have anyone -- okay in the Resource Center, I did
22 that. What happened when the consultant, I did

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that one.

2 We had a fire a couple weeks ago in the
3 X-326 Building. It wasn't reported until our
4 meeting on March 19th. It wasn't reported to the
5 public for almost another week and half.

6 I'm getting calls from the other
7 employees that are sick from the decommissioning
8 of the plant. Many are hard, past the cut off
9 period. They're reporting that they have kidney
10 and cancer problems already and less, some have
11 been there less than ten years.

12 The work going on at the plant now is
13 very hazardous because of the holdup material plus
14 possible explosions. These workers need to be
15 covered under the compensation bill. We need
16 someone to sit with us and explain the jobs here,
17 so we can explain the jobs.

18 You all don't have a clue of the
19 exposure here. Portsmouth is the largest plant
20 in the world. We did weapons-grade material. We
21 are a DOE and DOD facility.

22 I've listened to your reports today,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and it sounds like reports are being copycat and
2 turned down. I want to remind this Board, that
3 we have some the highest exposure according a DOE
4 report in 1985.

5 Also, you talked about the PCBs and I
6 submitted a paper on PCBs. In the process
7 building, the PCBs are 290,000 parts per million
8 after an event system. And by the time it reaches
9 the floor, we don't know what kind of chemical you
10 will be getting.

11 Not only is the PCB oil, PCB oil, but
12 this oil was radioactive. We worked in these
13 buildings for eight hours at a time with no
14 protective equipment. We weren't even told that
15 we were working with radioactive PCB oil.

16 And there is a Congressional hearing
17 on that oil. We claim this oil, also the electrical
18 equipment, the trichloroethylene. We worked many
19 times beside, beside waters without any protection
20 on.

21 They should rub, rub the PCB oil with
22 siphons at the facility. I have the name of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 workers. I have the, the results. And most these
2 workers tested high for PCB oil.

3 I have been fighting for a long, long
4 time. Matter of fact, I was one of the persons
5 who, who broke the story about plutonium being in
6 the gas diffusion plant, at the St. Simon Paducah
7 workers den.

8 I know that they did release some
9 records for the Paducah facility because I went
10 to Oak Ridge and got all records back in that, that
11 time in 1999.

12 But Portsmouth has never had their
13 records released and workers are being denied.
14 And I'm even getting people who, who got, who worked
15 there back in the early years that have been denied
16 for breast cancer, lung cancer, and liver cancer.

17 And this is just one lady with all the
18 illnesses that she had. Her family were turned
19 down for survivor fees. So we, we need to come
20 to Portsmouth.

21 We need to make you aware of exactly
22 what's going on, the PCB oil. I have three tumors,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a hysterectomy, and one thing after another. I
2 was a healthy person when I went to work there.

3 And they keep putting on all these
4 stipulations on the compensation bill. And we're
5 all getting turned down. We -- something has to
6 happen. We can't let this continue.

7 The records that we've released at our
8 meeting, one was forensics, radioactive industry
9 of the public inspection samples. And it was done
10 by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. And
11 it talks about Portsmouth and Paducah both having
12 smuts of plutonium and transuranic waste.

13 Also we have the NIOSH dose
14 reconstruction. And they also submitted that we
15 were exposed to neutrons and radiation in all these
16 process buildings. So we have been under,
17 underestimated for the exposures here and the work
18 that we did.

19 And it's, it is heartbreaking to watch
20 everyone see their families pass away and still
21 fighting for exposures, for Parkinson's disease,
22 for, for prostate cancer, for -- just about

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 everything these workers are getting turned down
2 for.

3 We did have a good result not too long
4 ago here where a widow was finally compensated for
5 Lou Gehrig's disease. So that is one step in the
6 right way. But we're, we're a long ways from doing
7 the right thing and trying to help these workers.

8 So if you could have a meeting here,
9 we could sit down. We'll take you out there and
10 show you the buildings and all of these 25,000
11 depleted uranium cylinders that have set on the
12 site that has given off neutron exposures. The
13 asbestos that these buildings are made of --

14 Are going to put in plutonium, and
15 transuranic, if we don't stop it, and it's on top
16 of our aquifer. And it's the largest aquifer in
17 the Midwest. So many people and many workers have
18 been, been exposed from working here at this site.

