## Meeting Date:

April 20, 2006, 4:00 p.m.

## Meeting with:

United Auto Workers (UAW) Local 1519, Santa Susana, California

## Attendees:

| Name | Organization |
|---|---|
| Glenn Quealy | United Auto Workers (UAW) Local 1519 |
| Ben Dominguez | UAW Local 1519 |
| Henry O. Fuentes | UAW Local 1519 |
| Cornelious Chisom | UAW Local 1519 |
| Ruben Barroso | UAW Local 1519 |
| Silvio Paschia | UAW Local 1519 |
| Angelo T. Gizis | UAW Local 1519 |
| Bill Everett | UAW Local 1519 |
| Victor Ortega | UAW Local 1519 |
| Tom S. Rubio | UAW Local 1519 |
| Maureen Kenny | UAW Local 1519 |
| Fred Harris | UAW Local 1519 |
| Don Roache | UAW Local 1519 |
| Guerdon R. Frame | UAW Local 1519 |
| Alice Acuña | UAW Local 1519 |
| Thomas Marks | UAW Local 1519 |
| Ricardo N. Hernandez | UAW Local 1519 |
| Linda Hays | UAW Local 1519 |
| John M. Cruz | UAW Local 1519 |

## NIOSH/ORAU Team:

Mark Rolfes, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), Office of Compensation Analysis and Support (OCAS)

Melton “Mel” Chew, M. H. Chew and Associates, Site Profile Team Leader

Steve Meiners, Tricord, Inc.

Mark Lewis, Advanced Technologies and Laboratories International, Inc. (ATL)

Mary Elliott, ATL

## Proceedings:

Ms. Linda Hayes, Vice President of United Auto Workers (UAW) Local 1519, opened the meeting at approximately 4:00 p.m. She introduced Mr. Mark Lewis of the Worker Outreach Team from the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) Dose Reconstruction Project.

Mr. Lewis thanked Ms. Hayes for the opportunity to meet with the union membership to discuss the Site Profile for the Energy Technology Engineering Center (ETEC). The Site Profile is a tool used to reconstruct radiation doses for workers who file claims for compensation under the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act (EEOICPA). He explained that the Team is interested in hearing what the workers at a site have to say about the Site Profile. Since most of the information comes from the records of the Department of Energy (DOE) and its contractors, it is important that the Site Profile development process includes the people who actually worked at the site. Giving the workers this opportunity improves the Site Profile because the workers are the true "site experts" who know about daily operations, safety practices, and accidents or incidents that may not appear in the "official" records.

Mr. Lewis described how his experiences as a union worker within the DOE nuclear weapons complex led to his involvement in the movement that culminated in the passage of the EEOICPA and, in turn, to his current position as the Team's Union Outreach Specialist.

The Site Profile is a "living document," which means that it can be revised as new information becomes available. The Worker Outreach Team first met with UAW Local 1519 in January 2006. During that meeting, the team explained the types of information that can enrich the Site Profile. The Team sent ETEC Site Profiles to union representatives for review after it was published on the NIOSH Web site: http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/ocas/etec.html. The Site Profile rollout meeting was scheduled after the union representatives had a chance to review the document. Mr. Lewis encouraged the attendees to share their comments or questions regarding the Site Profile at any time during the presentation.

**Question:**
How familiar are you with the incident that occurred at the SRE (Sodium Reactor Experiment)? The problem with our site is that incidents are not quantified. There was a special on the History Channel that said that the SRE incident released more radiation than Chernobyl.

***Mark Lewis:***
Mr. Mel Chew, who is the Site Profile Team Leader, will be able to address that when he speaks later in the meeting.

**Comment:**
Many of us went off-site to work for the company on other projects for DOE – places like Frankford Arsenal in Philadelphia. They made cannonballs and nuclear weapons and it was nasty.

**Comment:**
They made armor-piercing bullets from depleted uranium.

**Comment:**
If you got anywhere near the sinks or urinals in that building, your skin would start to burn. Some of us were there for more than a year. We came back with rashes that wouldn't heal and other health problems.

Mr. Lewis introduced the other members of the NIOSH/Oak Ridge Associated Universities (ORAU) team: Mr. Mark Rolfes, Mr. Mel Chew, Mr. Steve Meiners, and Ms. Mary Elliott. He requested that the attendees sign in on the sheet provided so that their names could be included in the minutes. Mr. Lewis explained that the meeting was being recording so that the minutes would accurately capture the comments and questions from the meeting. The minutes are published on the NIOSH Web site after the union has a chance to review them.

