UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

+ + + + +

ADVISORY BOARD ON TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND WORKER HEALTH

+ + + + +

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MEDICAL ADVICE FOR CES
REGARDING WEIGHING MEDICAL EVIDENCE (AREA #2)

+ + + + +

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 2016

+ + + + +

The Subcommittee met telephonically at 1:00 p.m. Eastern Time, Victoria A. Cassano, Subcommittee Chair, presiding.

MEMBERS

SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY:

KENNETH Z. SILVER LESLIE I. BODEN

MEDICAL COMMUNITY:

STEVEN MARKOWITZ, Board Chair VICTORIA A. CASSANO, Subcommittee Chair

CLAIMANT COMMUNITY:

DURONDA M. POPE FAYE VLIEGER

DEPARTMENT STAFF:

CARRIE RHOADS, Designated Federal Official JOHN VANCE, Policy Branch Chief, DEEOIC

A-G-E-N-D-A

Introduction - Purpose of the Meeting 3		
Review Questions from Last Subcommittee Meeting and DOL's Responses		
Review Questions/Concerns Regarding Those Responses		
Summary of Telecon with Program		
Open Discussion of How We Should Proceed		
Timetable		
Meeting with Claims Examiners (CE)		
Review of Claims Processing from CE's Perspective		
Report on Findings Related to Procedure		
Manual/Training Materials and		
Recommendations for Process Improvements		
Development of Deliverables Based on		
Requested Advice from Program		
Closing Comments from Dr. Cassano and		
Dr. Markowitz		
Adjourn		

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	1:00 p.m.
3	MS. RHOADS: Hi, everybody. Good
4	afternoon or good morning depending on what time
5	zone you're in.
6	My name is Carrie Rhoads and I'd like
7	to welcome you to today's teleconference meeting
8	of the Department of Labor's Advisory Board on
9	Toxic Substances and Worker Health, the
10	Subcommittee on Medical Advice for Claims
11	Examiners Regarding Weighing Medical Evidence.
12	I'm the board's designated federal
13	officer or DFO for today's meeting.
14	First, we appreciate the time and
15	diligent work of our Board members in preparing
16	for this meeting and for their forthcoming work.
17	I'll introduce the board members on
18	the subcommittee and do a quick roll call. If
19	everyone could just please respond when you hear
20	your name.
21	Dr. Victoria Cassano is the chair of
22	the Subcommittee.

1	CHAIR CASSANO: I'm here.
2	MS. RHOADS: And the members are Dr.
3	Leslie Boden.
4	MEMBER BODEN: Hi.
5	MS. RHOADS: Ms. Faye Vlieger. I'm
6	not hearing Ms. Vlieger. If you're on please let
7	us know.
8	Ms. Duronda Pope.
9	MEMBER POPE: Here.
10	MS. RHOADS: Dr. Ken Silver.
11	MEMBER SILVER: Here.
12	MS. RHOADS: Dr. Steven Markowitz.
13	MEMBER MARKOWITZ: Here.
14	MS. RHOADS: And he's the Chair of the
15	Board. And we're scheduled to meet from 1
16	o'clock till 3 o'clock Eastern Time today.
17	In the room with me is Melissa
18	Schroeder from SIDEM, our contractor, and John
19	Vance, Policy Branch Chief for DEEOIC.
20	At our previous meeting the
21	Subcommittee had requested that someone from the
22	Program be present at the Subcommittee meetings.

So, regarding the meeting today I don't think we are going to plan to take a break unless someone would like to. We'll just go the full two hours.

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

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

The Board's website can be found at dol.gov/owcp/energy/regs/compliance/advisoryboar d.htm. Or you can simply Google Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health and it will probably be the first link you see.

If you haven't already visited the board's website I encourage you to do so. After clicking on today's meeting date you'll see a page dedicated entirely to today's meeting.

The page contains publicly available

materials that are submitted to us in advance of the meeting. And we will publish anything that's provided to the Subcommittee there.

You should also find today's agenda and instructions for participating remotely. If you are participating remotely and you're having a problem please email us at energyadvisoryboard@dol.gov.

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

Please note that we do not have a scheduled public comment session today. The call-in information has been posted on the Advisory Board website so the public may listen in but not participate in the committee's discussion.

I've been asked about meeting minutes and transcripts also.

The Advisory Board voted at its April 26-28 meeting that the committee meeting should

be open to the public. The transcript and minutes will be prepared from today's meeting.

During the Board discussions today, as we're on a teleconference line, please speak clearly enough for the transcriber to understand.

When you begin speaking especially at the start of the meeting please state your name so we can get an accurate record of the discussion.

Also, I'd like to let our transcriber know -- please let us know if you're having an issue with hearing anyone or with the recording.

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

If the minutes are available sooner,
we'll put them up sooner. Also, although formal
minutes will be prepared, we'll also be
publishing verbatim transcripts which are going
to be more detailed in nature. Those transcripts

should be available on the Board's website within 30 days.

I would like to remind the Advisory
Board members that there are some materials that
have been provided to you in your capacity as
special government employees and members of the
Board which are not for public disclosure and
cannot be shared or discussed publicly including
in this meeting.

Please be aware of this as we continue with the meeting today. These materials can be discussed in a general way which does not include using any personally identifiable information such as names, addresses, specific facilities where the case is being discussed, or doctors' names.

And with that, I convene this meeting of the Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health Subcommittee on Medical Advice for Claims Examiners Regarding Weighing Medical Evidence.

Washington DC

And I'll turn it over to Dr. Cassano

who is the Chair of the Subcommittee. 1 2 CHAIR CASSANO: Thank you very much, Good morning, good afternoon, everyone, 3 Carrie. including Board members and members of the 4 5 public. What I wanted to do first was to do a 6 7 little bit of recap. This is our second -- just 8 to go back to the agenda, this is our second 9 Subcommittee meeting. I wanted to first of all go through 10 11 what we were asked to accomplish at the 12 Subcommittee. 13 And we were asked specific questions 14 by the Program, specific places where we could 15 help. 16 Number one, clarifying and make 17 recommendations regarding the assessment of 18 medical opinions, especially about 19 rationalization to support a particular conclusion and if there were any standardized 20 21 triggers that we could come up with.

Second was our methodologies for

improving physician responsiveness.

Third was training resources for improving the quality of medical review of the medical evidence, and some type of guidance regarding assessing contribution or aggravation to a preexisting disease.

That was a pretty tall order. And in order to be able to accomplish that, we felt that we really needed a better understanding of the process that the CEs go through.

And in regard to that, we sent a list of action items to the Program and we got, about a month later, we got our responses. And then Dr. Markowitz and myself had a conversation with the Program, sometime late in August, so that we could do a little bit more clarification.

But other than seeing these results, the rest of the Board members have not had a chance yet to talk about their understanding and their appreciation of the responses that we got from the Program.

So I wanted to open this up, primarily

to the other Board members, for each of them to be able to talk about what their concerns, or whether they have additional questions, regarding the answers that we got.

And then myself and Dr. Markowitz can certainly chime in. We'll do a little bit of the summary of what we learned in our subsequent phone conversation.

And then we really need an open discussion about how to proceed from here. And to develop a real timetable for meeting with claims examiners, review of the claims process from the CEs' perspective.

And then you develop some type of report on our findings, concerns, issues, et cetera and then development of deliverables. So we have a lot to go through to develop this timetable.

And so I do really want to get started. Before I do that, Dr. Markowitz, do you have any opening comments?

MEMBER MARKOWITZ: No, I just -- the

next step is that we're going to walk through the responses from DOL and --

CHAIR CASSANO: Well, I'm not going to read them. But I think I'm going to talk about
- I'm going to ask that we go through each one of these answers. I'm not going to read through them. But to see if there are subsequent questions that the other board members have -
because I don't think they've had an opportunity to discuss that. Does that make sense to you?

Sure, sure.

CHAIR CASSANO: Okay. So the first question that we asked, or the first issue that we presented, was whose responsibility is it to gather information that would support a medical opinion?

MEMBER MARKOWITZ:

In other words, information from IARC, information from any of the -- EPA, scientific research studies, et cetera. And the response we got was, that's really the claimant's responsibility.

And after further discussion with

them, we found out that they actually -- if
there's a treating physician who is not expert in
this area, they can actually their patient to
someone who is knowledgeable.

And that cleared up a lot for me as far as how, you know, medical research or epidemiological research is brought to the table in discussing a person's case. So I'd like other people to chime in on that one in particular, if they have any issues or questions.

MEMBER MARKOWITZ: This is Steven, let
me just kick this off here. I don't confuse

DOL's response that -- I'm not sure where this
phrase came from, consensus documents from
learned bodies, in this quote. I also don't
remember where that came from.

The underlying issue is how the expertise that's needed on the causation side, and even frankly on the diagnosis side. How's that countered? How does that impact the process of claims review and determination?

And clearly it can come from the

claimant's position. It can come from the inhouse industrial hygienist. It can come from the
CMC. And the CE is kind of the focal point, the
traffic person to assemble, and in some sense,
make a decision based on this expert input.

CHAIR CASSANO: Anyone else with comments on this?

MEMBER BODEN: Yes, this is Les Boden.

I sort of have a question about the Committee's thinking about these issues. So one of the things that I could imagine that the Committee might think about doing is trying to develop procedures that would synthesize and make the claims examiner's job easier and more transparent.

So I guess a question for the

Committee down the road is whether, for specific

covered illnesses, there should essentially be

some kind of manual that describes what's in the,

as we put it here, consensus documents from

learned bodies.

It sounds like de novo each time a

case with a specific condition comes up, that there's going to be a presentation of received wisdom. And there's a question in my mind about whether that's the best way to do it.

CHAIR CASSANO: I think my understanding of this is that it has to be synthesized into an opinion by someone with the expertise. So it's not the CEs responsibility to read the IARC manual on QCE.

That would either be the treating

physician or the -- whoever the treating

physician refers to to get that medical opinion
- the industrial hygienist or toxicologist or the

contracted medical consultant.

They would put all of the references together, and then synthesize those references and medical opinions. We might be able to develop some types of training documents for what we'll see later on their priority list, with some references, and a synthesis of those references with a generalized opinion about whether or not -- not on a specific case but in general, the

literature or does not support a causal relationship.

And that's sort of would be the first step towards quote unquote presumptions, if we were to go that far. Anybody else with comments or questions on this?

MEMBER MARKOWITZ: Yes, this is Steven again. So Les, could you just work through an example of what you're talking about? Because it seems like it's a way to streamline the consultation with the Haz-Map, which might make the CE's life easier and the decisions more transparent.

So could you just play out an example, for instance, of what you have in mind?

MEMBER BODEN: Well I might be able to start a discussion about it. I'm not sure I could play out a full example. But the idea would be, sort of, the CE is taking in information from various sources, whether it's the treating physician or another expert or a CMC, et cetera.

And the question is - wouldn't we want consistency over time, and over cases, in how various consensus documents are used?

Understanding that each individual case is unique.

So let me give you an example from one of the sets of cases that we looked at, where a question was what was the degree of impairment of a particular individual?

And essentially the rule was that the doctor had to look to the AMA guides and describe something that was consistent with what the AMA guide said. So the AMA guides then, in this case it was specified in law I think, told the doctor sort of what they had to do to apply to a specific case.

You could imagine a similar kind of situation for deciding whether a particular illness was caused by or aggravated by work exposures, where you would pull together sort of consensus documents on the relationships between your occupational exposure and disease outcome.

Does that clarify at all? 1 2 MEMBER MARKOWITZ: Yes, well, sort of. MEMBER BODEN: 3 Yes. 4 MEMBER MARKOWITZ: It seems like, for 5 commonly encountered conditions, an expedited 6 form of what the Haz-Map does within the SEM. 7 And it's conceivable, you know the devil's in the 8 details, but it's conceivable it would make 9 things more straightforward and probably consistent. 10 11 MEMBER BODEN: Yes. 12 MEMBER MARKOWITZ: But we'd have to 13 play it out and see what one looks like and see 14 if it makes sense. 15 MEMBER BODEN: Right. I'm not saying 16 that this would necessarily be a one-day job, but 17 that it might be something that would improve 18 both the efficiency of assisting, and the 19 consistency of how evidence is handled across 20 cases. 21 MEMBER MARKOWITZ: Okay. 22 CHAIR CASSANO: Okay. Anyone else

with comments on this, and then we can move to the next?

MEMBER SILVER: Yes, Ken Silver here.

If we do develop such a resource, I really hope

it would not be bottled up in the realm of not

publicly releasable documents, like many of the

those that have been provided to us.

The reason is, if the claimants knew what target they were aiming at to persuade the claims examiner, they might work with their physician to submit a file that already contained some of that evidence.

CHAIR CASSANO: Okay. Can we -- now the next issue was an issue regarding the types of medical evidence, and the question was asked: does all of the medical evidence go to the CMC?

And the response we got was only medical evidence determined to be relevant. And I think that both Dr. Markowitz and I sort of had the question of, well how does someone without medical training determine what is relevant?

And I think our conjoined opinion, if

you would, was that the way we're going to be able to do that is to look at some of the cases and also, in talking with the CEs in the CE form, to determine, hey, why do you consider this relevant, but this not.

So that's something that we're going to have to find out down the road. Does anybody else have any comments about this that is different than what's been discussed?

(No audible response.)

CHAIR CASSANO: I hear none, so moving right along. And then the next question was about duty to assist. And really the answer there was, there is no regulatory duty to assist.

But they do help with phone calls and talking to treating physicians in trying to tease out the information that they need to answer the claim. So that one was relatively straightforward. The next one --- discussion --

MEMBER MARKOWITZ: It is Steven. Let me just ask a question before we move on. So I think, from our full meeting in April and then it

appeared again on this call, this question about duty to assist.

And DOL's response is there is none officially but we do it. So my question, really to the other members, is whether -- is there a problem here? Because, you know, apparently the routine procedure is that the claims examiners are assisting. And if the perception is that it's violated sometimes, or not infrequently, then maybe there's something that we should look at.

CHAIR CASSANO: Good point. And that would take the individual personality of the CE out of it, as well if there was some standardized regulation regarding, or at least policy maybe not regulation, regarding this is what the CEs must do to assist the claimant in developing the claim, and not just them flow around. Any other discussion on that --

MEMBER MARKOWITZ: This is Steven again. The procedure manual I'm sure addresses this, I haven't memorized it yet, but I'm sure

there's some direction given to the claims examiner about assisting.

Perhaps this is just one of those issues that, if we get around to looking at claims, we can look for evidence of this.

CHAIR CASSANO: Yes. Good point. The next one was sufficient evidence and historical wages. I think I still have an issue with trying to figure out how a doc is supposed to do that.

I think, in our phone conversation with the program, we were told that basically, if there's information about when the person was taken out of work, was the person put on light duty, that works if you've got a treating physician that's been around and the issue was relatively soon -- you know, relatively recent, but a lot of that information is not going to be available.

And so we do feel that this is still problematic and maybe not something that the clinician should really be responsible to do. It just seems more of an economic issue than a

clinical issue. 1 2 Steve, do you have any further Or anybody else have any further 3 comments? 4 comments? 5 MEMBER MARKOWITZ: No, I don't. Okay, anybody else? 6 CHAIR CASSANO: 7 And the gentleman from the program that's on the 8 call with us, if at any time you want to chime in 9 and set us on a clearer path, please feel welcome 10 to do so. 11 MR. VANCE: Thank you. This is John 12 I appreciate that. I'll certainly 13 identify anything I think that is important or 14 noteworthy but, for the most part, I'm just going to sit and listen. And if I do hear something, I 15 16 will definitely chime in. Thank you. Thank you. 17 CHAIR CASSANO: Thank you, 18 very much. And the next is sort of a procedural 19 thing about paper trails, telephone requests -- I don't think there's much discussion on that. 20 21 It's all supposedly in the record.