19 There's a lot more that I could tell
20 you. And I did send in and submitted the 297,000
21 parts per million of the PCB oil that was in the
22 ventilated system. So it is on your webpage, I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 saw it.

2 And we would appreciate it if we could
3 get you to come. And the DOL, I hear they're going
4 to New York to help these workers file their claims.

5 And I think that that's great for the New York
6 workers.

7 So why aren't they here helping us?
8 Why are they fighting us? Why are they falsifying
9 our records? And the reason that we are -- I heard
10 somebody mention about the data. No data is the
11 reason, Portsmouth and Paducah became the SEC site
12 because they didn't keep data. What data they
13 kept, they shredded, and they falsified our
14 records. And that's why they burned the proof.

15 It wasn't on us. It was on the
16 Department of Labor. Jim Richardson says that.
17 I have his video tape that says, the burden of proof
18 belongs on them, not us. And now, all of a sudden,
19 it's shifted to the burden of proof on us. Thank
20 you for letting me speak.

21 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Thank you, very
22 much. Next is Ms. D'Lanie Blaze, who's on the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 phone.

2 MS. BLAZE: Hi guys. This D'Lanie
3 Blaze.

4 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Welcome.

5 MS. BLAZE: Can everyone hear me okay?

6 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Yes. That's fine.

7 MS. BLAZE: Great. I represent
8 workers of Santa Susana and its associated work
9 sites, Canoga and DeSoto Facilities.

10 And today, I just want to express
11 concern about the IH reports, which I believe are
12 routinely misinterpreted by CEs and the CMCs who
13 neglect to read the body of the report, and then
14 just base their opinions, or their decisions solely
15 on the IH conclusion that's provided at the end
16 of the document.

17 I recently reviewed an IH report for
18 a metal fabricator, pipefitter, welder, site
19 remediation worker employed at Santa Susana from
20 1979 to 2009.

21 And the IH described his aggressive
22 work processes involving routine and significant

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 exposures to lead, cadmium, and mercury. All of
2 which have established casual links to chronic
3 kidney disease.

4 And throughout the discussion of the
5 report, the IH repeatedly acknowledged that the
6 data supported significant pre-1995 exposure. But
7 the boilerplate text of the conclusion contained
8 several problems.

9 The first was a typo. While the
10 discussion of the documents stated it was highly
11 likely that the employee received significant
12 exposure before 1995, the conclusion stated that
13 it was highly unlikely. And that typo alone
14 changed the course of the claim and its outcome.

15 So now we're lost in the process of
16 lengthy objections, hearings, and we're awaiting
17 a final decision. But meanwhile, this worker is
18 clearly in need of help and he is deserving of
19 assistance.

20 The other concerns that I have about
21 the conclusion of the IH report is that there's
22 a table that shows exposure levels to lead, cadmium,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and mercury. But the levels that indicated are
2 inconsistent with the IH's opinions that are
3 provided throughout the body of the report.

4 And then the conclusion's final
5 statement doesn't even mention pre-1995 exposure.
6 It just implies that only insignificant exposure
7 occurred in passing.

8 So anyone who actually read the entire
9 three-page IH report would have caught the typo
10 and the inconsistency. But it seems the CE and
11 the CMC only read the conclusion, so it's no
12 surprise that the claim was recommended for denial
13 based on the idea of insignificant exposure.

14 So in an effort to find some clarity
15 on it, I contacted the IH directly. And I asked
16 for her help. Either helping me understand or if
17 necessary, issuing a correction to that typo in
18 the conclusion.

19 And that IH confirmed that the employee
20 did have significant pre-1995 exposure that was
21 intended to be acknowledged in IH report. But the
22 IH stated that the conclusion could have been

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 misinterpreted due to what she called clunky
2 language. Quote, that is just the language they
3 have use.

4 So I assume that the IH was referring
5 to either the IH contractor or to the national
6 office, whoever comes up with the boilerplate
7 language that's currently used to format these IH
8 reports.

