

Consolidated Written Feedback

DEEOIC Occupational History Questionnaire

April 20, 2021

The following are the written comments received by the DEEOIC Policy Branch with regard to feedback on new Occupational History Questionnaire format:

1. It is significantly better/more concise/useful than that previous version. It is better organized than the prior version.
2. It's a lot easier to go through compared to the previous format and I think it adequately addresses everything.
3. Like that it's shorter without multiple pages of no information/information we don't use. The old format included a lot of information we never really used.
4. The OHQ's are fine, suggest that they should be an automatic for every new claim from the RC.
5. I do feel it is much more condensed as far as the toxins. I do like it MUCH better than the old format - that was just a lot of wasted pages.
6. If the print could be enlarged on the form it may make a difference.
7. Not as many pages. It looks like more of a narrative than a checklist. Claimants appear to be a bit more honest about their potential exposure, because many of them are giving specific job description and describe the type of exposures.
8. I like the short look at a glance and it helps you in narrowing down what the employee was actually claiming exposure to, instead of them checking all the boxes on the old form and saying they were exposed to everything at the DOE facility just because the toxin is listed.
9. I like that it is more "compact" than the previous version, but it is also harder to read because they have made the font and tables smaller. If they could enlarge them both while keeping the whole document the same number of pages that would help.
10. Concise and easier to read, not as open ended on questions, and compliments the EE4 and easier to address causation.
11. Appreciate the condensed format but preferred the way the toxins were listed in the old version.
12. I actually like the previous OHQ because it was much easier to read.
13. I am not having any problems with these referrals and all are the same.
14. The addition of addressing solvents specifically is helpful.
15. The print is way too small. While trying to review the OHQ in OIS it is very difficult to read all the responses. The old format was easier to read. The new format is too condensed and difficult to read, it needs to be enlarged/zoomed in to read. Maybe a change in the font and providing more space between sections?
16. I would like more white space back to make it more legible; as it stands, there's block text closely surrounded by hard borders.

17. Often there is not enough information on labor processes and wish the RCs would delve further into that information. Stating “all duties of a carpenter” is not helpful because not all carpenters do the same work.
18. Often the information on exposures is of little value because claimants don’t know what they were exposed to. It is more valuable to get detailed information on employment dates, work locations/buildings, processes and duties performed, etc. so we can put the pieces together and run proper SEM searches/IH referrals. Have to call the employee/claimant to get this information.
19. It could get confusing if an employee worked for more than one facility. Would there be one of these for every site worked? Maybe incorporate something so it includes all employment sites in one?
20. This may be personal preference but, I think there is too much information condensed into a small space. The colored background on the ‘Section’ headings makes it difficult to see the heading title. There is a lot of empty space throughout the document but not enough space in between the lines of the questions to facilitate reading.
21. Should run these forms by the employees before implementing to see how we use it and if we have anything to add.
22. It is more cluttered than the previous version.
23. Not all claimants are as aware of what job processes could lead to exposure or what they were around which can sometimes make the document useless.
24. I do not see very many descriptions of building locations which has been helpful with exposure development in the past.
25. A plus is that it only lists the toxins with exposures, whereas the old one listed all possible toxins, many of which they were not exposed to, or where considered unknown exposures.
26. Overall, the new OHQ script is more organized.
27. The flow of the questions helps the caseworkers engage the claimant to speak freely about their work experiences.
28. It is easier to solicit information regarding relevant work locations, work duties, PPE, and exposures.
29. Claimants have the opportunity to list exposures in one section and in the following section the claimant can categorically define and further explain how the exposures were related to job duties and locations.
30. Caseworkers agree that the new OHQ form is more user friendly and allows inclusion of detailed information necessary to assist the district office CEs in the Part E adjudication.