On unavailable records, the biggest

question we had was -- how do you do this? Do you guys get a blanket release of medical records, so that the claims examiner can go and talk to whatever physician is on the list?

Or really more, again, a procedural question. And then the subsequent question is -- so if you can't get any medical records, how do you decide the case? Is it just an automatic denial?

That's my takeaway. I think Steve -I don't know if Steve has some more takeaway from
the conversation, but we do need other people's
input here.

MEMBER MARKOWITZ: This is Steven.

I'm rereading the DOL's response. I actually

don't fully understand it. If no records exist,

then I guess the CE goes to the treating

physician to get whatever they can get about

their knowledge.

But that means that records exist. So

I'm not sure that I really get what happens when

no records exist.

CHAIR CASSANO: Yes, I don't know how they would proceed. I mean, I would think that if it was something that was basically common knowledge, or at least well represented in the literature.

If you have a definitive diagnosis and you have a definitive exposure, then you can say the CE might be able to ask the CMC to make a decision, but if you don't even have a definitive -- I mean, you can send somebody, I guess, to another physician to get a diagnosis. And I guess the SEM would determine whether or not they were exposed.

So, in that case, I guess it could go to a CMC and there could be a decision made that's -- is that the process that's used in that case? Or do they just say, you know, sorry you don't have any medical evidence, you don't have any record. We can't approve your claim.

MR. VANCE: This is John Vance. I guess I'll use my permission to speak at this point.

(Laughter.)

MR. VANCE: Let me see if I can get some clarification. You have to keep in mind that these cases can identify sources of information that might not necessarily be medical from the onset.

So if we're talking about a survivor claim, somebody might indicate in that case -- well, you know, my father or my mother was treated at a hospital outside of Denver, and this is the hospital, this is the doctor.

We have some information about this facility, so that may be a lead that the CE may explore to try to contact the hospital to see if those records exist, but at the end of the day, Dr. Markowitz is correct. That if we have nothing, if there's no information, if we have nothing from the employee or nothing from the survivor, there's no avenues of development and we have no further medical documentation, then that case is not going to have a positive outcome.

In other situations where we have various types of medical documentation, but we don't really have a clear diagnostic opinion from a physician, those are instances where, if we're talking about an individual who passed away some time ago, we're looking at historical records.

Well, we would send that, probably, to a CMC, asking the doctor, you know, based upon this information, is there any basis to believe that this person had a condition that contributed to their death and was associated with the process of their exposure.

And, you know, if you can get that type of an affirmative response from a physician. And you are able to assemble some sort of medical documentation from the doctor to opine on, and so that's what we do.

But you have to keep in mind that these cases are extremely disparate. They have all kinds of assemblies of information and data that can lead a CE in different directions for development, but at the end of the day, if there

1 is absolutely no medical documentation in the 2 file to support a diagnosed condition, then we're going to be without any avenue to get to a 3 4 positive outcome. 5 Okay, so you -- I CHAIR CASSANO: 6 mean, but you could recommend to the claimant that he's got to know that he now needs to go to 7 8 a doctor and get a diagnosis, yes? 9 MR. VANCE: Yes, if you're talking 10 about a living employee --11 CHAIR CASSANO: Right. 12 MR. VANCE: -- but if you're talking 13 about someone who's deceased, that's not going to 14 be a possibility. 15 CHAIR CASSANO: Yes. Okay. Any other further discussion on that? I mean, that's what 16 17 we thought would happen. 18 MEMBER MARKOWITZ: This is Steven. 19 John, does that mean -- this issue of truly 20 unavailable medical records is mostly an issue 21 with the survivors claims? 22 MR. VANCE: Yes, I would say that's

generally the case. But, you know, when you're talking about individuals that were, you know, working at these places in the forties and the fifties and then passed away in the seventies.

Those are the toughest cases that we encounter for obtaining medical documentation.

And the only thing we generally get in a lot of those cases is the death certificate. And that's why we utilize that in a lot of those types of cases to establish diagnosis.

MEMBER MARKOWITZ: Thank you.

CHAIR CASSANO: Any other comments/
questions on that? Okay. And the next issue
was, again, this issue of weighing medical
evidence, which is probably the stickiest wicket
here.

We asked how are the CEs trained in weighing medical evidence. And the answer we got back was the CEs are trained to evaluate all evidence that's submitted in a case file, but we still don't have a really good answer on exactly how they're trained, what kind of training

materials, et cetera, to be able to tease out medical evidence.

The procedure manual talks about what methods to apply, but it doesn't have, I would call, an artificial intelligence to say, yes this diagnosis makes sense, this diagnosis doesn't.

Or, you know, the person smoked for 45 years and the smoking is more relevant than the exposure. So I think the answer, again to this as far as we know, is that we're going to have to talk to more CEs about this. And there are some training documents available. But, as I understand the process and what we were told on the phone, is that it's really the senior CEs that work with the newer people and get them up to speed and help them understand how to do this.

And that training materials may be available, but there's no standardized training manual, I guess, other than the procedure manual.

Anybody else want to chime in?

MEMBER VLIEGER: Good morning, this is Faye. Can you hear me?

CHAIR CASSANO: Yes.

MEMBER VLIEGER: There was a problem with me calling in. I've been attempting for nearly 20 minutes to talk, and the moderator never came on. So here I am.

While it's all well and good that they say that their CEs are trained, and John you can chime in any time you'd like, the training depends on the background of the individual and it is not what I would call standard.

While there is standardized -- the CE's work is not standardized. And the recent report that came out, the 2015 audit, found that there was more than a 10 percent error going on in the way that claims were developed and processed by the CEs. So I think it would be well worth our time in looking at those training materials.

CHAIR CASSANO: Yes. We asked to see them, I believe. That was during that phone call, I believe we were told that they would get what they could to us. So that's on its way. We

do need to look at that. 1 2 MEMBER MARKOWITZ: Let me just chime in. 3 4 CHAIR CASSANO: Yes. 5 MEMBER MARKOWITZ: I think that I remember that the training materials are limited 6 because much of the teaching is around specific 7 8 examples, which are not volunteered to be 9 standards or standardized across positions. 10 I'm sure we can get whatever training 11 materials exist. But it'll leave the question 12 whether we should be looking into, you know, a 13 more standardized stereotypic type of training, 14 but --15 CHAIR CASSANO: Yes. 16 MEMBER MARKOWITZ: -- not that we need 17 to answer that now, but I suspect that that's 18 going to be on the table. 19 CHAIR CASSANO: Yes. And I think we 20 all agree on that. Does anybody else have any 21 input? 22 MEMBER SILVER: This is Ken Silver

again. Let me just cite one more time, a few years before the board was created, Sheldon Samuels was a major influence in Washington, D.C. in occupational health policy.

He floated an idea on Terrie Berrie's mailing list that a career ladder ought to be created for people doing this kind of work that involves continuing education and certification.

Mr. Howie seemed kind of interested in that idea when we met in April. There'd be some problems involving the collective bargaining unit but, you know, a journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step.

And I think we should keep our eye on the idea that we can't really get educated on this stuff by reading a procedures manual and going through a couple of internal education sessions.

A long-term solution really requires a curriculum with advancement and recognition for people who have acquired real expertise within the Office of Workers Comp.

CHAIR CASSANO: Any other comments? 1 2 Yes, we'll try to set up a focus group Great. that's part of the agenda. We don't know what 3 4 time or anything. 5 And then the question about the 6 treating physician being compensated. The answer 7 that we got on the phone call was, if the claim 8 is accepted, then that -- it's somewhat 9 compensated for the opinion. If the claim is accepted, then yes 10 there is compensation. If the claim is not 11 12 accepted, there is no method to be able to 13 compensate a consulting physician who was 14 referred to develop a medical opinion, other than 15 the contracted medical consultant. 16 I think this was a question you asked. 17 So if you have any follow-up concerns with that, 18 or questions about that, or anybody else for that 19 matter. 20 MEMBER BODEN: No, not at the moment.

CHAIR CASSANO:

that's how it works in a lot of other systems

21

22

Okay. And I think

too. But it's, you know, there are some safeguards that aren't in here. The next question ---

MEMBER MARKOWITZ: Sorry, this is

Steven again. Causation reports can take a fair

amount of time to create high quality reports.

And I'm wondering whether there's actually a

category of reimbursement for causation reports

that recognizes something beyond the standard

examination.

The issue really is, you know, if a physician is writing a simple, straightforward, skimpy, rationalized report, that's one thing. But if they're taking the time to actually document their statements and provide of references, et cetera.

I'm talking about the CMC, I'm talking about the physician that the claim goes to. That takes time. And I'm wondering if there's a recognition of that in the reimbursement system.

MR. VANCE: I don't want to offer an answer that I'm not 100 percent certain about.

All I can tell you is that what we would pay 1 2 would be based on a coding structure in the billing for the services being provided by a 3 4 physician. So, in other words, if there's an ICD-5 6 10 classification for a reporting of that nature 7 that can be billed to the government, that the 8 government will reimburse that based on whatever 9 fee schedule exists for the energy program. Now I cannot specifically answer the 10 question as to a fully-drafted comprehensive 11 12 causation report. Is there a particular ICD-10 code for that? I don't think so. 13 14 But I'm just not familiar with billing coding enough to be able to answer that question 15 16 with any degree of certainty. Okay, thanks. 17 MEMBER MARKOWITZ: 18 Well, we can just put it on the list to find out. 19 Thank you. 20 MEMBER BODEN: Yes, so this is Les 21 Just to clarify, it sounds -- so there

is, I gather, a specific list of payments for

procedures that may have procedures on it that
may not be in the normal procedure coding because
they're specific to things like writing a
causation report? It was a question mark at the
end of that sentence.

(Laughter.)

MEMBER BODEN: So is that correct, that there is a reimbursement available for activities that are not normal CPT procedures?

MR. VANCE: Yes, that's what I was saying before. I'm not certain that -- this is John Vance again. I'm not certain as to what would be an allowed billable service by the physician, based on that type of specific process or procedure.

We'd have to go back and take a look at what is our ICD-9 and ICD-10 coding for that type of service. And what are the potential different types of services that a physician could bill for? Because there are innumerable classifications and procedures that a physician can charge the government against for services

rendered.

I'm just not familiar, and certainly not going to be able to answer that with any degree of certainty. And, you know, that coding classification process is a very complicated one that has a lot of, you know, complicated service and procedure codes and other types of things that are going on. So that would be one that I would not be confident answering.

MEMBER BODEN: Right. So this might be something that we could try to get more information about because what physicians are doing for this program is different from what physicians typically do.

They typically provide diagnostic services and treatment services. They're not treating here, but also the diagnostic services they're providing are somewhat different from the ones that they normally provide. So I think if there's a way of giving us that information, as Dr. Markowitz suggested, I think that would be useful to the committee.

1	MEMBER SILVER: This is Ken Silver.
2	I'm particularly interested in whether there are
3	physicians out there essentially working on a
4	contingency basis doing what Dr. Markowitz
5	described, writing fully rationalized causation
6	reports of someone who's not yet in the Part E
7	program, the claim might be denied.
8	Will the physician see any payment for
9	all of their library work and writing and re-
10	writing?
11	MS. RHOADS: Why don't I pass these
12	questions onto the program after the meeting is
13	over and we'll see what we can find out?
14	MEMBER SILVER: Great.
15	MS. RHOADS: Dr. Cassano, did we lose
16	you?
17	CHAIR CASSANO: and apparently, you
18	guys can't hear me for some reason.
19	MS. RHOADS: Hi. We can hear you now.
20	We heard you come on in the middle of your
21	sentence.
22	CHAIR CASSANO: Okay, great. Okay,

I'm here. What I was asking -- I had a follow up question for Mr. Vance, in that -- and I guess

Ken asked the same thing, was -- well he asked it in a slightly different way.

The physicians only get compensated if the claim is accepted. So a claimant could go out and spend \$2,000-\$2,500 for a what we would call a nexus opinion, and be out that \$2,500, if the claim is not accepted, correct?

MR. VANCE: That is correct. And a sort of in response to Ken's question -- this is John Vance again. I am well aware that there are people being paid by claimants, and their attorneys or representatives, to provide input on these cases.

But the method and the methodology for payment for those services is not something that would be payable by the Department of Labor.

That's sort of an external to the program.

That's sort of an external to the program.

So they're assembling cases by going to their own experts. And you have to think of it as not just the physician that they could seek

out input from. They could also be seeking out input from health scientists, toxicologists, industrial hygienists, and all of those are being paid through from fees being collected by an attorney, or however it's being arranged.

And those might not be payable or reimbursed by the Department of Labor, in any form, because we can only pay based on our authorized fee schedule under the method that we pay bills through the program.

CHAIR CASSANO: Okay, thank you. The next few -- I think the next one reviewed by CMC, again, goes back to how does the CE learn to weigh medical evidence, the CMC's report versus the training physician's report, et cetera?

And I think we sort of answered our own question, in that we really need to sit down with CEs and look at the training materials. So I'm not going to belabor this particular one, unless somebody else has -- or wants to address this separately from the other issue about weighing medical evidence in training materials.

Okay. Hearing none, I'm going to move on. Again, the next statement was assistance with rationalization, how complex, what do they want? And what we got back from the program was basically, well it's part of that whole gestalt of how the CE looks at things, whether there's enough, there isn't enough.

A doc saying, I'm an expert in this field and I say it's related versus a well-rationalized report. And there could be some standardization there, but I think it really is more mushy than we'd like it to be.

Steve, do you have any further comments about that? Or, again, I think this is something they need to learn about from speaking with the CEs. Anybody else have any discussion of this?

MEMBER MARKOWITZ: I do want to either put on the table -- this is Steven -- put on the or re-put on the table, I can't quite remember, that above and beyond speaking with claims examiners, looking at a number of claims

Individually, what the behavior is, 1 themselves. 2 what the CEs are doing in practice. And to have a real look at how medical evidence is 3 4 interpreted and moved. CHAIR CASSANO: Okay. Did we lose 5 Hello? Okay. 6 you? 7 MEMBER MARKOWITZ: I'm sorry. I just made a comment, could you hear me? 8 9 CHAIR CASSANO: I heard most of it, I think. 10 11 Oh, I'm just saying MEMBER MARKOWITZ: 12 that we need to look at some claims to get a 13 different picture. That's all. 14 CHAIR CASSANO: Okay. And the next question was the development letters, yes they 15 16 will supply some of the development letters for 17 And they state they're often lengthy. 18 physicians may not have the time or the 19 inclination to respond, especially if they're not 20 getting reimbursed for it. 21 Again, more about training resources, training materials. We're getting close to one 22

hour. And then I want to move on. I want to get this discussion done at the top of the hour.

And then again, looking for contribution or aggravation, this is something that they really need us to try to tease out for them. Again, it's hard to standardize that because it depends on quantity, length of time, dose and other contributing factors as to how much aggravation, how much contribution.

So that's the real question that's out there, and probably one that scientists have to answer. Quarterly reports, we will get. And we do have a list of priorities that I think answers this last -- what are the associated diseases that claimants are claiming most often? Any additional comments at this point?

MS. RHOADS: Hi Dr. Cassano, this is Carrie. Apparently when people were able to hear only some of the discussion, Ms. Vlieger got dropped off. Can we wait a few minutes for her to call back on?