9 So in this case, the national office
10 confirmed the existence of the typo and verified
11 that the conclusion should have stated that it was
12 highly likely that the employee was significantly
13 exposed.

14 But then the national office emphasized
15 that the exposure levels are provided in the table,
16 which again, are inconsistent with the rest of the
17 document. They state the exposure was low. And
18 then the national office failed to acknowledge the
19 pre-1995 exposure had been left out of the last
20 paragraph entirely.

21 So this leaves tremendous room for
22 misinterpretation and for a severely diminished

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 perception of the worker's exposure, particularly
2 when a CE or CMC only looks at the conclusion.

3 So obviously, I'm troubled by general
4 laziness that's exhibited by failure to read a
5 three-page IH report, which would have taken about
6 five minutes. This led to further delays for the
7 claimant. The inability to obtain needed help
8 under this program.

9 And it also led to unnecessary
10 administrative costs for Department of Labor, which
11 included an in-person hearing with a Jacksonville
12 representative who had to fly all the way to Los
13 Angeles in order to hear our case.

14 Now the national office has made so many
15 changes in this program in order increase
16 expediency. But I fail to see the logic in making
17 a series of bad decisions fast and then having to
18 revisit the issue again with all of the additional
19 wait time and administrative efforts and associated
20 costs, et cetera.

21 So I'm troubled by the boilerplate
22 language that seems to have been carelessly

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 constructed and that it requires the IHs to punch
2 in relevant information in several places in an
3 IH report. And that makes it pretty easy to miss
4 a relevant place.

5 And one missed insertion of copy and
6 pasted text could change the context and the
7 direction of the entire claim, so. And then too,
8 obviously the boilerplate conclusions that omit
9 information about pre-1995 exposure, that's just
10 alarming.

11 So ultimately, it seems like IH reports
12 are pretty tight and short. And there shouldn't
13 be a need to summarize them. There seems to be
14 no need to add a confusing table. Or even to add
15 a conclusion.

16 A solution might be to recommend
17 removing the conclusion entirely, which would at
18 least ensure that the CE and the CMC are forced
19 into reading the entire document.

20 And then it would enable the IH to be
21 thorough one time instead of having to insert little
22 bits and pieces of relevant text in several places

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in the report.

2 Anyway, that's it from me and as always,
3 it's a privilege to address the Board and to
4 represent workers under EEOICPA. Thanks for the
5 opportunity to comment.

6 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Our next speaker is
7 Ms. Angel Little.

8 MS. LITTLE: Good evening, everyone.

9 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Good evening.

10 MS. LITTLE: As you know, I'm an Angel
11 Little and I'm a daughter of a Cold War patriot.
12 His name is Earl A. Brown, Jr. He lives in
13 Knoxville, Tennessee.

14 He is a Navy veteran retired. Also he
15 is retired from ORNL. Amongst the jobs he had,
16 he initially started as a guard. However, he rose
17 through the ranks always being trained, was trained
18 through the fire safety.

19 So of course, he was at every plant in
20 Oak Ridge, Tennessee. Upon his retirement,
21 however, he was administration at ORNL, but he was
22 based at Y-12.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 My father now suffers with berylliosis.

2 This berylliosis also has damaged several things
3 that are going on with him to include renal failure.

4 He has been approved for berylliosis, however,
5 he was denied for kidney failure.

6 And that very much distresses me
7 because my father was a very robust man while he
8 was working for the Department. We have talked
9 with several people. We have seen several doctors.
10 He is three days a week in dialysis now.

11 And we keep seeing, oh he, because he
12 had high blood pressure. But it was okay for him
13 to have high blood pressure when he was working
14 for the Department. It didn't keep him from coming
15 to work every day. It didn't keep him from doing
16 his job every day to protect this United States
17 of America.

18 It didn't take him anything, but to get
19 up every morning and make sure he was at work every
20 day to support his family, put me through college,
21 support his wife, be her care giver.

22 But it distresses me that this room is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 not full. It distresses me that I, who live here
2 in Augusta, Georgia have to go to Oak Ridge to call
3 people long-distance to make sure that things are
4 taken care of for my father.

5 He is currently being serviced by a
6 professional case management. And that is a daily
7 chore within itself. I've talked with the people
8 out in Oak Ridge. I've been out there to Oak Ridge.