Mr. Lewis asked Mr. Rolfes, a health physicist from NIOSH, if he had any remarks before the presentation. Mr. Rolfes stated that he reviews and performs dose reconstructions using information provided by EEOICPA claimants, along with what is contained in the Site Profile. He remarked that he could answer any questions regarding the dose reconstruction or the EEOICPA claims processes.

Mr. Lewis turned the floor over to Mr. Steve Meiners for the presentation of the ETEC Site Profile. Mr. Meiners gave an overview of EEOICPA, which is a federal program to compensate workers who have become ill as the result of exposure to radiation or toxic substances while working in the DOE nuclear weapons and energy research programs. Eligible employees or former employees who worked for facilities or companies under contract with DOE or its predecessor agencies can file claims with the Department of Labor (DOL) for $150,000 plus reimbursement of medical expenses under Subtitle B for cancers, beryllium disease, and some silicosis cases. The DOL verifies the worker's employment and medical diagnosis. Subtitle E provides compensation for illnesses resulting from toxic chemical exposure in the workplace. A worker may be eligible for compensation under both Subtitles B and E, but NIOSH receives only Subtitle B cancer claims for radiation dose reconstruction. If the worker is deceased, the surviving spouse or children may file a claim on the worker's behalf.

NIOSH established the Office of Compensation Analysis and Support (OCAS) to facilitate and provide oversight for the dose reconstruction effort. Due to the large number of claims submitted, NIOSH hired ORAU and its subcontractors to assist with the dose reconstructions and other associated tasks.

Mr. Meiners stated that Site Profile rollout meetings such as this allow workers and former workers to respond to the content of the Site Profile, to ask questions, and to point out possible omissions or areas for improvement. The Team documents the comments and questions and takes them back to the teams that write the Site Profiles. The ETEC Site Profile is a collection of historic reference information about the site that provides a consistent set of data for the scientists who reconstruct EEOICPA radiation doses for workers from the ETEC site. Using the information from the Site Profile as a guide, the dose reconstructor enters the worker's exposure information from his or her dose records (if they are available) and personal information from the claims interview into a computer program to calculate the "probability of causation" (POC), that is, the probability that a worker's cancer is related to his or her occupational radiation dose.

The claim may be recommended for compensation if the computer program determines that the worker's occupational radiation dose is "as likely as not" (greater than 50% POC) to have caused the cancer.

**Question:**
If a worker is separated from his employer due to layoff or termination and he later discovers that he has cancer, can he file a claim?

***Steve Meiners:***
Yes. If an employee is diagnosed with cancer after his period of employment, he should still file a claim. The compensation is not dependent on the employer. It is a federally-funded compensation program. At present, there are no time limits on filing a claim. The handout folder contains information about filing a claim. There is also information for accessing the NIOSH Web site, where you can read about EEOICPA and see the ETEC Site Profile. There is a lot of important information on that Web site.

**Question:**
Are there time limitations for survivors for filing claims? Is that an open time frame also?

***Steve Meiners:***
That is correct. You may find it useful later if you spend some time now documenting which buildings and areas you have worked in and what work you performed there. This information could help you or your family if you ever have to file a claim. The Site Profile was written using the company's records. Those records may report the company's operating procedures and programs as the company expects them to happen, but in reality the records may not accurately reflect the actual way the work was performed. If you see discrepancies in the Site Profile, NIOSH needs to know about them. Your handout folders also include how to send this information to NIOSH, and that information is on the NIOSH Web site as well.

**Comment** (to the other attendees)**:**
The company makes our work history available to us. We have total access by request. It tells whether you worked at AI or Rocketdyne, and if you were sent to assignments at other facilities from the very beginning of your employment. I'm not certain that it tells what buildings or areas we worked in, though.

**Comment:**
Some employees were sent to assignments in other countries.

***Steve Meiners:***
This information would be useful in an individual dose reconstruction. The dose reconstructors would use the ETEC Site Profile, as well as the Site Profiles from the other facilities where you worked.

**Comment:**
The company is not able to get records from Frankford Arsenal. They are not available.

**Question:**
Can we find all the Site Profiles on the Internet? If the site was a nuclear site, would there be a Site Profile there?