CHAIR CASSANO: Sure.

1	MS. RHOADS: Thank you.
2	CHAIR CASSANO: Yes, we seem to be
3	having some technical difficulties here.
4	MS. RHOADS: Yes, let me just check
5	with the moderator and make sure she's calling
6	back in, and then we'll join her back in.
7	CHAIR CASSANO: Okay. Thank you.
8	MEMBER MARKOWITZ: So this is Steven.
9	Can I make a comment while we're waiting for
10	Faye?
11	CHAIR CASSANO: Yes.
12	MEMBER MARKOWITZ: The issue of
13	aggravation their response to that question
14	is
15	CHAIR CASSANO: Hello?
16	MEMBER VLIEGER: I am here. Can you
17	hear me?
18	MEMBER MARKOWITZ: Yes.
19	CHAIR CASSANO: Yes, I can hear you.
	CHAIR CASSANO: 1es, 1 can hear you.
20	I can't hear anybody else now.
20 21	_

1	CHAIR CASSANO: Okay, now I can hear
2	you. Okay.
3	MS. RHOADS: Is Ms. Vlieger back on
4	now?
5	MEMBER VLIEGER: You can hear me
6	again, right?
7	MS. RHOADS: Yes.
8	MEMBER MARKOWITZ: Oh yes.
9	MEMBER VLIEGER: All right, thank you.
10	MS. RHOADS: The moderator tells me
11	that there are seven lines active, so that should
12	be everybody. Sorry about that, go ahead.
13	CHAIR CASSANO: Faye, did you have a
14	comment or do you need me to repeat what we said?
15	I'm not quite sure where you fell off.
16	MEMBER VLIEGER: I fell off about five
17	minutes ago. I was able to call in and hear you,
18	but not be able to speak.
19	CHAIR CASSANO: Did you want to speak
20	to something?
21	MEMBER VLIEGER: Just in general. I
22	don't know how many times we're going to go back

and talk to the Department of Labor for 1 2 information before we actually have an idea of how much we need to know. 3 It's becoming very stultifying to not 4 5 be able to discuss anything with people in between meetings. And we need to rectify that. 6 CHAIR CASSANO: I think, yes, it does 7 8 become difficult. I think maybe we should -- we need a little bit of clarification of the rules 9 about how we can break up into subgroups and 10 working groups and be able to share information 11 12 and collaborate in that way. 13 Carrie, is that something that we can 14 do in a couple of minutes, so that we can move on 15 and get our game plan put together here? 16 MS. RHOADS: Sure, we were talking to 17 another subcommittee about this as well. You can 18 use email to communicate with the group, as long 19 as you copy me and Tony, on the discussion. 20 you can break up into working groups as well. 21 CHAIR CASSANO: Okay.

MS. RHOADS:

Maybe I can get some

1	guidance written on that as well for the next
2	CHAIR CASSANO: Okay, thanks. And a
3	working group can be up to three people, or
4	doesn't it matter?
5	MS. RHOADS: It just can't be the
6	entire Subcommittee.
7	CHAIR CASSANO: Okay. Who's there?
8	MEMBER MARKOWITZ: This is Steven.
9	CHAIR CASSANO: Steve? Were you about
LO	to say something?
L1	MEMBER MARKOWITZ: Yes. Faye, does
L 2	that address what you were raising?
L3	MEMBER VLIEGER: You know, I'm not
L 4	sure that you guys are getting to the heart of
L5	the issue. How many times do we have to ask for
L6	information before we just start making
L7	decisions?
L8	CHAIR CASSANO: Well, I think we need
L9	to make sure we've got, just like the CE, all the
20	relevant information. You know, I think we're
21	pretty close, at this point. And that's why I
2	want to move on now to the next step, which is

number five on the agenda - open discussion about how we should proceed.

We have a lot of information at this point. And there are -- we have been told that we can get training materials, we can meet with the CEs and we can get development letters and review those.

So, I think we're at the point where we can start to decide - Okay, what are we going to first? Who's going to do it? Do we break up into working groups to look at a variety of cases and report back? And that's the discussion we need to have now. So, without saying this is a free-for-all, I think we need everybody to give their input on this.

I could be partly directive about it, about what I think should be first and second and third, et cetera, but I want everybody to participate and especially you Faye, knowing how these things sort of work, to sort of make a sequence out of the next step.

MEMBER MARKOWITZ: This is Steven.

Maybe, before we get into that, Carrie could give us some insight into an approximate time table for the activities that Tori just listed - meetings for the claims examiner, whatever training materials you get, the development letters.

I know it's approximate, but do you have any sense of when we might have that?

MS. RHOADS: Well, for the training materials and the development letters, the Program is working on gathering them. They said a couple of weeks -- that they need to look up each one separately.

And the materials that you all have on your disks have cases that were provided to the Part B Lung Commission Subcommittee. And you all are welcome to go into those cases to look for examples, or to just review the process of what you can tell from those cases.

I will have to ask someone about a timeframe for speaking with CEs or the focus group that you're talking about, but I'll do that

and send out some information after the meeting. 1 2 Does that cover all of your things? CHAIR CASSANO: Just one question on 3 4 the cases. You said they were all lung patients? 5 MS. RHOADS: They are. The first lung cases that they did were for the Part B 6 7 Subcommittee, so they are listed under that 8 Subcommittee folder. 9 But you all can go in there and look 10 at those cases anytime. 11 MR. VANCE: Yes. This is John Vance. 12 I was part of the group that did that work, so 13 I'm very familiar with it. They accepted, in our 14 cases, for beryllium disease, beryllium 15 sensitivity and some other lung diseases like 16 silicosis. 17 And what you have access to is medical 18 records, copies of statements of accepted facts, 19 any kind of CMC referral process that occurred. 20 And some of those cases are relatively 21 straightforward and other ones are more

complicated.

But I do know that some of the cases, at least in the CBD examples with recommends to deny, you may find cases where there were conflicts in medical opinion and you'll see some examples of where you had lots of differing positions on particular situations.

CHAIR CASSANO: Yes, I think that would give us a lot of information. Beryllium disease is very finite. And I think we really do need to see cases from Part B because there are so many disparate types of information.

Beryllium is, compared to some of the other stuff we may be working with, relatively -- I don't mean to disparage anybody, but relatively simple. But when you're talking about organic solvent mixtures plus heavy metals plus something else, it gets very complicated.

So I think we need this in certain cases. What's the consensus out there?

MEMBER VLIEGER: This is Faye. We need to see Part B patients, not just Beryllium patients.

1 CHAIR CASSANO: Yes. 2 MEMBER BODEN: Right. This is Les. I thought, when I saw it and maybe I missed 3 4 something, was three cases - they were by and 5 large pulmonary cases, I think. CHAIR CASSANO: 6 Yes. 7 MEMBER BODEN: And my sense is, 8 cursory at any rate with you, is that even though 9 part of me wants not to have extra work, that three cases are not enough to tell the complete 10 11 story of what's going on. 12 MS. RHOADS: Hi Dr. Boden, this is 13 Carrie. Those three cases were in response to 14 one of the -- someone had asked at the April meeting, that we see some examples with CMC 15 16 referrals. So that's what those are. 17 MEMBER BODEN: Oh, right, okay. 18 CHAIR CASSANO: Anybody else on this 19 issue, about getting Part B cases? 20 MEMBER MARKOWITZ: Sure. This is 21 Steven. Yes. We have to, you know, make a more

specific request. But my question is, you know,

just talking of the time table here, it's at five weeks before we meet in person.

DOL has had practice in turning around cases and settled some of the problems that they had initially. So the question is whether it's possible and people want to see some cases before our October meeting, so that we can have a better discussion.

Or whether we want to wait until the actual meeting, so that we can structure any of the questions of the Subcommittee. Personally, I would favor, if possible, looking at some claims before the October meeting, so that we can have a better discussion and get going.

But also that will help us formulate any more definitive requests.

CHAIR CASSANO: I would like to do
that as well. I'm traveling extensively between
now and then. But if we could -- Sorry, I could
switch to it, but I'd like everybody to be
looking at.

There are 14 priorities that are on

1	here. If we could get one or two cases of each
2	of these, that would be 28 cases. We could then
3	divide those up into working groups and have
4	working groups review them and develop questions,
5	at which point and I don't know if all this
6	will probably not all get accomplished by
7	October. We may be able to peruse them a little
8	bit. But unless there's some time during the
9	full Committee meeting, Steve, where we could
10	break out and do this forum with the CEs, I don't
11	see that happening the next full meeting.
12	MS. RHOADS: Hi, this is Carrie.
13	Before you go on, I just want everybody to know -
14	- another subcommittee has also asked for one of
15	each of these cases. So they're already working
16	on that. I'll definitely share that with both
17	subcommittees when it's finished.
18	CHAIR CASSANO: Okay, great, thank
19	you.
20	MEMBER MARKOWITZ: Carrie, what's the
21	timetable, roughly, for that?
22	MS. RHOADS: I think in a couple of

weeks. I'm not sure. I'll check with Doug and 1 2 make sure. Okay, but that 3 MEMBER MARKOWITZ: 4 means a couple of weeks before the October 5 meeting. That's good. Hopefully, yes. I think 6 MS. RHOADS: the beginning of October was what they talked 7 8 about, but I need to check before saying for 9 sure. 10 CHAIR CASSANO: And, Carrie, we're 11 going to be getting these by disk, correct? 12 MS. RHOADS: Yes, because there'll be cases that'll have PII on them. 13 14 CHAIR CASSANO: Okay. So if we get these by the first of October, we can divvy them 15 16 up. I can divvy them up and maybe -- I don't 17 know, we're now two weeks before the 16th. 18 And maybe right before the meeting on 19 the 16th, we can have a little bit of a 20 discussion about what we found, generally, in 21 these cases. And that would move that bit along. 22 I think once we see these -- I think

1	it's important to see these cases before and
2	to look at the training materials and the
3	development letters before we have our focus
4	group with the CEs. Other thoughts about that?
5	MEMBER BODEN: Just a question. Is
6	there a specific time, maybe I missed this, that
7	we plan to have these focus groups?
8	CHAIR CASSANO: Not yet. We need to
9	figure that out.
10	MEMBER BODEN: Okay.
11	CHAIR CASSANO: But I don't see it
12	happening before the next full meeting.
13	MEMBER BODEN: No.
14	CHAIR CASSANO: Because I think it
15	would have to be an open meeting, correct Carrie?
16	MS. RHOADS: Yes. If you want to have
17	another Subcommittee meeting, we have to publish
18	that in the Federal Register and everything.
19	Yes, but you can discuss it by email or some
20	other method.
21	CHAIR CASSANO: Okay, so we can do
22	that. So if we get these by October 1st, I will

make sure I'll divide them among the group, somewhat equitably.

And maybe by the 10th, I have to look at my calendar, let me go back in my calendar -- let's see, so if we get these by the 1st, which is a Thursday, the Subcommittee meeting is -- I'm in September, wait a second. October.

No. There we go. So, the first is a Saturday. So if we get them sometime around there, probably the week of the 11th, 12th and 13th, we can have some -- obviously, if we're going to be talking via email, we have to talk in generalizations, so we'll have to code Case 1, and just put diagnosis, no PII, no nothing.

And then the working group that's working on that will submit questions, issues, concerns they have about how the case worked, so that we can may be able to finish that work by the time of the full meeting.

And then maybe at the full meeting, after the full meeting, we can discuss the training materials and the development letters.

1	And then, obviously, we would need a six weeks
2	lead team before we could have a focus group?
3	And I'm not sure how we would work
4	that. Would we travel to meet? I don't think on
5	the phone would work very well. Any suggestions
6	on that?
7	MEMBER VLIEGER: I don't know why we
8	couldn't do write ups and then compare the write
9	ups, or at least be able to have small work
10	groups discussions.
11	CHAIR CASSANO: Yes.
12	MEMBER VLIEGER: I don't see a problem
13	doing small work group discussions over the
14	phone.
15	CHAIR CASSANO: Yes, you can do that.
16	But I think that the focus group
17	MEMBER BODEN: Those are separate
18	issues, actually.
19	CHAIR CASSANO: Okay.
20	MEMBER BODEN: One would deal with
21	claims and work groups

We can discuss those over the phone that week, 1 2 right before the full meeting. And then, probably within two weeks of that full meeting, 3 4 have discussions about the training materials and 5 development letters. Maybe put some type of a report 6 7 together. And then set up a focus group meeting. 8 MEMBER BODEN: Can I ask a question? 9 This is a, really, and Advisory Committee rules I have a concern about CEs feeling 10 question. 11 comfortable having full and open discussions 12 about issues in their jobs in a public setting. 13 But I don't know if anything else is consistent 14 with Advisory Committee rules. 15 This is Steven. MEMBER MARKOWITZ: Ιt 16 hadn't occurred to me that the focus group would 17 be open public access. 18 CHAIR CASSANO: Yes, I was hoping it 19 would be. 20 MEMBER BODEN: That's what I was 21 hoping also. But I just wanted to be sure that

22

we could do that.

MEMBER MARKOWITZ: It could be a subset of a subcommittee.

CHAIR CASSANO: Yes. I mean, as long as one person on the subcommittee didn't go, it's not a full subcommittee meeting. And, therefore, we can do it in private, right? Carrie?

MS. RHOADS: I think so. But I have to ask about focus groups, specifically. I'll make sure I don't forget.

CHAIR CASSANO: And the other reason for doing that is because we wouldn't want to inadvertently publicly blab PPI as we're talking about a particular case. I think it's scary to do it that way.

MS. RHOADS: Absolutely.

CHAIR CASSANO: So I'm not sure if you can suspend the rules for that. If different people on the Subcommittee worked with a couple of CEs, and then another group worked with another couple of CEs, then -- I'm not trying to be not be transparent here, but there is some legitimate concerns with PPI, et cetera.

And people talking about whether or not they feel they have the information they need to do their job. That's something -- we want people to be honest with us about this. So I would prefer not to have it public if we can.

MEMBER MARKOWITZ: This is Steven.

Not to mention that it wouldn't work for

Subcommittee members to be present at a focus

group. It would inhibit the discussion.

CHAIR CASSANO: Right.

MEMBER MARKOWITZ: So, inevitably, it's going to be a relatively small subset of the Subcommittee that would be present. And again, I agree that it's not a question of subverting the rules, it's a question of effectively getting information.

CHAIR CASSANO: Yes. So going back now to the agenda, we should have had a vague timetable of how we're going to advance. We're going to get cases, we're going to look at cases, we're going to have our big meeting, we're going to then look at training materials and

development letters. And then we're going to meet the CEs.

MEMBER MARKOWITZ: This is Steven.

Let me ask you a question about that. Talking about the Subcommittee agenda for the October meeting. We should be in the position of sharing with the larger Committee, our review of development letters.

We should be in the position of reviewing the training materials and reporting back to the committee on that. And it sounds like we'll have some claims to look at. And we can have the beginning of a discussion about what we found the claims at the full board meeting.

CHAIR CASSANO: Yes.

MEMBER MARKOWITZ: Is that realistic?

Is that right?

CHAIR CASSANO: Steven, I don't think it is that realistic at this point. I know you want some kind of report, but I think a report on getting to this point and what we are looking at and how we're going to move forward and

discussing the claims at the next meeting, is probably as much as -- I only have one week where I'm not traveling between now and the Subcommittee meeting. So I'm freaking out a little bit.