9 And I have to run and jump through hoops
10 just to get things taken care of. From picking
11 up his medicines, from making sure he has
12 transportation. I should be case manager.
13 However, I'm not. I'm his daughter, the one that
14 loves him.

15 Also with all the research and I am just
16 at awe at this Advisory Board and the time that
17 you take to review things. That berylliosis has
18 some effects on your kidney, on your liver. He
19 has neuropathy.

20 So I'm still trying to figure out, what
21 is the problem that my father is still fighting
22 these days, with my assistance, long distance, 350

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 miles away in trying to get services for him? I
2 don't know if I need to fly to D.C. with you, which
3 I will. I don't need -- hey, I got gas in the car,
4 I'll do it.

5 And I teach high school and I teach my
6 students every day. Do what's right. Do for you
7 to make this world a better place. And make sure
8 you get your education because nobody can take that
9 away from you.

10 However, my father has things that are
11 taking it away from him. He's ill. Just this past
12 week, on Thursday, he had two mini-strokes. And
13 by God's help and the weather we had last weekend,
14 I was able to go 350 miles in less than 5 hours
15 without a ticket.

16 I was able to get to my father and by
17 God's help and some great neurologist that I'm going
18 to look up again, they changed some medications,
19 they were able to do some assessments, and he is
20 at his house.

21 Also with my assistance, I got a
22 hospital bed in there. I got everything he needs

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in there. But I couldn't get that unless I did
2 it, nobody else. My father is worthy of everything
3 that he deserves. And he deserves more than he's
4 getting from this United States of America.

5 I am charging you, the Advisory Board
6 to look up Earl A. Brown, Jr. His birthday is
7 October 19, 1936, born in Rockwood, Tennessee.
8 And pull his case file, look at him because he's
9 ill now, and we need help.

10 Tell me what I need to do. It's not
11 a question and answer session. But I'm here as
12 an advocate. If I don't do it and you don't do
13 it, who's going to do it? I'm available any and
14 every day. My cell phone is 24/7.

15 My high school students know I have an
16 ill parent, who has recently lost his wife, who
17 is an ill person who worked for the Department of
18 Labor, who worked for the Department of the Navy,
19 who served at the Pentagon, served in Vietnam.

20 So I think my father deserves more and
21 better, and he shouldn't have to fight, nor I to
22 get the benefits that are due to him. So in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 closing, my cell phone number is 706-294-0357.
2 I'm here in Augusta, Georgia. If you need to see
3 me, just call me.

4 And I have a daughter who would like
5 to know that her grandfather has been done right.
6 That her biology degree that helps me research and
7 help her grandfather is not in vain. That she will
8 not have to go through these things as her
9 grandfather is.

10 She sees him suffering now. She sees
11 that and it's really, really sad that this Board
12 even has to convene for things like this. It's
13 really sad that family has to be here.

14 But I appreciate the time, the effort
15 and the knowledge that sits here in this room.
16 And again, I am Angel Little, here in Augusta
17 Georgia and I'd like to thank you.

18 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: What did you say your
19 cell phone number was?

20 MS. LITTLE: 706-294-0357.

21 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Okay. Thank you.

22 MS. LITTLE: Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Are there any other
2 people who would like to make a public comment?
3 We do have a little time, so if -- okay, and there's
4 no one else waiting on the phone, right?
5 Do you want me ask her? Yes.

6 To the moderator on the phone, is there
7 anyone else in the phone who has somehow
8 communicated that they would like to make a public
9 comment?

10 OPERATOR: No. Should I let, give
11 them an option on how to do that?

12 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Yes.

13 OPERATOR: If anyone on the phone would
14 like to make a comment, please press star zero.

15 We have a couple, so one moment, please.
16 The first one is Stephanie Carroll.

17 You may go ahead. Just one moment
18 please. Let them open their line, one by one.
19 Start with Stephanie Carroll. Comment.
20 Stephanie Carroll, you may go ahead.

21 MS. CARROLL: Thank you, very much.
22 Thank you. I deeply appreciate the Board and the

1 opportunity to make a comment. I didn't prepare
2 anything formally.