***Steve Meiners:***
Yes – there are Site Profiles for eligible sites that were involved in the DOE nuclear weapons and energy research program. However, this program does not include information for commercial nuclear facilities.

The ETEC Site Profile includes an introduction and a collection of five technical documents: the Site Description, the Medical Dose, the Environmental Dose, the Internal Dose, and the External Dose. These describe the history of the ETEC facilities and radiation monitoring programs.

The Site Description summarizes the ETEC facilities that were used in the contracts between DOE and Rockwell's Atomics International and its successors from 1948 to the present. This section describes the radiation-related programs that took place at Area IV of the Santa Susana Field Laboratory as well as the facilities at DeSoto Avenue, the Vanowen Building in Canoga Park, and the Downey Site. The Site Description lists each building, detailing the production activities and the radiation sources that were present. This section includes Table 2-6, Major Incidents, which describes the incidents and accidents that occurred in these areas.

The Medical Dose section discusses which workers received medical X-rays as a condition of their employment. The medical X-ray program is described, including the frequency and types of X-rays that were regularly required and the different X-ray equipment and techniques that were used. NIOSH assumes one chest X-ray per employee per year for dose reconstruction purposes if information on the frequency of X-ray examinations is not available.

The Environmental Dose section is included for workers who were not monitored in bioassay and dosimetry programs, taking into consideration the sources of environmental radiation exposures in the workplace. Both external environmental and internal environmental doses for unmonitored workers are discussed in this section:

- External environmental doses are included from radiation monitoring data taken from 1975 to 1999, and are calculated for the period from 1952 to 1974. Annual external doses are given for DeSoto Avenue from 1959-1998, Area IV from 1954-1999, Canoga Avenue (Vanowen Building) from 1954-1960, and the Downey Site from 1952 to 1955.
- Internal environmental dose is based on site-wide monitoring for air concentrations of known radionuclides. Internal environmental radiation doses are received by breathing radionuclides in air or by swallowing radionuclides in resuspended soil. Specific monitoring was done for many different radionuclides for specific years.

The Internal Dose section describes the bioassay programs from August 1958 to the present. The radionuclides that were monitored in the urinalysis program varied over time. Whole body and lung counts have been performed from 1967 to the present. Bioassay analyses have been done for gross alpha, gross beta, mixed fission products, and specific radionuclides over the years, including tritium, carbon-14, sulfur-32, phosphorus-32, cobalt-60, strontium-90, cesium-137, promethium-147, polonium, plutonium, americium, cerium and thorium. Minimum detectable levels (MDLs) are included.

Mr. Meiners inquired if the attendees had participated in a bioassay program at any time. Most attendees indicated that they had done so.

**Question:**
I noticed that beryllium was listed on the slide that talked about Subtitle B. Does the Site Profile talk about beryllium, too?

***Mel Chew:***
Only radioactive beryllium is discussed in the Site Profile.

***Mark Lewis:***
Beryllium disease is covered by Subtitle B of EEOICPA, but those claims go through DOL.

***Mark Rolfes:***
That is correct. NIOSH does not receive any claims for berylliosis or silicosis. DOL looks at blood tests and chest X-rays and relies on medical opinions to verify a claimant's eligibility for compensation for these diseases.

***Steve Meiners:***
The section on External Dose describes the external dosimetry programs that monitored for beta, gamma and neutron radiation that came from radiation sources outside the body. Data are available for the period from 1954 to the present. Dosimeter technology and exchange frequency are also considered. MDLs are given. NIOSH applies a "missed dose" component to compensate for dosimeter readings that were reported as "zero" in an effort to be claimant-favorable. The "missed dose" is calculated using one-half of the MDL.

Mr. Meiners concluded the presentation by stating that information from workers will help make the ETEC Site Profile a more useful instrument for calculating dose reconstructions. He encouraged the attendees to review the Site Profile and to consider their own work experiences while examining the document. Any information that might contribute to revisions to the Site Profile can be sent directly to NIOSH at the mailing address or the e-mail address in the presentation, as well as by fax at the number provided.

**Question:**
Should we be worried about repercussions from our employer?

***Mark Rolfes:***
Everything remains confidential. The recording being made here today is not to identify who made comments or who asked questions. The information we are collecting today is to help ensure that the claimants from ETEC are given the benefit of the doubt when NIOSH completes their dose reconstructions.