MEMBER MARKOWITZ: No, I wasn't saying that a report should be produced. I was saying that the discussion at this Subcommittee has with the full Committee would include having looked at some of the development letters, having looked at whatever training materials have been given to us.

And then having an open discussion about that. Not having settled on any sort of position or even the next steps about that. But bring that discussion to the full Committee.

CHAIR CASSANO: I mean, we could.

What does everybody else think? I mean, I think
we have to have somewhat of a discussion about
our evaluation of the procedure manuals and some
of the other stuff.

You know, we've been in on this

subcommittee and they understand how we got here 1 2 from where we were. But the full Committee isn't going to understand that. 3 4 So I think we have a lot to present up 5 to that point. We can certainly try to look briefly at some of the development letters and 6 7 see the low hanging fruit that may be there, as 8 well as the training materials. 9 But I don't think we can do a deep 10 dive into any of it before that meeting. I mean, you know, I don't see us being 11 comments? 12 able to do a very comprehensive evaluation. 13 MEMBER MARKOWITZ: Right, yes, okay. 14 You know, we've got time. CHAIR CASSANO: We'll talk about that. 15 16 MEMBER MARKOWITZ: We'll see where 17 we're at. Yes. We'll see how far we get. 18 Obviously, my job is to move the process along. 19 But not faster than we can. 20 So we'll revisit the agenda of this 21 Subcommittee in the larger full Committee meeting in a few weeks. 22

CHAIR CASSANO: Okay. Yes, it also depends on how soon we get the material. You know, if it takes until October 1st to get the material, we can do a very cursory evaluation of it, and present that.

But we can talk offline or email back and forth about that. Any other comments about how much we should look at before the full Committee meeting?

MEMBER VLIEGER: I would hope that we would have at least a plan, going forward, of how we're going to attack things for the timeline when we're at the October meeting.

CHAIR CASSANO: Yes. And I was going to try to pin some of that down today. And that's what we were doing, as far as looking at the cases and then getting the training materials and looking at that.

And then, I was hoping we could develop some kind of a report, maybe not an official report, but sort of consolidate some of our findings on the procedure manual and the

training materials. And maybe some cursory recommendations for process improvement. And then we'll talk about the development of deliverables. This is all on the agenda.

But the first thing is to get all of the relevant information. And then go on from there. I can send out a timetable after this meeting, based on when we're going to get all of the additional information, and send that out to everybody.

MEMBER VLIEGER: Couldn't we at least start on the documents that we have that are for the perspective of the Subcommittee? And at least start working on those in some Subcommittee groups?

CHAIR CASSANO: Which documents are you talking about? Well, we already have cases that we can look at for how they weighed medical evidence in our hands. So I don't know why we couldn't do some subcommittee work with what we already have, and then just add the additional cases as they come.

1	MEMBER VLIEGER: How many cases are on
2	that disk? They're just the three pulmonary
3	cases?
4	MS. RHOADS: There are three pulmonary
5	cases from the April meeting and then there's
6	about 50 cases on there.
7	CHAIR CASSANO: Oh there are? But
8	they're all pulmonary, correct? They're all
9	beryllium cases?
10	MS. RHOADS: They're all lung cases,
11	right?
12	MR. VANCE: They are all Part B lung
13	
14	CHAIR CASSANO: Okay.
15	MEMBER VLIEGER: Well there's also the
16	cases from the Cleveland office. There's three
17	cases from the Cleveland office with referrals to
18	CMC.
19	CHAIR CASSANO: Those are still Part
20	B cases?
21	MEMBER VLIEGER: Yes, but it goes to
22	referring to the weighing of medical evidence.

CHAIR CASSANO: We can certainly do that but, again, we're going to be re-doing work because we're going to have to look at the Part E plans as well.

But certainly we can look at them and have discussions and I can divide people up into subgroups. And we can get some of that done.

MEMBER VLIEGER: My point is of starting on some of this is, I don't think we're going to see a big difference in what we already have in our hands versus any new -- only the difference in the disease and how it's handled. So that's why I'd at least like to start on what we have.

CHAIR CASSANO: We certainly can do that. What's the consensus on this? Should we wait a couple of weeks to get the other cases, or should we have discussions on the beryllium cases that we have?

MR. VANCE: This is John Vance. Let me interject really quick. The 50 cases that Carrie Rhoads just mentioned. When we did that

pool, that would be -- it was focused primarily 1 2 on Part B lung diseases. CHAIR CASSANO: 3 Right. 4 MR. VANCE: A vast majority of those 5 cases will also have a Part E component to it, just to let you guys know. 6 7 CHAIR CASSANO: Okay. 8 Like I said before, some MR. VANCE: 9 of those cases, as Faye mentioned, will have CMC referrals. I know a couple of cases that I 10 specifically pulled for that actually did have 11 12 conflicts of medical opinion in there. that would relate to both the Part B and E case. 13 14 CHAIR CASSANO: Okay. So what we'll 15 do is we'll take a look at those cases, and I 16 will have to take a look at them. And what I'll 17 do is I'll pull the ones that seem to be -- that 18 have Part E components to them -- and we can have 19 some discussions on them. And then I'll divvy 20 Does that make sense to everybody? them up. 21 MEMBER SILVER: Sure.

Yes.

MEMBER VLIEGER:

CHAIR CASSANO: And then we'll get the 1 2 additional 28 cases, or whatever we're going to get from the others. So, after this meeting, I 3 will send out a timeline for how that will be 4 5 accomplished, and how we're going to synthesize a discussion of that. 6 7 Does everybody want to write a 8 synopsis of the case? We're going to have to 9 number the cases and just do it Case No 1, 10 contention and views, et cetera, and then we're 11 going to have to put down your concerns or the issues or the questions that you have. 12 MEMBER BODEN: This is Les. 13 I don't 14 know exactly how to do this, but I think it would 15 be advisable to have a sort of common, straight, 16 general template --17 CHAIR CASSANO: Okay. 18 MEMBER BODEN: So that we're all 19 discussing the same things. 20 CHAIR CASSANO: Okay, I can get that 21 done. 22 That would be great. MEMBER BODEN:

That would be great.

CHAIR CASSANO: Okay. So we're going to look at the preliminary cases and the, probably over the next two weeks, before we get the other ones, and we'll set up some way of -- some standardized template to look at them and add specific questions and then move on from there to the new cases that you're getting.

And if we get the training materials and the development letters, we'll certainly take a look at those. And, also, people will document their issues or concerns on that. And we can bring that to the full committee.

MEMBER POPE: This is Duronda Pope.

CHAIR CASSANO: Yes.

MEMBER POPE: So just to be clear.

We're going to be looking at those cases as a

full committee, not as focused committees?

CHAIR CASSANO: No, we cannot -- I will divvy those cases. I will look at the cases. And so that people aren't just picking one case or two cases that seem interesting to

them, I will pick the cases that I think we get 1 2 the most bang for the buck out of. 3 MEMBER POPE: Okay. 4 CHAIR CASSANO: And then I will put 5 that list out, and what suggestions on who should 6 look at them or what working group would look at 7 them - probably an industrial hygienist, either 8 you or Faye, and either me or Dr. Markowitz, if I 9 can impress him, so that we have a civilian, an industrial hygienist and a physician on each of 10 11 these. 12 MEMBER POPE: Okay. 13 CHAIR CASSANO: Does that make sense? 14 MEMBER POPE: Yes. 15 CHAIR CASSANO: Okay. So I'll put 16 that together and we can go from there. And I'll send out a little bit of a timetable of how we're 17 18 going to get that done. 19 MEMBER POPE: Okay. 20 CHAIR CASSANO: Now I also think, even 21 though we have some of this documented, we need to put out some type of synthesized document on 22

what we found regarding the procedure manual and the training materials. What do other people think about that?

so that a year from now, when we're going back to try to work on process improvement, we understand what our concerns were at the beginning. And especially if new people come on, or people leave the committee, we need to have some documentation other than the minutes and the summaries of the meeting. Comments?

MEMBER VLIEGER: I have a question.

CHAIR CASSANO: Yes.

MEMBER VLIEGER: This is Faye. The question I have is - How are we going to provide the summaries, other than to ourselves and the Department of Labor? Are any of these summaries going to be uploaded?

CHAIR CASSANO: I think once they are finalized, yes, but I think they can be used as a work product. If we can communicate by email, then we can put a document in that email that's a working document or a draft or something,

1 correct? 2 MS. RHOADS: You can. If you are summarizing cases, just make sure that there's no 3 4 PII in your summary. 5 CHAIR CASSANO: Right. MS. RHOADS: Just be able to do that 6 7 without putting identifiers in there. 8 CHAIR CASSANO: Right. And that's 9 what I'm going to do with these cases, is I may actually -- I will code them or number them. 10 11 don't know if it's acceptable -- I haven't opened 12 the disk to see if I can blank out PPI in it or not, which would make it a little bit easier. 13 14 But I don't want to be sending cases 15 back and forth, that's for sure. It's just going 16 to have to be Case No. 1, TCE, Parkinson's 17 Disease. 18 MS. RHOADS: Right, you shouldn't be 19 sending anything from the disk or changing 20 anything on the disk. 21 CHAIR CASSANO: Okay.

If you want to make

MS. RHOADS:

1 summaries, just make sure you don't transfer any 2 PII into your summary. CHAIR CASSANO: Okay, okay. 3 And 4 that's why we need to number them and code them 5 and move from there. But then the report would 6 obviously have -- the synopsis would not have any of that. 7 8 It would just say -- you would try to 9 synthesize it, I think. In our discussion and our evaluation of these cases, these are the 10 11 general problems that we've had, while we're 12 talking about specifics. 13 MS. RHOADS: And just to be clear, no 14 one should have to redact anything on the disks 15 either. 16 CHAIR CASSANO: Okay. 17 MS. RHOADS: I don't think you'd be able to do it, but just don't even try. 18 19 CHAIR CASSANO: Don't even try. 20 ma'am. 21 MS. RHOADS: Right. 22 CHAIR CASSANO: Thank you. I heard

you loud and clear. And then, farther on down, once we have a great handle on how this was done and what our issues and question and problems are, we can start to develop our recommendations, which is Number D under the timetable.

And then we can have a discussion on whether we're going to develop training materials and/or try to work on developing presumptives.

But I think the presumptive issue is more for the full committee than for us. Other comments?

MEMBER SILVER: Tori, this is Ken. I splashed a little bit around in some of the case files. When the template is developed and sent out, it would be helpful if it emphasized the key issues we should hope in on.

The files are so voluminous, it seems like our success will be largely determined by what we decide not to look at.

CHAIR CASSANO: Right. And I know that from winding my way through 6,000 page case files myself, that you learn very quickly what's important and what isn't important.

MEMBER SILVER: Yes, so if you could steer us towards these three, four or five main issues, that would be most helpful.

CHAIR CASSANO: Okay. I will do my best. I may need Steve's input on this as well, but I will do my best.

MEMBER MARKOWITZ: We are sure you will. So there is an issue that we need to make sure stays on our agenda here, which is something that DOL asked us about, however difficult the issue is, which is how to really operationalize the legal requirements under the statute, the aggravation, contributions, disease be incorporated into the claims process.

CHAIR CASSANO: Yes.

MEMBER MARKOWITZ: Have those words defined, et cetera. So I'm not saying that I have an answer to that, but we need to figure out a way how to further that discussion.

CHAIR CASSANO: That's on my down more on the bottom of my deliverables. I don't think we understand this. I mean, I'm getting a better

understanding. But I don't think I understand it enough yet, until I look through a bunch of cases to see how they're put together, to see how we incorporate that.

I think that's one of the last things, you know, we can get to. I've actually gotten through this agenda. I can't believe it. I would like some other comments from individuals on anything that seems to have been missed, anything that we glossed over, anything that you think needs a little bit more solid discussion.

MEMBER VLIEGER: I think we need to review the Department of Labor's responses to our questions, in light of how we find the evidence in the files.

I don't find that all of the district offices actually do the claims processes the same way. They have different checklists for doing things. They have different form letters.

And it think that, in order to make this program as uniform as possible, we need to examine what DOL thinks is going on versus what

we find in those files.

CHAIR CASSANO: Yes. I mean, I think that's obvious that we need to do that. But in a non --

MEMBER VLIEGER: I was strictly doing it for information because when I deal with different district offices, and they say well we always do it this way, and I haven't seen it with other district offices, then I actually question whether the training materials are actually uniform.

CHAIR CASSANO: They're not. Well they've already told us they're not.

MEMBER VLIEGER: Yes, they told us that there's basic materials that are uniform, but that the individual training is not. But I think some of the basic materials are not uniform either.

CHAIR CASSANO: I think we'll find that out when we get the training materials. I want to -- our discussion is to enlighten or to help DOL move this process forward.

It's not to say, you know, you think 1 2 this is what's happening, but this is what's really happening. I think we just report on what 3 we see is happening. 4 5 And I think DOL can make its own 6 conclusions in some way to be able to say, gee we 7 didn't realize it was happening this way. 8 order to make sure that -- you know, we're an 9 advisory committee, we're not the Inspector General, we're not the auditors. I think we need 10 11 to do that. 12 MEMBER MARKOWITZ: This is Steven. I 13 just want to remind you. Our charter is to make 14 recommendations to the Secretary of the 15 Department of Labor regarding four areas and, 16 specifically, how to make improvements in those 17 areas. 18 So that's our chartered mission and 19 that's what we're aiming for. 20 CHAIR CASSANO: Right. Thank you, 21 Steve. You said it --22 I don't have anything MEMBER VLIEGER:

different in mind, it's just that I want to make 1 2 sure that we don't necessarily take what we get and not review. 3 I don't think that's 4 CHAIR CASSANO: 5 anybody's intention. MEMBER VLIEGER: 6 Okay. MEMBER MARKOWITZ: 7 Yes. I mean there 8 is, in a way, a more difficult issue beyond the 9 training materials, which is, chances are the regional or district offices have developed some 10 11 limited variation in how they do things, that is 12 probably not captured or reflected in the 13 training materials. And the only way we could 14 really look at that is by systematically looking 15 at things across different offices. 16 CHAIR CASSANO: Yes. 17 MEMBER MARKOWITZ: And we may get 18 there, but right now that's in the back of our --19 CHAIR CASSANO: Yes. 20 MEMBER MARKOWITZ: We need to keep 21 that on the radar. 22 CHAIR CASSANO: Yes. Any other

comments, suggestions, questions? If not -- if 1 2 we're done for right now, can we close the meeting, Carrie? 3 Sure, if there's nothing 4 MS. RHOADS: 5 else to be done, we can definitely do that. Okay, because I think 6 CHAIR CASSANO: 7 it's going to take a little bit of clarification 8 on my part to put together the timetable to get 9 through the cases that we have, and do the 10 templates. My job -- I will reiterate what I've 11 12 been asked to do. I've been asked to take an 13 initial look at these cases, pull ten or fifteen 14 that probably are most relevant to Part E, including some with referrals, some without 15 16 referrals, et cetera, divide those up into two or 17 three -- probably three subcommittees -- two 18 working groups, excuse me. 19 And then develop a template for what 20 we should look for in those cases. Is that 21 correct? Did I miss anything?

MEMBER MARKOWITZ:

22

And this is

No.