3 But just wanted to note, especially for
4 the Board reviewing SEM that being an authorized
5 rep who specializes in beryllium disease, I'm
6 always interested in the documentation proving
7 workers are exposed to beryllium.

8 And I haven't had as many problems here
9 in the Rocky Flats claims or Nevada Test Site.
10 But I had the opportunity last night to review the
11 SEM for Portsmouth. And I was shocked to see that
12 Portsmouth had three buildings related to
13 beryllium.

14 And just with a very quick review
15 online, I found formal worker programs, these --
16 (Telephonic interference.)

17 MS. CARROLL: -- reports, which showed
18 beryllium in multiple buildings. I think I was
19 at eight or nine buildings that it was in.

20 And so I was shocked to see the
21 difference between evidence that should be being
22 used for the SEM, and the actual SEM that claims

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 examiners are using.

2 Another thing I noticed is that the
3 claimant I was, I was researching on had a job
4 category of welder and maintenance mechanic. He
5 said no exposure to beryllium on any of those job
6 titles. And the buildings he, he was in didn't
7 show exposure to beryllium.

8 This is the thing, when I read the
9 formal worker program needs assessment, it clearly
10 right of the bat noted that there were beryllium
11 welding rods used late into the 90s. And, and
12 that's not even, you know, documented in the site
13 exposure matrix.

14 What we've been told by the Department
15 of Labor is that beryllium isn't included
16 throughout SEM related to Part E. But I also show
17 a lot of beryllium exposure in SEM, even as it
18 relates to Part E.

19 Illnesses related like dermatitis,
20 which known to be related to beryllium, weren't
21 even listed in the Portsmouth SEM. Beryllium has
22 no illness related to its exposure in the SEM there.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So I was shocked to see that and I wanted
2 to note that with the Board. And I appreciate all
3 the work that you're doing. And wish I could
4 attend. Thank you, so much.

5 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Thank you. To the
6 moderator, is there another person on the phone
7 who wants to speak?

8 MR. REAVIS: Yes. This is Rick
9 Reavis. Rick Reavis wants to speak.

10 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Go ahead.

11 MR. REAVIS: Are you, are you talking
12 to Rick Reavis now, Doctor?

13 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Yes. We can hear
14 you fine.

15 MR. REAVIS: Okay. Thank you, very
16 much. I want to thank you. I want to thank
17 everybody else who sat there listening. I want
18 to thank the people that are getting up there
19 talking. It takes a lot to do that.

20 I want to say that I thoroughly,
21 thoroughly believe in what Terrie Barrie said about
22 Congress needs to look into this program. If you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 go back to when program was initiated in 2000, it
2 was to correct a wrong.

3 Because the government had to admit
4 what they did to these people, exposed them to
5 radiation without their knowledge. It's a
6 terrible thing. So the President wanted to make
7 amends. Initially the program said, if got one
8 of the 22 cancers and worked at one these company,
9 you were to get compensation.

10 That's turned into a big boondoggle.

11 And if you think of it, in 2003, DOE had that
12 program from 2000 to 2003. And it was so corrupt,
13 and I do mean corrupt, that they had to take it
14 away from DOE and give to DOL.

15 And for all these years, all the way
16 going to 2019, that's a long time even for the
17 government to try and correct a wrong. I don't
18 think the problem has been corrected. I can tell
19 you, and I am by the way disappointed that I can't
20 ask questions.

21 Because I have questions I know the
22 answers to. But I get those answers via the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 government and DOL, DOE, and NIOSH. And I'd like
2 to ask those questions so they could be answered
3 where people could actually have it on tape.

4 But one lady was talking about false
5 information. My God, you talk about false
6 information. People need to go look up Texas City
7 Chemical. You're supposed to have 250 days of
8 processing, producing something that emits
9 radiation, was used a bomb, in order to qualify
10 for an SEC.

11 Texas City Chemical only produced for
12 three months, October, November, December 1953.
13 NIOSH was looking for an SEC for that and in 2008,
14 they said that they could do a dose reconstruction.

15 And they gave five years time that they
16 said covered for the SEC. Five years. For some
17 reason, in 2010, actually 2009, somebody put a lot
18 of pressure on NIOSH. And the pressure caused them
19 to reevaluate and revisit Texas City Chemical.