**Question:**
Does a person have to have cancer to file a claim?

***Mark Lewis:***
There must be a medical diagnosis for cancer, berylliosis, or silicosis for a claimant to file for compensation under Subtitle B. NIOSH only receives cancer claims for dose reconstruction. If you have any other illness that you suspect may be caused by exposure to chemicals used in your occupation, you should contact your DOL Resource Center to file a Subtitle E claim.

**Question:**
Do you think this law will stay on the books?

***Mark Rolfes:***
Because EEOICPA is a law, another law would have to be passed to remove it from the books.

**Question:**
How many teams are going to all the sites to talk about the program?

***Mark Lewis:***
The NIOSH Dose Reconstruction Project has one Worker Outreach Team that goes out to talk with the unions. The Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health realized early in the program the need to give labor a voice in the Site Profile, so they recommended that NIOSH create a Worker Outreach Program. My union asked me to take a leave of absence to come work with the Outreach Team.

**Question:**
Who is financing the compensation program?

***Mark Lewis:***
DOL is the designated payer. Under EEOICPA, Congress set up the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Fund to provide money to compensate claimants.

***Response:***
So this is taxpayers' money, and not dependent on a business?

***Mark Lewis:***
That is correct. The funds come from government money.

Mr. Meiners introduced Mr. Mel Chew, the Site Profile Team Leader and author, for further discussion on the ETEC Site Profile.

Mr. Chew stated that the Site Profile Team began gathering information for the Site Profile documents in November 2005. Boeing gave the Team access to records that went back as far as the 1940s and continued up through present operations. As they searched through 147 four-drawer file cabinets, the Team soon realized that the contracts involved not only Area IV (the Santa Susana Field Laboratory), but also facilities at DeSoto Avenue, Canoga Park (the Vanowen Building), and the Downey site. The Team found documentation of all the DOE radiation programs beginning in the late 1940s: the experimental reactors, the fuel fabrication for those reactors, the accelerators, and the research and development programs. Since all four sites must be documented for these programs, the Site Description of the ETEC Site Profile is much larger than the usual 25 to 30 pages. Since the Site Profile was written, the Team has discovered that there was a radiation program in place in 1948 at the Downey Site. The Site Description is being revised to reflect that information as well as the fact that there was a radiation safety program in place at that time.

Mr. Chew noted that the EEOICPA compensation program also includes work done under contract with DOE's predecessors – the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC), the Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA), and even as far back as the Manhattan Engineer District (Manhattan Project).

The dose reconstructors use the Site Profile to start building an EEOICPA claimant's radiation history. The site-specific information included in the Site Description and the Dose sections is there to ensure that a claimant is given the best possible opportunity to have a POC high enough

to be awarded compensation.

Mr. Chew revisited the question regarding whether the claimant's employer would know that a claim had been filed. He stated that DOL requests employment verification from DOE and its contractors (the employers) as well as the employee's radiation records. He encouraged the attendees to follow the suggestion to request their employment history from the company so they could verify that the information is correct.

The Site Profile Team faced a challenge in developing the ETEC Site Profile. Employees often performed work under contracts with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and other federal agencies concurrently with their work under the DOE contracts. While it is not evident that radiation was involved in programs with the other agencies, radiography employees went back and forth between Area IV and the other government program areas to X-ray equipment (e.g., space shuttle engines). Because the employees went back and forth between these areas, the radiation dose received from the radiography equipment in all areas is considered in the Site Profile.

The programs at ETEC were primarily energy research and development programs. The reactors at the site were small-scale experimental reactors that gave employees potentially higher radiation exposures because of the variable requirements of the experiments being conducted. Mr. Chew asked the attendees to review the Site Description to verify the dates of the contract programs, reminding them that the accuracy of this information could possibly affect a claim.

Mr. Chew addressed the earlier comment regarding the television documentary comparing the Sodium Reactor Experiment (SRE) incident to the Chernobyl incident. The SRE incident involved a cladding failure, while Chernobyl was a major incident involving a meltdown that caused a graphite fire that burned for days, sending a large cloud of fallout over a very large area. Many of the rescue personnel died as a result of the high radiation levels; and other health effects are evident, such as a marked increase in thyroid cancers in people living in the affected area.

Four members of the Site Profile Team spent an entire day reviewing documentation on the SRE incident to assure that it was addressed properly in the Site Profile. The cladding failure resulted in the release of some of the reactor's coolant, which caused the meltdown of a very small section of the reactor. There was a small release of radioactive material. The area was monitored and surveys were taken. The system was brought under control in a timely manner. It is not apparent that any employees were overexposed from the incident.