So, Carrie, are you the one who 1 2 assembles the to-do list from this meeting? Yes, I usually right up a 3 MS. RHOADS: 4 list and then I send it to Dr. Cassano, and she adds her input. 5 6 MEMBER MARKOWITZ: And then you 7 distribute it to the Subcommittee? 8 MS. RHOADS: Right. 9 MEMBER MARKOWITZ: Okay. So I will try to have 10 CHAIR CASSANO: that done, let's say -- today is Tuesday -- I'll 11 12 try to have that stuff out to you by Friday. 13 we can go from there. And Dr. Markowitz, am I 14 allowed to entice you into service on one of the working groups as a physician representative? 15 16 MEMBER MARKOWITZ: 17 CHAIR CASSANO: Thank you. 18 closing comments from anybody? Mr. Vance? 19 MR. VANCE: Well, Carrie, when you 20 actually use -- or Steven -- When you assemble 21 the action list, if you know by then when you 22 have a target date for the developing letters or

1 the training materials or whatever, if you could 2 add that to that, that would be great. Yes, I will. 3 MS. RHOADS: Thank you. MR. VANCE: And this is John Vance. 4 Ι 5 don't really have anything else to add, other than just thanking you for allowing me the 6 7 opportunity to participate. 8 Oh, we appreciate --CHAIR CASSANO: 9 you're going to be participating a lot more, I think. 10 11 MR. VANCE: I have been participating behind the scenes, collecting information for you 12 13 guys, so I already am helping. 14 CHAIR CASSANO: Okay, great. And, if there's stuff that you want to put together, to 15 16 send to us that might enlighten us a little bit, 17 please do. 18 I guess Carrie -- you guys will figure 19 out how that gets done, within the rules, et 20 cetera. 21 MS. RHOADS: Sure. 22 CHAIR CASSANO: Thanks.

1 MS. RHOADS: Okay then, if there's 2 nothing else, do you want to go ahead and close 3 the meeting? CHAIR CASSANO: I would -- if there 4 5 are no objections, I will close the meeting. Thank you all for participating. I appreciate 6 7 Those members of the public that listened, 8 thank you as well. I want to thank the Program, I want to 9 10 thank Mr. Vance and Carrie, the transcriber and all of the members of the Subcommittee. 11 12 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter 13 went off the record at 2:44 p.m.) 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

A-G-E-N-D-A 2:1 able 10:8 11:2 15:17 16:16 20:2 25:8 27:15 30:1 34:12 36:15 38:3 44:18 46:17.18 47:5 47:11 55:7 58:18 59:9 65:12 75:6 76:18 81:6 above-entitled 86:12 **absolutely** 28:1 61:15 acceptable 75:11 accepted 34:8,10,12 40:6,9 51:13,18 access 51:17 60:17 **accomplish** 9:11 10:8 accomplished 55:6 71:5 accurate 7:8 acquired 33:21 action 10:12 84:21 active 46:11 activities 37:9 50:3 **actual** 54:10 add 67:21 72:7 85:2,5 additional 11:3 44:16 67:9,21 71:2 address 41:20 48:12 addresses 8:14 21:21 adds 84:5 Adjourn 2:22 advance 6:1 62:19 advancement 33:20 **Advice** 1:5 2:17 3:10 8:19 advisable 71:15 **advisory** 1:3 3:8 5:15 6:16,21 8:3,18 60:9 60:14 81:9 affirmative 27:14 afternoon 3:4 9:3 agenda 6:4 9:8 34:3 49:1 62:18 63:5 65:20 67:4 78:9 79:7 aggravated 17:19 aggravation 10:5 44:4 44:9 45:13 78:13 ago 27:6 46:17 agree 32:20 62:14 ahead 46:12 86:2 aiming 19:9 81:19 allowed 37:13 84:14 allowing 85:6 **AMA** 17:11,12,13 amount 35:6 and/or 77:8 answer 20:13,17 29:18 29:21 30:9 32:17 34:6 35:22 36:10,15 38:3

44:12 78:18 answered 41:16 answering 38:9 **answers** 11:4 12:6 44:13 anybody 16:5 20:7 23:3 23:6 30:20 32:20 34:18 42:16 45:20,22 52:14 53:18 84:18 anybody's 82:5 anytime 51:10 apparently 21:6 39:17 44:18 appeared 21:1 apply 17:15 30:4 **appreciate** 3:14 23:12 85:8 86:6 appreciation 10:20 approve 25:19 approximate 50:2,7 **April** 6:21 20:22 33:10 53:14 68:5 area 1:6 13:3 areas 81:15,17 arranged 41:5 artificial 30:5 asked 6:19 9:11.13 12:13 19:15 29:17 31:19 34:16 40:3,3 53:14 55:14 78:10 83:12,12 asking 27:8 40:1 assemble 14:4 27:15 84:20 assembles 84:2 assemblies 27:20 assembling 40:20 assessing 10:5 assessment 9:17 assist 20:13,14 21:2,17 assistance 42:2 assisting 18:18 21:8 22:2 associated 27:11 44:14 attack 66:12 attempting 31:3 attorney 41:5 attorneys 40:14 audible 20:10 audit 31:13 auditors 81:10 **August** 10:15 authorized 41:9 automatic 24:8 available 5:7,22 7:16,18 8:1 22:18 30:12,18 37:8 avenue 28:3

avenues 26:19 aware 8:10 40:12

B 50:16 51:6 52:10,21 53:19 68:12,20 70:2 70:13 back 9:8 29:19 37:16 41:13 42:4 44:21 45:6 45:6 46:3,22 49:12 58:4 62:17 63:11 66:6 74:5 75:15 82:18 background 31:9 bang 73:2 bargaining 33:11

bargaining 33:11 based 2:16 14:5 27:8 36:2,8 37:14 41:8 67:8

basic 80:15,17 basically 22:11 25:3 42:5

basis 27:9 39:4 becoming 47:4 beginning 56:7 63:13 74:7

begins 33:13 behavior 43:1 belabor 41:19 believe 27:9 31:20,21

79:7 **Berrie's** 33:5

beryllium 51:14,14 52:8 52:12,21 68:9 69:18 best 15:4 78:5,6 better 10:9 54:7,14

78:22 **beyond** 35:9 42:21 82:8

big 62:21 69:10 biggest 23:22 bill 37:20 billable 37:13

billed 36:7 **billing** 36:3,14

bills 41:10

bit 9:7 10:16 11:6 47:9 55:8 56:19,21 64:5 73:17 75:13 77:12 79:11 83:7 85:16

blab 61:12 blank 75:12

blanket 24:2 board 1:3,16 3:8,15,17

4:15 5:15 6:12,16,21 7:3 8:4,7,18 9:4 10:18 11:1 12:8 33:2 63:14

board's 3:12 5:7,13,19 7:16 8:1

Boden 1:14 4:3,4 14:8,8

16:16 18:3.11.15 34:20 36:20,21 37:7 38:10 53:2,7,12,17 57:5,10,13 59:17,20 60:8,20 71:13,18,22 bodies 13:15 14:21 bottled 19:5 **bottom** 78:21 **Branch** 1:22 4:19 break 5:2 47:10,20 49:10 55:10 briefly 65:6 bring 64:16 72:13 brought 13:7 **buck** 73:2 **bunch** 79:2

С calendar 7:17 58:4,4 **call** 3:18 21:1 23:8 30:5 31:10,21 34:7 40:8 44:21 46:17 call-in 6:15 calling 31:3 45:5 **calls** 20:15 capacity 8:5 captured 82:12 career 33:6 Carrie 1:21 3:6 9:3 44:18 47:13 50:1 53:13 55:12,20 56:10 57:15 61:6 69:22 83:3 84:1,19 85:18 86:10 case 8:15 13:8 15:1,22 17:4,13,16 24:8 25:14 25:17 26:8,21 29:1,20

58:13,17 61:13 70:13 71:8,9 72:22 75:16 77:12,20 **cases** 17:2,7 18:20 20:2 26:4 27:19 29:5,8,10 40:15,20 49:11 50:15 50:17,19 51:4,6,10,14

51:20 52:1,3,10,19 53:4,5,10,13,19 54:4 54:6 55:1,2,15 56:13 56:21 57:1 62:20,20 66:17 67:17,22 68:1,3 68:5,6,9,10,16,17,20 69:17,18,21 70:5,9,10 70:15 71:2,9 72:3,8 72:17,20,21,22 73:1 75:3,9,14 76:10 79:2

Cassano 1:10,17 2:19 3:21 4:1 8:22 9:2 12:3 12:12 14:6 15:5 18:22 19:13 20:11 21:12

83:9,13,20

22:6 23:6,17 25:1 28:5,11,15 29:12 31:1 31:19 32:4,15,19 34:1 34:21 39:15,17,22 41:11 43:5,9,14 44:17 44:22 45:2,7,11,15,19 46:1,13,19 47:7,21 48:2,7,9,18 51:3 52:7 53:1,6,18 54:17 55:18 56:10,14 57:8,11,14 57:21 59:11,15,19,22 60:18 61:3,10,16 62:10,17 63:15,18 64:17 65:15 66:1,14 67:16 68:7,14,19 69:1 69:15 70:3,7,14 71:1 71:17,20 72:2,15,19 73:4,13,15,20 74:12 74:18 75:5,8,21 76:3 76:16,19,22 77:19 78:4,15,20 80:2,12,19 81:20 82:4,16,19,22 83:6 84:4,10,17 85:8 85:14,22 86:4 category 35:8 causal 16:1 causation 13:18 35:5,8 36:12 37:4 39:5 caused 17:19
CBD 52:2
CE 2:9 14:3 16:19 20:3 21:13 24:17 25:8
26:13 27:21 41:13
42:6 48:19 CE's 2:10 16:12 31:12
certain 35:22 37:11,12
52:18
certainly 11:6 23:12 38:2 65:5 69:1,5,15
72:10
certainty 36:16 38:4 certificate 29:8
certification 33:8
certified 7:14
CEs 1:5 10:10 15:8 20:3 21:16 29:17,19 30:11
30:14 31:7,16 41:18
42:16 43:2 49:6 50:21 55:10 57:4 60:10
61:19,20 63:2
CEs' 11:13
cetera 11:16 12:19 16:22 30:1 35:16
41:15 49:18 61:22
71:10 78:17 83:16 85:20
chair 1:11,16,17 3:21
4:1,14 7:15 9:1,2 12:3

12:12 14:6 15:5 18:22 19:13 20:11 21:12 22:6 23:6,17 25:1 28:5,11,15 29:12 31:1 31:19 32:4,15,19 34:1 34:21 39:17,22 41:11 43:5,9,14 44:22 45:2 45:7,11,15,19 46:1,13 46:19 47:7,21 48:2,7 48:9,18 51:3 52:7 53:1,6,18 54:17 55:18 56:10,14 57:8,11,14 57:21 59:11,15,19,22 60:18 61:3,10,16 62:10,17 63:15,18 64:17 65:15 66:1,14 67:16 68:7,14,19 69:1 69:15 70:3,7,14 71:1 71:17,20 72:2,15,19 73:4,13,15,20 74:12 74:18 75:5,8,21 76:3 76:16,19,22 77:19 78:4,15,20 80:2,12,19 81:20 82:4,16,19,22 83:6 84:10,17 85:8,14 85:22 86:4 **chance** 10:19 chances 82:9 changing 75:19 **charge** 37:22 charter 81:13 chartered 81:18 **check** 45:4 56:1,8 checklists 79:18 Chief 1:22 4:19 **chime** 11:6 13:9 23:8 23:16 30:20 31:8 32:2 **cite** 33:1 civilian 73:9 claim 20:18 21:18 25:19 26:8 34:7,10,11 35:18 39:7 40:6,9 claimant 1:18 21:17 28:6 40:6 claimant's 12:20 14:1 claimants 19:8 40:13 44:15 claiming 44:15 claims 2:9,10 3:10 8:20 11:12,12 13:21 14:14 19:10 21:7 22:1,5 24:3 28:21 31:15 42:21,22 43:12 50:4 54:12 59:21 63:12,14 64:1 78:14 79:17 clarification 10:16 26:3

47:9 83:7

clarify 18:1 36:21

clarifying 9:16 classification 36:6 38:5 classifications 37:21 clear 27:3 72:16 76:13 77:1 cleared 13:5 clearer 23:9 clearly 7:5 13:22 **Cleveland** 68:16,17 clicking 5:20 clinical 23:1 clinician 22:21 close 43:22 48:21 83:2 86:2,5 closing 2:19 84:18 **CMC** 14:3 16:22 19:16 25:8,15 27:8 35:17 41:12 51:19 53:15 68:18 70:9 **CMC's** 41:14 code 36:13 58:13 75:10 76:4 **codes** 38:7 coding 36:2,15 37:2,17 38:4 collaborate 47:12 collected 41:4 collecting 85:12 collective 33:11 come 9:21 13:22 14:1,2 39:20 67:22 74:7 comes 15:1 comfortable 60:11 comment 6:14 43:8 45:9 46:14 comments 2:19 5:6 11:21 14:7 16:5 19:1 20:8 23:3,4 34:1 42:14 44:16 65:11 66:7 74:10 77:10 79:8 83:1 84:18 **comments/** 29:12 Commission 50:16 committee 6:22 14:11 14:17 38:22 55:9 60:9 60:14 63:7,11 64:9,16 65:2,21 66:9 72:13,18 74:8 77:10 81:9 committee's 6:17 14:9 committees 72:18 common 25:3 71:15 commonly 18:5 communicate 47:18 74:20 **COMMUNITY** 1:13,15 1:18 **Comp** 33:22 compare 59:8

compared 52:12 compensate 34:13 compensated 34:6,9 40:5 compensation 34:11 complete 53:10 complex 42:3 complicated 38:5,6 51:22 52:17 component 70:5 components 70:18 comprehensive 36:11 65:12 conceivable 18:7,8 concern 60:10 concerns 11:2,15 34:17 58:17 61:22 71:11 72:12 74:6 conclusion 9:20 conclusions 81:6 **condition** 15:1 27:10 28.2 conditions 18:5 confident 38:9 conflicts 52:4 70:12 **confuse** 13:12 conjoined 19:22 **consensus** 13:14 14:20 17:3,21 52:19 69:16 consider 20:4 **consistency** 17:2 18:19 consistent 17:12 18:10 60:13 consolidate 66:21 consultant 15:14 34:15 consultation 16:11 consulting 34:13 contact 26:14 contained 19:11 contains 5:22 contention 71:10 contingency 39:4 continue 8:10 continuing 33:8 contracted 15:14 34:15 contractor 4:18 contributed 27:10 contributing 44:8 contribution 10:5 44:4 44:9 contributions 78:13 convene 8:17 conversation 10:14 11:8 22:10 24:12 **copies** 5:5 51:18 **copy** 47:19 correct 26:16 37:7 40:9 40:10 56:11 57:15