20 Now what they said they could do in five
21 years, to a dose reconstruction, no longer could
22 they do that when reduced it to two years. You would

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 think the logical thinking that if you reduced it
2 down from five years to two years, you would still
3 be able to do a dose reconstruction.

4 They come back and they say, well it's
5 because the, the question was asked, what changed?

6 Well there were two different things. And we
7 found out about the, the lawsuit. And we found
8 out there was a bankruptcy. What's bankruptcy got
9 to do with Texas City Chemical and their dose
10 reconstruction?

11 So anyway, the bottom line is nothing
12 changed. There was nothing changed. But yet they
13 reduced it to two years, gave an SEC for Texas City.

14 Those people got paid. My feeling is that those
15 people should have got paid.

16 They were lied to like all the other
17 people across this country, thousands of them.
18 And there's many of them that you need 250 days
19 to qualify for an SEC. Well, I've heard of some
20 that had 249, didn't get paid.

21 Well if you look at Texas City, again,
22 they should have got paid. But they only had 60

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 days of production. Something's wrong with that.

2 And I, I strongly feel the people should take a
3 look at TCC. Look at the records on TCC, what they
4 did.

5 Another thing I believe, a lot of people
6 -- I just mentioned, in fact, there's a problem
7 with DOL. There has been a problem with the DOL.

8 It's been ongoing. I got a letter from DOL, 2018,
9 trying to explain away Texas City. They've been
10 --- I've been asking this question for going on
11 nine years. They're trying to explain away. And
12 the best they can ever come up with, is well, you
13 know, it's difficult to explain, one company versus
14 another one.

15 Well how difficult can it be to explain
16 what the difference is between Texas City and the
17 company my father-in-law worked for, Blockson?
18 And he worked there 25 years and didn't get paid.

19 And people at Texas City, two years, actually three
20 months.

21 There, you put all this stuff together,
22 and you look at this 2018 letter that I got from

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the Department of Labor. And they're saying, well,
2 the difference with Texas City is because we did
3 not have, at that time, in 2010, the information
4 that we had to grant the SEC.

5 Well, the problem with that is I have
6 numerous records. And I, and I really would like
7 to have people call me just like Angel Little.
8 My cell phone number is 815-791-3991.

9 Now, Department of Labor told me that
10 they did not have that information. Well, listen,
11 I can go back to 2007, 2008, 2010. I have all kinds
12 of records on Texas City.

13 I have an ombudsman for the government,
14 I don't want to mention names, but he also agrees
15 something's wrong. They, they pulled out a
16 document, the document received a U308, other
17 domestic sources.

18 According to the government if there's
19 any problem with the document, the benefit goes
20 to the claimant. Well this document, I counted
21 nine errors, provable errors. But yet, DOL, NIOSH,
22 and Department of Energy from what I've read, all

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 agree, all agree that this document is good.

2 If you look at this document for Texas
3 City, I told you that they produced October,
4 November, December 1953. That is correct. And
5 Tom Tomes, I know he's probably sitting there.

6 He could tell you that Jim Netton asked
7 him that back in 2010. And he said, October,
8 November, December '53. Netton said, is that
9 correct? He said, yes, that's correct. All
10 right.

11 If you look at this document that is
12 so good, it's got Texas City, nobody mentions that.

13 With the Oversight Committee and all the way up
14 to HHS, I know nothing was told about the document
15 other than the fact that it says, Blockson Chemical
16 quit producing in the 1960.

17 Yes, indeed it does say that. But it
18 also says that Texas City produced only one month,
19 March 1954. That's just one mistake. There's
20 nine mistakes. If in fact, the government stands
21 by and NIOSH says, best available science, fair,
22 consistent, best available science.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And if there's any problem with the
2 document, then the benefit goes to the claimant.
3 Well how come the benefit didn't go to the claimant
4 in my father-in-law's case? According to the
5 document, it only produced Texas City, one month.

6 I'll tell you something else about my
7 father-in-law and then I'll wrap it up. And
8 believe me, I got a whole lot more to say so anybody
9 out there listening, please call that number,
10 815-791-3991.