**Question:**
Are you familiar with the lawsuit against Boeing by area residents?

***Mel Chew:***
I am aware of that lawsuit. That lawsuit is probably more about the environmental effects from the chemicals used to clean up the propellants that were used in other programs. The suit does not give reference to any radiation exposure. The Site Profile Team actually reviewed the environmental survey performed as the basis of the suit. The company that surveyed the area did not find evidence of unacceptable radiation levels. There is discussion in the Site Profile about some of the information in that environmental report – the effects on groundwater, for example.

**Comment:**
Water for our showers came from the groundwater supply.

**Question:**
A road is all that separates Area IV from Rocketdyne. Was the radiation held just to the buildings where the experiments were conducted?

***Mel Chew:***
By and large, that is true. However, they did monitor the perimeter of Area IV and beyond. Information on the background radiation in the other areas is included in the Site Profile. The Environmental Dose section covers not only the unmonitored employees working in Area IV, but also those working in proximity to the radiation areas – for example, a construction worker who was working outside one of the buildings.

**Question:**
When we were first hired in to work with radiation, we had an annual physical. That didn't happen anymore after the company sold out to another company. Does this law address the need for radiation workers to have periodic physicals to monitor their health?

***Mark Rolfes:***
There is a medical surveillance program.

***Mark Lewis:***
There is a law in place that addresses monitoring the health of nuclear workers. Originally, the law addressed former employees of the three gaseous diffusion plants, but I believe that it was modified later to include others.

**Comment:**
My concern is that there is a long latency period for some of these cancers. I want to know if we should be monitored regularly and if there is something in place that will enforce that.

***Mark Lewis:***
The legislation covers the medical surveillance of former workers. I suggest that you contact your lawmakers with your concern.

**Mel Chew – Question to Attendees:**
Do you recall any bioassay programs that monitored chemical exposure, or were the programs all for radiation exposure? Do you recall any of the facilities that were monitored?

***Response:***
The programs were for radiation exposure. I know that they monitored SRE and other radiation areas.

***Mel Chew:***
The Site Profile Team found a fair amount of bioassay data for the Powder Room at the DeSoto Avenue facility.

***Response:***
I spent about six months in the Powder Room.

**Comment:**
I have non-Hodgkin's lymphoma that was diagnosed before my employment. I received treatment before and during my employment. I worked in X-ray at Canoga from 1987 to 1991,

when I transferred to the facility on the hill (Area IV). I also worked in X-ray there with 150, 250, and 300 machines, but most of my work was with a small cobalt source – maybe 1 curie (Ci). I was not originally required to wear a badge while doing X-rays and also working in the facility – in these so-called clean areas. However, a couple years later, I was required to wear a badge. During the period when I was not monitored, I was hit with an X-ray during work on Stage 4 of the Peacekeeper project. On a different occasion, I was sent to the hospital after I was exposed while working on another project.

***Mel Chew:***
What do you mean by "got hit?"

***Response** (from commenter)**:***
I got an exposure. What happens when I retire? Legally, do I have grounds to file a claim considering that my cancer was diagnosed before my employment? I have been in remission for 18 years.

***Mark Rolfes:***
Without speaking to your specific case, the way this bill was designed is that your cancer must be shown to be a result of occupational radiation exposure at a DOE site. Typically, there is a minimum latency period before there is a reasonable probability that the cancer resulted from the exposure. Other factors considered are the type of cancer and the amount of exposure. If you would be diagnosed with a different cancer during or after your employment, and you have been exposed to radiation, you most certainly can file a claim based on that cancer.

***Mark Lewis:***
I would suggest that you call your DOL Resource Center with this question. There is a sheet in your handout folder that has contact information for the California Center in Livermore.

**Question:**
What about the possibility that he was exposed at another eligible site?

***Mark Rolfes:***
If you worked at another covered DOE site prior to this, any exposure received during employment there also would be included in the dose reconstruction.

***Mel Chew:***
I encourage you to write down your recollections so that when you talk to the DOL Resource Center about your case, you have chronological documentation of the events relating to your situation. This will help them address your issue in an accurate fashion.