determined 19:18 diseases 44:14 51:15 68:8 75:1 83:21 education 33:8.17 countered 13:20 77:17 70:2 effectively 62:15 **couple** 33:17 47:14 develop 11:11,14,17 disk 56:11 68:2 75:12 efficiency 18:18 50:12 55:22 56:4 14:12 15:18 19:4 75:19,20 either 15:10 42:18 73:7 61:18,20 69:17 70:10 34:14 55:4 66:20 77:4 disks 50:15 76:14 73:8 76:15 80:18 cover 51:2 77:7 83:19 disparage 52:14 email 6:7 47:18 57:19 covered 14:18 **developed** 31:15 77:13 disparate 27:19 52:11 58:12 66:6 74:20,21 **CPT** 37:9 82:10 distribute 84:7 emphasized 77:14 create 35:6 employee 26:18 28:10 developing 21:17 77:8 district 79:16 80:7.9 created 33:2,7 82:10 employees 8:6 84:22 encounter 29:6 curriculum 33:20 development 2:16 **dive** 65:10 cursory 53:8 66:4 67:1 11:16 26:19 27:22 divide 55:3 58:1 69:6 encountered 18:5 43:15,16 49:6 50:5,10 encourage 5:19 83:16 D 57:3 58:22 60:5 63:1 divvy 56:15,16 70:19 energy 36:9 **D** 77:5 63:8 64:10 65:6 67:3 72:20 energyadvisoryboar... **D.C** 33:3 72:10 doc 22:9 42:8 6:8 **d.htm** 5:15 devil's 18:7 doctor 17:11,14 26:11 enlighten 80:21 85:16 data 27:20 **DFO** 3:13 7:13 27:8,16 28:8 ensure 7:14 doctors' 8:15 **entice** 84:14 date 5:20 84:22 diagnosed 28:2 document 35:15 72:11 **entire** 48:6 diagnosis 13:19 25:6 day 26:15 27:22 days 7:17 8:2 25:11 28:8 29:10 30:6 73:22 74:21,22 entirely 5:21 30:6 58:14 documentation 26:20 **EPA** 12:18 **de** 14:22 deal 59:20 80:6 **diagnostic** 27:3 38:15 27:2,16 28:1 29:6 epidemiological 13:7 death 27:11 29:8 38:17 74:9 equitably 58:2 **difference** 69:10.12 documented 73:21 deceased 28:13 error 31:14 decide 24:8 49:9 77:18 different 20:9 27:21 documents 5:10 13:14 **especially** 7:6 9:18 deciding 17:18 37:19 38:13,18 40:4 14:20 15:18 17:3,21 43:19 49:19 74:7 decision 14:5 25:9,15 43:13 61:17 79:18,19 19:6 30:12 67:12,16 essentially 14:18 17:10 decisions 16:12 48:17 80:7 82:1,15 doing 14:12 33:7 38:13 39:3 dedicated 5:21 differing 52:5 39:4 43:2 59:13 61:11 establish 29:10 **DEEOIC** 1:22 4:19 difficult 47:8 78:10 82:8 66:16 79:18 80:5 et 11:15 12:19 16:22 **deep** 65:9 difficulties 45:3 **DOL** 12:2 54:3 78:10 30:1 35:16 41:15 defined 78:17 diligent 3:15 79:22 80:22 81:5 49:18 61:22 71:10 definitely 23:16 55:16 direction 22:1 **DOL's** 2:3 13:13 21:3 78:17 83:16 85:19 83:5 directions 27:21 24:15 evaluate 29:19 **definitive** 25:6,7,9 directive 49:16 dol.gov/owcp/energy... **evaluation** 64:20 65:12 54:16 disclosure 8:7 5:14 66:4 76:10 degree 17:8 36:16 38:4 **discuss** 12:10 47:5 **dose** 44:8 **everybody** 3:3 46:12 deliverables 2:16 11:16 57:19 58:21 60:1 **Doug** 56:1 49:14,18 54:20 55:13 67:4 78:21 discussed 8:8,12,15 **Dr** 2:19,20 3:21 4:2,10 64:18 67:10 70:20 denial 24:9 20:9 4:12 8:22 10:14 11:5 71:7 evidence 1:6 3:11 8:21 denied 39:7 discussing 13:8 64:1 11:20 19:19 26:16 **Denver** 26:10 71:19 38:21 39:4,15 44:17 10:4 18:19 19:12,15 discussion 2:7 5:12 53:12 73:8 84:4,13 deny 52:3 19:16,18 22:5,7 25:18 6:18 7:9 11:10 12:22 draft 74:22 29:15,18,20 30:2 **Department** 1:1,20 3:8 40:18 41:7 47:1 74:16 16:17 20:19 21:19 41:14,22 43:3 67:19 dropped 44:20 **Duronda** 1:19 4:8 72:14 79:13 81:15 23:20 28:16 42:16 68:22 79:14 depending 3:4 44:2,19 47:19 49:1,12 duty 20:13,14 21:2 exactly 29:21 71:14 examination 35:10 depends 31:9 44:7 66:2 54:8,14 56:20 62:9 22:14 63:13 64:8,13,16,19 examine 79:22 describe 17:11 Ε 71:6 76:9 77:6 78:19 examiner 19:10 22:2 described 39:5 describes 14:19 79:11 80:21 **E** 39:6 69:3 70:5,13,18 24:3 50:4 **discussions** 7:3 59:10 examiner's 14:14 designated 1:21 3:12 83:14 detailed 7:22 59:13 60:4,11 69:6,18 easier 14:14 16:12 **examiners** 2:9 3:11 70:19 8:20 11:12 21:7 42:22 details 18:8 75:13 disease 10:6 17:22 determination 13:21 **Eastern** 1:10 4:16 **example** 16:9,14,18 determine 19:21 20:4 51:14 52:9 69:12 economic 22:22 17:6 25:12 75:17 78:13 educated 33:15 **examples** 32:8 50:18

52:2.5 53:15 **excuse** 83:18 exist 24:16,20,22 26:15 32.11 **exists** 36:9 expedited 18:5 **expert** 13:2 14:5 16:21 expertise 13:18 15:8 33:21 experts 40:21 explore 26:14 exposed 25:13 exposure 17:22 25:7 27:12 30:9 exposures 17:20 extensively 54:18 external 40:19 extra 53:9 extremely 27:19 **eye** 33:14 F **FACA** 7:17 facilities 8:14 facility 26:13 factors 44:8 facts 51:18 fair 35:5

familiar 36:14 38:2 51:13 far 13:6 16:5 30:10 65:17 66:16 farther 77:1 faster 65:19 father 26:9 **favor** 54:12 **Faye** 1:19 4:5 30:22 45:10 46:13 48:11 49:19 52:20 70:9 73:8 74:13 federal 1:21 3:12 57:18 fee 36:9 41:9 feel 22:19 23:9 62:2 **feeling** 60:10 fees 41:4 fell 46:15,16 felt 10:8 field 42:9 **fifteen** 83:13 fifties 29:4 figure 22:9 57:9 78:18 85:18 file 19:11 28:2 29:20 files 77:13,16,21 79:15

39:13 52:3 79:14,16 80:1,19 **findings** 2:12 11:15 66:22 finish 58:18 finished 55:17 **finite** 52:9 **first** 3:14 5:17 9:6,10 12:12,13 16:3 49:10 49:17 51:5 56:15 58:8 67:5 five 46:16 49:1 54:1 78:2 floated 33:5 flow 21:18 focal 14:3 focus 34:2 50:21 57:3,7 59:2,16 60:7,16 61:8 62:8 focused 70:1 72:18 **folder** 51:8 follow 5:11 40:1 **follow-up** 34:17 forget 61:9 form 18:6 20:3 41:8 79:19 **formal** 7:19 formulate 54:15 forth 66:7 75:15 forthcoming 3:16 forties 29:3 forum 55:10 forward 63:22 66:11 80.22 found 5:13 13:1 31:13 56:20 63:14 74:1 four 78:2 81:15 **frankly** 13:19 freaking 64:4 free-for-all 49:14 Friday 84:12 fruit 65:7 full 5:4 16:18 20:22 55:9,11 57:12 58:19 58:20,21 60:2,3,11 61:5 63:14 64:9,16 65:2,21 66:8 72:13,18 77:10 fully 24:16 39:5 fully-drafted 36:11 further 12:22 23:2,3 26:20 28:16 42:13 78:19

G

gather 12:15 36:22

gathering 50:11

game 47:15

generalized 15:21 generally 29:1,7 56:20 gentleman 23:7 gestalt 42:5 getting 43:20,22 48:14 53:19 56:11 62:15 63:21 66:17 72:8 78:22 give 17:6 49:14 50:1 52:8 given 22:1 64:11 giving 38:20 **glossed** 79:10 go 5:3 9:8,10 10:10 11:17 12:5 16:5 19:16 24:3 25:14 28:7 37:16 40:6 46:12,22 50:17 51:9 55:13 58:4,8 61:4 67:6 73:16 84:13 86:2 goes 24:17 35:18 41:13 68:21 going 5:2 7:21 12:1,3,4 12:5,6 15:2 20:1,6 22:17 23:14 26:21 28:3.13 30:10 31:14 32:18 33:17 38:3.8 40:20 41:19 42:1 46:22 49:9,10 53:11 54:14 56:11 58:12 62:12,17,19,20,20,21 62:21 63:1,22 65:3 66:11,12,14 67:8 69:2 69:3,10 71:2,5,8,11 72:2,17 73:18 74:5,14 74:17 75:9,15 77:7 79:22 83:7 85:9 good 3:3,4 9:3,3 21:12 22:6 29:21 30:21 31:6 56:5 Google 5:15 gotten 79:6 government 8:6 36:7,8 37:22 great 34:2 39:14,22 55:18 71:22 72:1 77:2 85:2,14 group 34:2 47:18 48:3 50:22 51:12 57:4 58:1 58:15 59:2,13,16 60:7 60:16 61:19 62:9 73:6 groups 47:11,20 49:11 55:3,4 57:7 59:10,21

gee 81:6

general 8:12 15:22

46:21 71:16 76:11

generalizations 58:13

61:8 67:15 83:18 84:15 guess 14:16 24:17 25:10,12,14,21 30:19 40:2 85:18 guidance 10:4 48:1 guide 17:13 guides 17:11,13 guys 24:2 39:18 48:14 70:6 85:13,18

Н handle 77:2 handled 18:19 69:12 hands 67:19 69:11 hanging 65:7 happen 28:17 happening 55:11 57:12 81:2,3,4,7 happens 24:21 **hard** 44:6 **Haz-Map** 16:11 18:6 heading 5:8 health 1:3 3:9 5:16 8:19 33:4 41:2 hear 3:19 20:11 23:15 30:22 39:18,19 43:8 44:18 45:17,19,20,22 46:1.5.17 heard 39:20 43:9 76:22 hearing 4:6 7:12 42:1 heart 48:14 heavy 52:16 **Hello** 43:6 45:15 help 9:15 20:15 30:16 54:15 80:22 helpful 77:14 78:3 helping 85:13 hey 20:4 **Hi** 3:3 4:4 39:19 44:17 53:12 55:12 high 35:6 **historical** 22:7 27:6 hone 77:15 honest 62:4 hope 19:4 66:10 Hopefully 56:6 hoping 60:18,21 66:19 hospital 26:10,11,14 hour 44:1,2 **hours** 5:4 house 14:2 How's 13:19 **Howie** 33:9 hygienist 14:2 15:13

finalized 74:19

find 6:4 20:7 36:18

80:1

73:7,10

hygienists 41:3

IARC 12:17 15:9 **ICD-** 36:5 ICD-10 36:12 37:17 **ICD-9** 37:17 idea 16:18 33:5,10,15 47:2 identifiable 8:13 identifiers 75:7 identify 23:13 26:4 **illness** 17:19 illnesses 14:18 imagine 14:11 17:17 **impact** 13:20 impairment 17:8 important 23:13 57:1 77:22,22 **impress** 73:9 **improve** 18:17 improvement 67:2 74:5 improvements 2:14 81:16 improving 10:1,3 in- 14:1 inadvertently 61:12 inclination 43:19 include 8:12 64:9 including 8:8 9:4 83:15 incorporate 79:4 incorporated 78:14 indicate 26:8 individual 17:4,9 21:13 27:5 31:9 80:16 Individually 43:1 individuals 29:2 79:8 industrial 14:2 15:13 41:3 73:7,10 inevitably 62:11 influence 33:3 information 6:15 8:13 12:15,17,18 16:20 20:17 22:12,17 26:5 26:12,17 27:9,20 38:12,20 47:2,11 48:16,20 49:3 51:1 52:8,11 62:2,16 67:6 67:9 80:6 85:12 infrequently 21:9 inhibit 62:9 **initial** 83:13 initially 54:5 innumerable 37:20 input 14:5 24:13 32:21 40:14 41:1,2 49:15 78:5 84:5 insight 50:2 Inspector 81:9 **instance** 16:15

instances 27:4 instructions 6:5 intelligence 30:5 intention 82:5 interactive 6:11 **interested** 33:9 39:2 interesting 72:22 interject 69:21 internal 33:17 interpreted 43:4 introduce 3:17 Introduction 2:2 involves 33:8 involving 33:11 issue 7:12 12:13 13:17 19:14,14 22:8,15,22 23:1 28:19,20 29:13 29:14 35:11 41:21 45:12 48:15 53:19 77:9 78:8,11 82:8 **issues** 11:15 13:10 14:10 22:4 58:16 59:18 60:12 71:12 72:12 77:3,15 78:3

job 14:14 18:16 62:3 65:18 83:11 jobs 60:12 John 1:22 4:18 23:11 25:20 28:19 31:7 37:12 40:12 51:11 69:20 85:4 join 45:6 joining 6:9 journey 33:12

it'll 32:11

items 10:12

Keep 26:3 27:18 33:14

82:20 Ken 4:10 19:3 32:22 39:1 40:3 77:11 Ken's 40:11 KENNETH 1:14 key 77:14 kick 13:12 **kind** 14:3,19 17:17 29:22 33:7,9 51:19 63:20 66:20 kinds 27:20 knew 19:8 **know** 4:7 7:11,11 13:6 18:7 21:6 22:16 24:11 25:1.17 26:9 27:8.13 28:7 29:1.2 30:7.10 32:12 33:12 34:3 35:1

35:11 38:4,6 46:22 47:3 48:13,20 50:7 52:1 53:21,22 55:5,13 56:17 59:7 60:13 63:19 64:22 65:11,14 66:3 67:19 70:6,10 71:14 75:11 77:19 79:6 81:1,8 84:21 knowing 49:19 knowledge 24:19 25:4 knowledgeable 13:4

<u>L</u> Labor 1:1 40:18 41:7

47:1 74:16 81:15

Labor's 3:8 79:13

ladder 33:6 large 53:5 largely 77:17 larger 63:7 65:21 late 10:15 Laughter 26:1 37:6 law 17:14 lead 26:13 27:21 59:2 learn 41:13 42:15 77:21 learned 11:7 13:15 14:21 leave 32:11 74:8 **legal** 78:12 legitimate 61:22 length 44:7 lengthy 43:17 Les 14:8 16:8 36:20 53:2 71:13 **Leslie** 1:14 4:3 let's 58:5 84:11 **letters** 43:15,16 49:6 50:6,10 57:3 58:22 60:5 63:1,8 64:10 65:6 72:10 79:19 84:22 library 39:9 life 16:12 light 22:13 79:14 limited 32:6 82:11 line 7:4 lines 46:11 link 5:17 list 10:11 15:19 24:4 33:6 36:18,22 44:13 73:5 84:2,4,21 listed 50:3 51:7 listen 6:16 23:15 listened 86:7 listing 5:8 **literature** 16:1 25:5 little 9:7 10:16 11:6 47:9 55:7 56:19 64:5

73:17 75:13 77:12 79:11 83:7 85:16 **living** 28:10 long 47:18 61:3 long-term 33:19 look 17:11 20:2 21:10 22:5 32:1 37:16 41:18 43:3,12 49:11 50:12 50:17 51:9 57:2 58:3 62:20,22 63:12 65:5 66:8 67:18 69:3,5 70:15,16 72:3,6,11,20 73:6,6 77:18 79:2 82:14 83:13,20 looked 17:7 64:9,10 looking 22:4 27:6 31:17 32:12 42:22 44:3 54:12,21 63:21 66:16 66:18 72:17 82:14 looks 18:13 42:6 lose 39:15 43:5 lot 11:17 13:5 22:17 29:7.9 34:22 38:6 49:3 52:8 65:4 85:9 **lots** 52:5 loud 77:1 low 65:7 lung 50:16 51:4,5,15 68:10,12 70:2