11 My father-in-law was also at Pearl
12 Harbor. He survived the West Virginia. I always
13 tell people, what the government couldn't do, or
14 what Japanese couldn't do to my father-in-law, the
15 government did. With that, I'll let you go. You
16 know why. Thank you. Bye.

17 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Thank you. There's
18 one more? Okay.

19 OPERATOR: Yes. We have one more.
20 Ms. Donna Hand.

21 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Okay.

22 OPERATOR: You may go ahead.

1 MS. HAND: Thank you, very much. I'll
2 try to be brief, and hopefully not take very long.

3 I have some issues that I need to address and in
4 today's talk and everything, it was said, that it
5 was legally use of the term, is broad, when you
6 use vapors, gases, dusts and fumes.

7 Well the Part E is, is to be broad.
8 And the actual documentation of a toxic substance
9 definition also says, means, any material that has
10 the potential to cause illness or death because
11 of its radioactive, chemical, or biological nature.

12 And that was in the Federal Registry
13 in 2006 as the goal. And that's what they had
14 decided to use. So if you have vapors, gases, dusts
15 and fumes that is the definition of toxic substance
16 according to their own definition, as well, OSHA.

17 OSHA has air contaminants.
18 Particulate contaminants include dust, fumes,
19 mists, aerosols, and fibers. Liquids changed into
20 vapors. Vapors are the volatile form of
21 substances. Vapors are the gaseous form of
22 substances. Then they have too much --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 (Telephonic interference.)

2 MS. HAND: -- the degree of worker risk
3 from exposure to any given substance depends on
4 the nature and potency of the toxic effect and the
5 magnitude and duration of exposure.

6 They also have been, you know,
7 biological hazards. Some of these chemicals react
8 differently once it gets into the body. So these
9 are issues here that should have been addressed.

10 And back in 2006, they were aware of
11 these issues, but somehow have been forgotten
12 about. In fact, their own D&C Handbook says that
13 the legal standard for acceptance of a claim under
14 the EEOICPA is less than stringent than that of
15 other venues.

16 Medical opinions are to solidly based
17 on the facts, as accepted by the CE and expressed
18 in the Statement of Accepted Facts, and on the
19 state-of-the-art medical knowledge. They should
20 be as objective as possible.

21 The appropriate legal requirements,
22 and I quote, a case should be accepted if the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 evidence in a particular case shows that there was
2 plausible relationship between the exposure at the
3 workplace and the employee's illness, or in some
4 cases, death.

5 And that's on Page 7 of their own
6 handbook, D&C Handbook, which is now the Contract
7 Medical Consultants Handbook. They define
8 causation as the legal standard of certainty of
9 causation, falls between the preponderance of
10 evidence and a reasonable suspicion.

11 So it's greater than a reasonable
12 suspicion, but it's less than more likely than not.

13 Because that's the preponderance of evidence.
14 So you're at least as likely as not, is more than
15 a reasonable suspicion, but less than 50 percent.

16 The workplace exposure can contribute
17 to an increased risk of an illness. That's
18 acceleration. And contributing, also caused,
19 increased, the likelihood of suffering and harm
20 and results in an earlier onset of a condition,
21 such as person having prostate cancer at an earlier
22 age, than what's normal in the public.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 That's on page 9 of the D&C Handbook.
2 Aggravation, defined as worsening of a previous
3 existing disease. It also is whether workplace
4 exposures aggravates a condition that may have
5 remained latent or inactive.

6 So contributing then, aggravation is
7 not being addressed at all in any of the decisions
8 that the Contract Medical Consultant is supposed
9 to be addressing, as well as, the Case Examiners
10 are supposed to be addressing.

11 And if the causation standard is more
12 than a reasonable suspicion, but less than 50
13 percent, that's not a medical certainty standard.
14 That's way less than that for causation.

15 The Contract Medical Consultants are
16 to consider the nature, frequency, and duration
17 of exposure. As well as the intensity and wrath
18 of exposure, if, if this information is available.

19 A lot of the regulations have also said
20 that the proof of exposure to toxic substance may
21 be established by the submission of any appropriate
22 document or information that is evidence that such

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 substance was present at the facility, in which
2 the employee was employed and that the employee
3 came into contact with such substance.