**Question:**
Is there a typical latency period for people who have been diagnosed with cancer from radiation exposure?

***Mark Rolfes:***
There are many types of cancer that are eligible under the law. There is not an exclusive list as was stated earlier. Only chronic lymphocytic leukemia is currently excluded because there has been no evidence that it is caused by radiation exposure. The latency periods vary and depend on factors such as age at exposure, gender, amount of exposure, type of exposure, etc. Some cancers have very short latency periods (e.g. some types of leukemia) for a given amount of exposure in comparison to other cancers (e.g. lung cancer or skin cancer).

**Question:**
What are the odds that a cancer will be determined to be the result of radiation exposure?

***Mark Rolfes:***
That varies with the individual based on the factors that I just mentioned. That is why NIOSH performs the dose reconstruction – to determine the probability that your cancer was caused by your occupational radiation exposure. NIOSH has received approximately 22,000 cases for dose reconstruction. Approximately 25% of the 13,000 completed cases have been recommended for compensation. The NIOSH Web site <www.cdc.gov/niosh/ocas> has information on program statistics by state and facility.

***Mel Chew:***
NIOSH has processed the dose reconstructions in a claimant-favorable manner. The probability that the cancer is related to the exposure can be as low as 50% and be recommended for compensation. The number of cases is actually skewed in the claimants' favor because of the way the probability is calculated.

**Comment:**
The bottom line is that about 25% of the claimants are compensated after dose reconstruction.

***Mark Lewis:***
The 22,000 cases are the ones that have been recommended for dose reconstruction.

***Mel Chew:***
That percentage will probably change. Some of the more difficult cases cannot be processed until the Site Profiles are complete.

***Response:***
That could mean that fewer cases will be compensated.

**Comment:**
Let's go back to your remark. It sounds like not all cases are recommended for dose reconstruction.

***Mark Rolfes:***
The DOL will determine whether the case goes to NIOSH for a dose reconstruction.

**Question:**
Does a person have to be exposed to radiation for a long period of time to get cancer? Or is it different for each individual?

***Mel Chew:***
A person can receive either small doses of radiation over a long period of time or a large dose of radiation in a very short time. The total dose is considered, not necessarily the amount of time. If you were exposed on a chronic level, the dose is calculated over the entire time of the employment.

**Comment:**
If the company allows you to receive the maximum exposure for a year in a single month, they can say "You go work another job for 11 months because you're burnt out for the year." You're not going to have any less chance of getting cancer that way than if you get the same amount of radiation spread out over the whole year.

**Question:**
Does the law only cover cancer? Does it cover other things like thyroid disease?

***Mark Rolfes:***
NIOSH only gets cancer claims covered by Subtitle B for dose reconstruction. Subtitle E of the Act covers diseases, in addition to cancer, that may have been caused by exposure to radiation or chemicals in the workplace. DOL administers and adjudicates all Subtitle E claims.

***Mark Lewis:***
The DOL Resource Center in Livermore will also handle your Subtitle E claims.

**Question:**
If a person has a deceased parent who worked at the site, is it more difficult to make a claim on their behalf if they had cancer and the Death Certificate says they died from heart failure?

***Mel Chew:***
Most likely, the Death Certificate will list cancer as the cause of death as well. The U. S. radiation programs go back to the early 1940s. Quite a few of the cases from these places are filed by survivors on behalf of a deceased worker.

**Question:**
Can a person file claims under both Subtitles?

***Mel Chew:***
Yes, you can file under both Subtitles B and E.

***Mark Rolfes:***
When a claim is filed through the DOL, it will be considered under both Subtitles.

**Question:**
When the company was doing annual physicals that included complete blood work, there was a period when everyone's T4 (thyroid) test results came back high or "out of scope," and the company dismissed it as a lab error. Is this the kind of information you want?

***Mel Chew:***
When the Site Profile Team was working on the Medical section, we actually talked to the Medical Department and some of the early doctors that worked in the medical X-ray program. We were interested only in the types of X-ray machines that were used, how well they were collimated, and the X-rays that were taken. I do not know if that information was in the Medical section of the Site Profile. I think that what you are saying may be noteworthy for a Subtitle E claim, but it seems that the company dismissed the issue as a lab error because everyone's results came back high.

**Question:**
When you file a claim, does that dismiss liability for a future legal action?

***Mark Lewis:***
After a claim is recommended for compensation and the DOL approves it, all claimants must sign a release that says they will not file any legal action on behalf of the worker. The compensation will not be paid until these forms are signed and returned to DOL.

Mr. Chew thanked the attendees for their time and the meeting adjourned at approximately 5:15 p.m.