М

M 1:19 ma'am 76:20 mailing 33:6 main 78:2 **major** 33:3 majority 70:4 **making** 48:16 manual 14:19 15:9 21:21 30:3,19,19 33:16 66:22 74:1 Manual/Training 2:13 **manuals** 64:20 mark 37:4 Markowitz 1:16 2:20 4:12,13 10:14 11:5,20 11:22 12:11 13:11 16:7 18:2,4,12,21 19:19 20:20 21:20 23:5 24:14 26:16 28:18 29:11 32:2,5,16 35:4 36:17 38:21 39:4 42:18 43:7,11 45:8,12 45:18,21 46:8 48:8,11 49:22 53:20 55:20 56:3 60:15 61:1 62:6 62:11 63:3,16 64:6 65:13,16 73:8 78:7,16

81:12 82:7,17,20 83:22 84:6,9,13,16 material 66:2,4 materials 2:13 5:5 6:1 8:4,11 30:1,17 31:18 32:6,11 41:18,22 43:22 49:5 50:5,10,14 57:2 58:22 60:4 62:22 63:10 64:11 65:8 66:17 67:1 72:9 74:2 77:7 80:10,15,17,20 82:9,13 85:1 matter 34:19 48:4 86:12 mean 25:2,10 28:6,16 28:19 52:14 61:3 64:17,18 65:11 78:22 80:2 82:7 means 24:20 56:4 medical 1:5,6,15 3:10 3:11 8:19,20 9:18 10:3,4 12:15 13:6 15:12,14,17 19:15,16 19:18,21 24:2,7 25:18 26:5,20 27:2,15 28:1 28:20 29:6,14,18 30:2 34:14.15 41:14.22 43:3 51:17 52:4 67:18 68:22 70:12 meet 4:15 49:5 54:2 59:4 63:2 meeting 2:2,3,9 3:7,13 3:16 4:20 5:1,5,9,20 5:21 6:2,19,22,22 7:2 7:7,15 8:9,11,17 9:9 11:11 20:22 39:12 51:1 53:15 54:7,10,13 55:9,11 56:5,18 57:12 57:15,17 58:6,19,20 58:21 60:2,3,7 61:5 62:21 63:6,14 64:1,4 65:10,21 66:9,13 67:8 68:5 71:3 74:10 83:3 84:2 86:3,5 meetings 4:22 5:8 47:6 50:4 Melissa 4:17 **MEMBER** 4:4,9,11,13 11:22 12:11 13:11 14:8 16:7,16 18:2,3,4 18:11,12,15,21 19:3 20:20 21:20 23:5 24:14 28:18 29:11 30:21 31:2 32:2,5,16 32:22 34:20 35:4 36:17,20 37:7 38:10 39:1,14 42:18 43:7,11 45:8,12,16,18,21 46:5 46:8,9,16,21 48:8,11

48:13 49:22 52:20 53:2,7,17,20 55:20 56:3 57:5,10,13 59:7 59:12,17,20 60:8,15 60:20 61:1 62:6,11 63:3,16 64:6 65:13,16 66:10 67:11 68:1,15 68:21 69:8 70:21,22 71:13,18,22 72:14,16 73:3,12,14,19 74:11 74:13 77:11 78:1,7,16 79:12 80:5,14 81:12 81:22 82:6,7,17,20 83:22 84:6,9,16 members 1:12 3:15,17 4:2 6:12 8:4,6 9:4,4 10:18 11:1 12:8 21:5 62:8 86:7.11 memorized 21:22 mention 62:7 mentioned 69:22 70:9 met 1:10 33:10 metals 52:16 method 34:12 40:16 41:9 57:20 methodologies 9:22 methodology 40:16 methods 30:4 **middle** 39:20 miles 33:12 mind 15:3 16:15 26:3 27:18 82:1 minutes 6:19 7:2,13,15 7:18,20 31:4 44:20 46:17 47:14 74:9 missed 53:3 57:6 79:9 **mission** 81:18 **mixtures** 52:16 moderator 31:4 45:5 46:10 **moment** 34:20 **month** 10:13 morning 3:4 9:3 30:21 mother 26:9 move 19:1 20:21 42:1 44:1 47:14 48:22 56:21 63:22 65:18 72:7 76:5 80:22 **moved** 43:4 **moving** 20:11

Ν

name 3:6,20 7:7 names 8:14,16 nature 7:22 36:6 nearly 31:4

mushy 42:12

muted 6:11

necessarily 18:16 26:5 82:2 need 11:9 20:17 24:12 32:1,16 41:17 42:15 43:12 44:5 46:14 47:3 47:6,9 48:18 49:13,14 50:12 52:10,18,21 56:8 57:8 59:1 62:2 73:21 74:8 76:4 78:5 78:8,18 79:12,21 80:3 81:10 82:20 **needed** 10:9 13:18 needs 28:7 79:11 **never** 31:5 new 69:11 72:8 74:7 **newer** 30:15 **nexus** 40:8 non 80:4 non-Advisory 6:12 **normal** 37:2,9 normally 38:19 **note** 6:9,13 noteworthy 23:14 **novo** 14:22 number 9:16 42:22 49:1 71:9 75:10 76:4 77:5

0

o'clock 4:16.16 objections 86:5 obtaining 29:6 obvious 80:3 **obviously** 58:11 59:1 65:18 76:6 occupational 17:22 33:4 occurred 51:19 60:16 October 54:7,13 55:7 56:4,7,15 57:22 58:7 63:5 66:3,13 offer 35:21 office 33:22 68:16,17 officer 3:13 offices 79:17 80:7,9 82:10,15 official 1:21 66:21 officially 21:4 offline 66:6 **Oh** 43:11 46:8 53:17 68:7 85:8 okay 12:12 18:21,22 19:13 23:6 28:5,15 29:13 34:21 36:17 39:22,22 41:11 42:1 43:5,6,14 45:7 46:1,2 47:21 48:2,7 49:9 53:17 55:18 56:3,14 57:10,21 59:19 65:13

66:1 68:14 70:7.14 71:17,20 72:2 73:3,12 73:15,19 75:21 76:3,3 76:16 78:4 82:6 83:6 84:9 85:14 86:1 once 56:22 74:18 77:2 one-day 18:16 ones 38:19 51:21 70:17 72:5 onset 26:6 open 2:7 7:1 10:22 11:9 49:1 57:15 60:11,17 64:13 opened 75:11 opening 11:21 operationalize 78:11 opine 27:16 opinion 12:16 15:7,12 15:21 19:22 27:3 34:9 34:14 40:8 52:4 70:12 opinions 9:18 15:17 **opportunity** 12:9 85:7 order 10:7,8 79:20 81:8 organic 52:15 ought 33:6 outcome 17:22 26:22 28:4 outside 26:10

Р

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S **p.m** 1:10 3:2 86:13 page 5:21,22 77:20 paid 40:13 41:4 paper 23:19 Parkinson's 75:16 part 23:14 34:3 39:6 42:5 50:16 51:6,12 52:10,21 53:9,19 68:12,19 69:3 70:2,5 70:13,18 83:8,14 **participate** 6:17 49:19 85:7 participating 6:5,6 85:9 85:11 86:6 particular 9:19 13:9 17:9,18 36:12 41:19 52:6 61:13 particularly 39:2 **partly** 49:16 pass 39:11 passed 27:5 29:4 path 23:9 patient 13:3 patients 51:4 52:21,22 pay 36:1 41:8,10 payable 40:18 41:6

П			
novment 20:0 40:17	70:14 16 70:0 10 14	product 74:20	roder 92:21
payment 39:8 40:17	72:14,16 73:3,12,14	product 74:20	radar 82:21
payments 36:22	73:19	program 2:6,17 4:22	raising 48:12
people 13:9 30:15 33:7	position 14:1 63:6,9	9:14 10:12,15,21	rate 53:8
33:21 40:13 44:18	64:15	22:11 23:7 36:9 38:13	rationalization 9:19
47:5 48:3 54:6 61:18	positions 32:9 52:6	39:7,12 40:19 41:10	42:3
62:1,4 69:6 72:11,21	positive 26:21 28:4	42:4 50:11 79:21 86:9	rationalized 35:13 39:5
74:2,7,8	possibility 28:14	provide 35:15 38:15,19	42:10
people's 24:12	possible 54:6,12 79:21	40:14 74:14	re- 39:9
percent 31:14 35:22	posted 6:15	provided 6:3 8:5 19:7	re-doing 69:2
perception 21:8	potential 37:18	36:3 50:15	re-put 42:20
permission 25:21	PPI 61:12,22 75:12	providing 38:18	read 12:4,6 15:9
person 14:4 22:12,13	practice 43:2 54:3	public 5:6 6:14,16 7:1	reading 33:16
27:10 30:7 54:2 61:4	preexisting 10:6	8:7 9:5 60:12,17 62:5	real 11:11 33:21 43:3
person's 13:8	prefer 62:5	86:7	44:10
personality 21:13	preliminary 72:3	publicly 5:22 8:8 19:6	realistic 63:16,19
personally 8:13 54:11	prepared 7:2,14,20	61:12	realize 81:7
perspective 2:10 11:13	preparing 3:15	publish 6:2 57:17	really 10:9 11:9,19
67:13	present 4:22 62:8,13	publishing 7:21	12:20 19:4 20:13 21:4
persuade 19:9	65:4 66:5	pull 17:20 70:17 83:13	22:21 24:5,21 27:3
peruse 55:7	presentation 15:2	pulled 70:11	29:21 30:14 33:15,19
phone 11:8 20:15 22:10	presented 12:14	pulmonary 53:5 68:2,4	35:11 41:17 42:11
30:14 31:20 34:7 59:5	presiding 1:11	68:8	44:5 52:9 60:9 69:21
59:14 60:1	presumptions 16:4	Purpose 2:2	78:11 81:3 82:14 85:5
phones 6:11	presumptive 77:9	put 7:19 14:20 15:15	realm 19:5
phrase 13:14	presumptives 77:8	22:13 36:18 42:19,19	reason 19:8 39:18
physician 10:1 13:2	pretty 10:7 48:21	47:15 58:14 60:6	61:10
15:11,12 16:21 19:11	previous 4:20	71:11 73:4,15,22	recap 9:7
22:15 24:4,18 25:11	primarily 10:22 70:1	74:21 79:3 83:8 85:15	received 15:2
27:4,14 34:6,13 35:12	priorities 44:13 54:22	putting 75:7	recognition 33:20
35:18 36:4 37:14,19	priority 15:19	pating 7 0.7	35:20
37:21 39:8 40:22	private 61:6		recognizes 35:9
73:10 84:15	probably 5:17 18:9 27:7	QCE 15:9	recommend 28:6
physician's 41:15	29:15 44:11 55:6	quality 10:3 35:6	recommendations 2:14
			9:17 67:2 77:4 81:14
physicians 20:16 38:12 38:14 39:3 40:5 43:18	58:10 60:3 64:2 72:4	quantity 44:7	
	73:7 82:12 83:14,17	Quarterly 44:12	recommends 52:2
pick 73:1	problem 6:7 21:6 31:2	question 12:13 14:9,16	record 7:8 23:21 25:19
picking 72:21	59:12	15:3 17:1,8 19:15,20	86:13
picture 43:13	problematic 22:20	20:12,21 21:1,4 24:1	recording 7:12
PII 56:13 58:14 75:4	problems 33:11 54:4	24:6,6 32:11 34:5,16	records 23:22 24:3,7,16
76:2	76:11 77:3	35:3 36:11,15 37:4	24:20,22 26:15 27:6
pin 66:15	procedural 23:18 24:5	40:2,11 41:17 43:15	28:20 51:18
places 9:14 29:3	procedure 2:12 21:7,21	44:10 45:13 51:3	rectify 47:6
plan 5:2 47:15 57:7	30:3,19 37:2,15 38:7	53:22 54:5 57:5 60:8	redact 76:14
66:11	64:20 66:22 74:1	60:10 62:14,15 63:4	references 15:15,16,20
plans 69:4	procedures 14:13	74:11,14 77:3 80:9	15:20 35:16
play 16:14,18 18:13	33:16 37:1,1,9,21	questions 2:3 9:13 11:3	referral 51:19
please 3:19 4:6 6:7,9,13	proceed 2:7 11:10 25:2	12:8 13:10 16:6 29:13	referrals 53:16 68:17
7:4,7,11 8:10 23:9	49:2	34:18 39:12 54:11	70:10 83:15,16
85:17	process 2:14 10:10	55:4 58:16 71:12 72:7	referred 34:14
plus 52:16,16	11:12 13:20 25:16	79:14 83:1	referring 68:22
point 14:3 21:12 22:6	27:12 30:13 37:14	Questions/Concerns	refers 15:12
25:22 44:16 48:21	38:5 50:18 51:19	2:4	reflected 82:12
49:4,8 55:5 63:19,21	65:18 67:2 74:5 78:14	quick 3:18 69:21	regard 10:11
65:5 69:8	80:22	quickly 77:21	regarding 1:6 2:4 3:11
policy 1:22 4:19 21:15	processed 31:16	quite 42:20 46:15	5:1 8:20 9:17 10:5
33:4	processes 79:17	quote 13:15 16:4	11:3 19:14 21:15,16
pool 70:1	Processing 2:10	quote 13.13 10.4	74:1 81:15
Pope 1:19 4:8,9 72:14	produced 64:7	R	regional 82:10
1 ope 1.13 4.0,3 72.14	produced 04.7		
II	•	ı	ı