4 It does not address at all that it has
5 to be a significant level. So if you have
6 significant factor, meaning any factor, and it
7 doesn't, you just have to have the nature, duration,
8 and frequency. That's all that the IH can address.

9 And all these subjective statements
10 such as smoking and exceeding the regulations,
11 they're not relevant underneath the program. The
12 level is a subjective statement that is not
13 relevant.

14 And again, even in the AIHA study,
15 A-I-H-A, they have a exposure assessment rating
16 speed. And in there they have a certainty
17 description, that's a Category 3, health effect,
18 you know, substance of the air, but reversible,
19 that's Category 2.

20 If it's life threatening or disabling
21 injury, that's a Category 4. You know, and they
22 said, this is it. It doesn't have the level. And

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 they also talk about similar exposure groups.

2 So if the Industrial Hygiene has
3 similar exposure groups, then they know that every
4 single one of them would be exposed to this chemical
5 during this process, if they did this process, such
6 welders or soldering, et cetera.

7 So you could have a presumption with
8 the IHs. The IHs and also the Contract Medical
9 Consultants never include or address the skin
10 absorption of these chemicals.

11 Because you inhale it, you ingest it,
12 you absorb it through your skin, as well as if you
13 had any wounds, it go directly also to the
14 bloodstream.

15 Basically, the Global Initiative for
16 Chronic Obstructive Lung Disease in their 2018
17 report, which is their pocket guide, that uses it.

18 Says that, dust and vapors.

19 So to say that it's a legal constraint
20 to use dust, vapors, and mists for COPD or any
21 pulmonary because it's too broad, well
22 internationally everybody uses that for COPD.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The other issue that I have is that the
2 biokinetics of chronic beryllium disease is not
3 just related to the lung. Chronic beryllium
4 disease includes from the biokinetics of it, the
5 liver and the skeleton, as well as those other
6 organs that -- but that's definitely found that
7 it goes to the liver and the goes to the skeleton.

8 So when you, somebody is accepted for chronic
9 beryllium disease, those two other organs and body
10 systems should be addressed as well.

11 And it's -- since the Department of
12 Labor has already found consequential illnesses
13 for chronic beryllium disease, that's been
14 determined by their doctor, why should a claimant
15 again go and get their doctor who has nothing, knows
16 nothing about chronic beryllium disease to say that
17 yes, these are consequential illnesses?

18 These, you know, they've -- these are
19 issues that we're finding more and more of, that
20 you're not using the language or the definition
21 that comes in the statute. Such as the IH says,
22 well the significant high-level, significant

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 low-level.

2 Well no, significant means any factor.

3 So if there's any level, that's it. And again,
4 the level, you can address if you have, it's a high
5 uncertainly because of the exposure judgement made
6 without any available exposure monitoring data.

7 Adverse effects are uncertain because
8 you don't have any information. And that's from
9 the Industrial Hygiene Association, itself. Thank
10 you, again, for your time. If there's anything
11 that I can do to help, or further, you know, I can
12 do that.

13 I also want to point out that we did
14 request an IH interview on a particular case with
15 occupational disease in the eye. And they refused
16 to let us have that interview with that IH.

17 When we had the hearing, the claimant
18 told the hearing officer the level of exposure to
19 nitric acid, as well as plutonium oxide directly
20 to his eye.

21 And in the final decision, the hearing
22 officer said, even though you explained that your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 level was higher than the IH, it had no bearing
2 on his decision and he still denied the case. So
3 again, thank you, and have a nice evening.

4 CHAIR MARKOWITZ: Okay. Thank you,
5 very much. Okay. That ends the public comment
6 session. So we've been here for a while. So maybe
7 we should close for the day and start up again
8 tomorrow at 8:30.

9 And I think we'll probably start off
10 with how we're going to categorize and organize
11 our claims review and move forward. And then on
12 the Parkinson's disease, how to move forward on
13 the topics that Marek raised.

14 So, thank you, very much. And the
15 meeting is adjourned for the day.

16 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
17 went off the record at 5:41 p.m.)
18
19
20