Register 57:18 results 10:17 58:5 59:12 65:7,11,16 smoking 30:8 regulation 21:15,16 review 2:3,4,10 10:3 65:17 69:10 75:12 **solid** 79:11 regulations 7:17 11:12 13:21 49:7 79:3,3 81:4 solution 33:19 regulatory 20:14 50:18 55:4 63:7 79:13 **seeing** 10:17 solvent 52:16 reimburse 36:8 82:3 seek 40:22 somebody 25:10 26:8 reimbursed 41:7 43:20 reviewed 41:12 seeking 41:1 41:20 reimbursement 35:8,20 reviewing 63:10 seen 80:8 somewhat 34:8 38:18 **SEM** 18:6 25:12 37:8 revisit 65:20 58:2 64:19 reiterate 83:11 **Rhoads** 1:21 3:3,6 4:2,5 send 25:10 27:7 51:1 soon 22:16 66:2 relate 70:13 4:10,12,14 39:11,15 67:7,9 71:4 73:17 **sooner** 7:18,19 related 2:12 42:9 39:19 44:17 45:1,4 84:4 85:16 **sorry** 25:17 35:4 43:7 relationship 16:2 46:3,7,10 47:16,22 **sending** 75:14,19 46:12 54:19 relationships 17:21 48:5 50:9 51:5 53:12 **senior** 30:14 sort 14:9 16:3,19 17:15 relatively 20:18 22:16 55:12,22 56:6,12 sense 12:10 14:4 18:14 17:20 18:2 19:19 30:6 50:8 53:7 70:20 22:16 51:20 52:13,14 57:16 61:7,15 68:4,10 23:18 27:15 40:11,19 62:12 69:22 75:2,6,18,22 73:13 41:16 49:20,20 64:14 releasable 19:6 76:13,17,21 83:4 84:3 sensitivity 51:15 66:21 71:15 release 24:2 sent 10:11 77:13 84:8 85:3,21 86:1 sounds 14:22 36:21 relevant 19:18,21 20:5 **sentence** 37:5 39:21 right 18:15 20:12 28:11 63:11 30:8 48:20 67:6 83:14 38:10 46:6,9 53:2,17 separate 59:17 **sources** 16:20 26:4 remember 13:16 32:6 56:18 60:2 61:6 62:10 separately 41:21 50:13 **speak** 7:4 25:21 46:18 42:20 63:17 65:13 68:11 **September** 1:8 58:7 46:19 remind 8:3 81:13 70:3 75:5,8,18 76:21 sequence 49:21 speaking 7:6 42:15,21 77:19 81:20 82:18 remotely 6:5,6 **service** 37:13,18 38:6 50:21 83:2 84:3.8 rendered 38:1 84:14 special 8:6 repeat 46:14 road 14:17 20:7 **services** 36:3 37:19.22 specific 8:14 9:13,14 report 2:12 11:15 31:13 **roll** 3:18 38:16,16,17 40:17 14:17 15:1,22 17:16 35:13 36:12 37:4 room 4:17 session 6:10,14 32:7 36:22 37:3,14 41:14,15 42:10 49:12 roughly 55:21 sessions 33:18 53:22 57:6 72:7 60:6 63:20,20 64:7 routine 21:7 set 23:9 34:2 60:7 72:5 **specifically** 36:10 61:8 66:20,21 76:5 81:3 rule 17:10 sets 17:7 70:11 81:16 reporting 36:6 63:10 rules 47:9 60:9.14 setting 60:12 specifics 76:12 settled 54:4 64:14 reports 35:5,6,8 39:6 61:17 62:15 85:19 specified 17:14 44:12 seven 46:11 **speed** 30:16 S representative 84:15 seventies 29:4 spend 40:7 representatives 40:14 safeguards 35:2 **share** 47:11 55:16 splashed 77:12 represented 25:4 **Samuels** 33:3 shared 8:8 **STAFF** 1:20 request 53:22 Saturday 58:9 sharing 63:6 **standard** 31:10 35:9 requested 2:17 4:21 saw 53:3 Sheldon 33:2 standardization 42:11 requests 23:19 54:16 saying 18:15 37:11 side 13:18,19 standardize 44:6 requirements 78:12 42:8 43:11 49:13 56:8 **SIDEM** 4:18 standardized 9:20 requires 33:19 64:6,7 78:17 silicosis 51:16 21:14 30:18 31:11,12 rereading 24:15 scary 61:13 **Silver** 1:14 4:10,11 19:3 32:9,13 72:6 research 12:19 13:6,7 scenes 85:12 19:3 32:22,22 39:1.1 standards 32:9 resource 19:4 schedule 36:9 41:9 39:14 70:21 77:11 start 7:7 16:17 48:16 scheduled 4:15 6:14 78:1 49:9 67:12,14 69:13 resources 10:2 43:21 similar 17:17 respond 3:19 43:19 Schroeder 4:18 77:4 scientific 1:13 12:18 simple 35:12 52:15 started 11:20 **response** 12:19 13:13 19:17 20:10 21:3 scientists 41:2 44:11 **simply** 5:15 starting 69:9 24:15 27:14 40:11 state 7:7 43:17 **single** 33:13 screen 5:11 45:13 53:13 second 9:7,8,22 49:17 sit 23:15 41:17 statement 42:2 responses 2:3,5 10:13 58:7 situation 17:18 statements 35:15 51:18 10:20 12:2 79:13 situations 27:1 52:6 STATES 1:1 Secretary 81:14 responsibility 12:14,21 see 5:17,20 7:13 12:7 six 59:1 **statute** 78:12 **skimpy** 35:13 15:8 15:19 18:13,13 26:2 **stays** 78:9 responsible 22:21 26:14 31:19 39:8,13 slightly 40:4 **steer** 78:2 52:4,10,21 53:15 54:6 responsiveness 10:1 **small** 59:9,13 62:12 **step** 12:1 16:4 33:13 rest 10:18 55:11 56:22 57:1,11 **smoked** 30:7 48:22 49:21

steps 64:15 supposedly 23:21 77:13 83:19 timetable 2:8 11:11,18 stereotypic 32:13 sure 12:11,11 13:13 templates 83:10 55:21 62:19 67:7 **Steve** 23:2 24:10,11 16:17 21:21,22 24:21 ten 83:13 73:17 77:5 83:8 32:10 44:22 45:5,21 42:13 48:9 55:9 81:21 **Terrie** 33:5 to-do 84:2 Steve's 78:5 46:15 47:16 48:14,19 thank 9:2 23:11,16,17 today 4:16 5:1 6:14 7:3 Steven 1:16 4:12 13:11 53:20 56:1,2,9 58:1 23:17 29:11 36:19 7:17 8:11 66:15 84:11 16:7 20:20 21:20 59:3 60:21 61:9,16 41:11 45:1,7 46:9 today's 3:7,13 5:20,21 24:14 28:18 35:5 70:21 75:3,15 76:1 55:18 76:22 81:20 6:47:2,15 84:17 85:3 86:6.8.9 told 17:14 22:11 30:13 42:19 45:8 48:8 49:22 78:7,9 81:8 82:2 83:4 53:21 60:15 62:6 63:3 84:16 85:21 31:21 49:4 80:13,14 86:10 63:18 81:12 84:1,20 **survivor** 26:7,19 thanking 85:6 **Tony** 47:19 stickiest 29:15 survivors 28:21 thanks 36:17 48:2 top 44:2 Tori 50:3 77:11 story 53:11 suspect 32:17 85:22 straight 71:15 suspend 61:17 thing 23:19 29:7 35:13 toughest 29:5 straightforward 18:9 **Toxic** 1:3 3:9 5:16 8:18 **switch** 54:20 40:3 67:5 20:19 35:12 51:21 **synopsis** 71:8 76:6 **things** 14:11 18:9 37:3 toxicologist 15:13 streamline 16:10 synthesis 15:20 38:7 42:6 49:20 51:2 toxicologists 41:2 traffic 14:4 strictly 80:5 synthesize 14:13 15:16 66:12 71:19 79:5,19 structure 36:2 54:10 82:11,15 71:5 76:9 **trails** 23:19 **studies** 12:19 trained 29:17,19,22 **synthesized** 15:7 73:22 think 5:2 12:4,9 14:12 stuff 33:16 52:13 64:21 **system** 35:20 15:5 17:14 19:19,22 31:7 20:22 22:8,10 23:13 84:12 85:15 systematically 82:14 training 10:2 15:18 stultifying 47:4 **systems** 34:22 23:20 24:10 25:2 30:9 19:21 29:22 30:12,17 subcommittee 1:5,10 31:16 32:5,19 33:14 30:18 31:8,17 32:6,10 Т 1:11,17 2:3 3:10,18 34:16,21 36:13 38:19 32:13 41:15,18,22 3:22 4:21,22 5:9 6:3 table 13:7 32:18 42:19 38:21 40:21 41:12.16 43:21,22 49:5 50:5,9 8:19 9:1.9.12 47:17 42:20 50:2 54:1 42:11,14 43:10 44:13 57:2 58:22 60:4 62:22 48:6 50:16 51:7,8 47:7,8 48:18,20 49:8 63:10 64:11 65:8 take 5:2 21:13 35:5 54:11 55:14 57:17 49:14,17 52:7,9,18 66:17 67:1 72:9 74:2 37:16 70:15,16 72:10 58:6 61:2,4,5,18 62:8 82:2 83:7.12 53:5 55:22 56:6,22,22 77:7 80:10,16,20 82:9 62:13 63:5 64:4,8 takeaway 24:10,11 57:14 59:4,16 61:7,13 82:13 85:1 65:1,21 67:13,14,20 taken 22:13 63:18,20 64:18,18 transcriber 7:5,10 84:7 86:11 takes 35:19 66:3 65:4,9 69:9 71:14 86:10 subcommittees 55:17 talk 10:19 11:2 12:4 73:1,20 74:3,18,19 transcript 7:1 83:17 24:4 30:11 31:4 47:1 76:9,17 77:9 78:21 **transcripts** 6:20 7:21 79:1,5,11,12,20 80:2 **subgroups** 47:10 69:7 58:12 65:15 66:6 67:3 7:22 **submit** 19:11 58:16 talked 56:7 80:17,19 81:1,3,5,10 transfer 76:1 **submitted** 6:1 29:20 talking 16:9 20:3,16 82:4 83:6 85:10 transparent 14:15 **subsequent** 11:7 12:7 26:7 27:5 28:9,12 thinking 14:10 16:13 61:21 24:6 29:2 35:17,17 47:16 thinks 79:22 travel 59:4 **subset** 61:2 62:12 50:22 52:15 54:1 **third** 10:2 49:18 traveling 54:18 64:3 **Substances** 1:3 3:9 58:12 61:12 62:1 63:4 thought 28:17 53:3 treated 26:10 5:16 8:18 67:17 76:12 thoughts 57:4 treating 13:2 15:10,11 16:21 20:16 22:14 subverting 62:14 talks 30:3 thousand 33:12 **success** 77:17 tall 10:7 three 48:3 53:4,10,13 24:17 34:6 38:17 68:2,4,16 78:2 83:17 treatment 38:16 sufficient 22:7 target 19:9 84:22 suggested 38:21 **TCE** 75:16 83:17 triggers 9:21 Thursday 58:6 teaching 32:7 suggestions 59:5 73:5 truly 28:19 team 59:2 till 4:16 try 26:14 34:2 38:11 tease 20:16 30:1 44:5 time 1:10 3:4,14 4:16 **summaries** 74:10,15,16 44:5 65:5 66:15 74:5 technical 45:3 14:22 17:2 23:8 27:6 76:8,18,19 77:8 84:10 summarizing 75:3 Telecon 2:6 31:8,17 33:1 34:4 84:12 35:6,14,19 43:18 44:7 summary 2:6 11:7 75:4 trying 14:12 20:16 22:8 teleconference 3:7 7:4 50:2 54:1 55:8 57:6 76:2 telephone 23:19 61:20 **Tuesday** 1:8 84:11 **supply** 43:16 telephonically 1:10 58:19 65:14 **support** 9:19 12:15 tell 36:1 50:19 53:10 timeframe 50:21 turn 8:22 tells 46:10 timeline 66:12 71:4 16:1 28:2 turning 54:3 supposed 22:9 template 71:16 72:6 times 46:22 48:15 two 5:4 55:1 56:17 60:3

voluminous 77:16 29:14.18 41:22 68:22 **16** 2:5 72:4,22 83:16,17 type 10:4 11:14 27:14 volunteered 32:8 welcome 3:7 23:9 50:17 16th 56:17,19 32:13 37:14,18 60:6 voted 6:21 **well-** 42:9 **1st** 57:22 58:5 66:3 went 86:13 W 2 types 15:18 19:14 27:2 wicket 29:15 29:9 37:19 38:7 52:11 wages 22:8 winding 77:20 **2** 1:6 typically 38:14,15 wait 44:20 54:9 58:7 **wisdom** 15:3 **2,000-\$2,500** 40:7 69:17 **wondering** 35:7,19 **2,500** 40:8 words 12:17 36:5 78:16 waiting 45:9 2:44 86:13 **walk** 12:1 unavailable 23:22 work 3:15,16 16:8 20 31:4 28:20 want 11:19 17:1 23:8 17:19 19:10 22:13 **2015** 31:13 underlying 13:17 30:20 35:21 42:4,18 30:15 31:12 33:7 39:9 **2016** 1:8 understand 7:5 24:16 44:1.1 46:19 48:22 49:20 51:12 53:9 **24** 2:6 30:13,16 65:1,3 74:6 49:18 54:6,9 55:13 58:18 59:3,5,9,13,21 **26-28** 6:22 62:7 67:20 69:2 74:5 78:22 79:1 57:16 61:11 62:3 **28** 55:2 71:2 74:20 77:8 63:20 71:7 75:14,22 understanding 10:9,19 3 15:6 17:4 79:1 80:21 81:13 82:1 worked 58:17 61:18,19 uniform 79:21 80:11,15 Worker 1:3 3:9 5:16 85:15 86:2,9,9 3 2:2 4:16 wanted 9:6,10 10:22 80:17 8:19 **30** 8:2 Workers 33:22 **unique** 17:5 60:21 4 unit 33:11 wants 41:20 53:9 working 29:3 39:3 UNITED 1:1 47:11,20 48:3 49:11 Washington 33:3 **45** 30:7 unquote 16:4 wasn't 64:6 50:11 52:13 55:3,4,15 way 8:12 15:4 16:10 58:15,16 67:14 73:6 5 uploaded 74:17 74:22 83:18 84:15 ups 59:8,9 20:1 31:15,22 38:20 50 68:6 69:21 use 25:21 47:18 84:20 40:4 47:12 61:14 72:5 works 22:14 34:22 **56** 2:8 useful 38:22 77:20 78:19 79:18 worth 31:17 usually 84:3 80:8 81:6,7 82:8,13 wouldn't 17:1 61:11 6 utilize 29:9 62:7 **we'll** 5:3 7:19,20 11:6 6,000 77:20 15:19 34:2 39:13 45:6 write 59:8,8 71:7 writing 35:12 37:3 39:5 58:13 63:12 65:15,16 7 65:17,20 67:3 70:14 39:9.10 **vague** 62:18 8 Vance 1:22 4:19 23:11 70:15 71:1 72:5,10 written 5:6 48:1 23:12 25:20,20 26:2 80:19 83 2:20 Χ 28:9,12,22 35:21 we're 4:15 7:4 12:1 20:1 86 2:22 37:10,12 40:2,10,12 20:6 26:7 27:4,6 28:2 51:11,11 68:12 69:20 30:10 43:22 45:9 9 69:20 70:4,8 84:18,19 46:22 48:20 49:8 year 74:4 907:16 56:10,17 58:11 61:12 years 30:8 33:2 85:4,4,11 86:10 variation 82:11 62:19,19,20,21,21 Ζ 63:1,22 65:17 66:12 variety 49:11 various 16:20 17:3 27:2 **Z** 1:14 66:13 67:8 69:2,3,9 vast 70:4 71:2,5,8,10,18 72:2 **zone** 3:5 verbatim 7:21 72:17 73:17 74:4 76:11 77:7 81:8,9,10 0 versus 41:14 42:9 69:11 79:22 81:19 83:2 1 Victoria 1:10,17 3:21 we've 48:19 64:22 viewing 6:10 65:14 76:11 **1** 4:15 58:13 71:9 75:16 views 71:10 WebEx 5:11 6:9 1:00 1:10 3:2 violated 21:9 website 5:7,13,19 6:16 **10** 31:14 36:6 visited 5:18 7:16 8:1 100 35:22 Vlieger 1:19 4:5,6 30:21 week 58:10 60:1 64:2 10th 58:3 31:2 44:19 45:16 46:3 weeks 50:12 54:2 56:1 **11th** 58:10 46:5,9,16,21 48:13 56:4,17 59:1 60:3 **12** 2:3 65:22 69:17 72:4 52:20 59:7,12 66:10 12th 58:10 67:11 68:1.15.21 69:8 weigh 41:14 **13** 1:8 70:22 74:11.13 79:12 **weighed** 67:18 **13th** 58:11 80:5,14 81:22 82:6 weighing 1:6 3:11 8:20 **14** 54:22

<u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Medical Advice for CEs Regarding

Weighing of Medical Evidence

Before: Toxic Substances and Worker Health Adv. Bd.

Date: 09-13-16

Place: teleconference

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Court Reporter

near Nous &