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WELCOME AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

MS. RUCKART: Well, welcome everybody. This is our October CAP meeting, and we are having a conference call rather than an in-person meeting just so we could have it as quickly as possible. This is Perri Ruckart, and we’re going to introduce everyone who’s on the call and then just have some brief announcements before we get started.

Frank.

DR. BOVE: Frank Bove.

MR. MASLIA: Morris Maslia.

MS. RUCKART: And we have the court reporter. We’re transcribing this meeting. Now we’ll go out to the phone line.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): This is Jeff Byron, Cincinnati, Ohio.

MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): This is Mike Partain, Tallahassee, Florida.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): This is Jerry Ensminger.

DR. CLAPP (by Telephone): Richard Clapp
calling from Boston.

**MS. SIMMONS (by Telephone):** Mary Ann Simmons, Portsmouth, Virginia.

**MS. RUCKART:** Unfortunately, Jerry has told us that Denita will not be able to join us, and we’re still waiting to see --

**MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone):** She told me if she got home in time from her treatment that she would get on the line.

**MS. RUCKART:** Okay, and we’re still hopeful that Sandra Bridges will be able to call in.

**MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone):** Tom with us yet?

**MS. RUCKART:** And Tom, that’s right. Tom, are you on?

**MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone):** I tried to call Sandra, and I can never get a hold of her. So I knew everybody else would be here.

**MS. RUCKART:** Tom, is Tom Townsend on?

**MR. BYRON (by Telephone):** I don’t think so. I haven’t heard him.

**MS. RUCKART:** We have a majority of people so we really should just go ahead and get started. If they call in later, that would be good.
Before you say something it would be good if you could identify yourselves because since we’re not all here in person it will be hard otherwise for the court reporter to know who said what because we are taking transcribed minutes of this meeting. So please keep that in mind.

This is something I was going to save until the end but because some people have to leave sooner than we had thought, I want to mention some possible dates for the next face-to-face meeting, and I just want everyone to think about these dates and what works for you. And then please send me an e-mail in the next week or so and let me know. So we don’t have to talk about it now but just to get it out there. Possible dates for a face-to-face meeting include Wednesday, December 10th; Monday, December 15th; Tuesday, December 16th and Thursday, December 18th. Does anyone need me to repeat those dates?

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): No, but I do have a conflict with December 18th.

MS. RUCKART: Okay, everyone, you don’t have to tell me now. Please go back and look at
your calendars and just send me an e-mail, and then we’ll just see what date works best for everybody. Thanks.

Welcome, and let’s just get started with Morris on his water modeling update.

**UPDATE ON WATER MODELING**

**MR. MASLIA:** First, I’d like to go back to Tarawa Terrace. The Chapter I Report which is the nitty-gritty details of the sensitivity analyses. The Monte Carlo simulation and all that has been cleared by ATSDR at the highest levels of command, and we are still awaiting an external reviewer to return his comments. And at that point I will consolidate all the comments, revise the report accordingly and then give it over to the USGS to prepare for publishing, both hard copy and online --

**MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone):** Hey, Morris. Hey, Morris, this is Jerry Ensminger. Where’s all that background chatter coming from?

**MS. RUCKART:** This is Perri. I wanted to actually break in here for an announcement. It would be really helpful if everyone could mute their phones. Or I’m being told by our sound technician everyone needs to mute their
phones if you’re not actually speaking because we’re getting a lot of feedback, and it’s very hard to hear what’s being said by the speaker. So we appreciate that. Thank you.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): I hear all that laughter. That’s coming from somebody’s office.

MR. BYRON: This is Jeff, and I agree with you.

MS. RUCKART: There’s no one laughing here in the room so it must be coming from someone’s conference call line, someone else who’s out there beside ATSDR.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Mike, is that you?

MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): Yeah, it may be me. I’m walking outside right now.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Whoever it is needs to turn off the TV then.

(Whereupon, a brief discussion with the sound technician ensued.)

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): This is Jeff. I can still hear them in the background.

MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): It’s not me because I’m outside.
(Whereupon, a brief discussion with the sound technician ensued.)

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Well, we have to move on because these guys --

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Go ahead, Morris. I’m sorry.

MR. MASLIA: Okay, that’s fine. As I was saying so we’re waiting to consolidate all the comments on Chapter I. And just to clarify so there’s no misunderstanding, these comments are not technical revisions to the model or to the analyses but rather to the way the report is written. Just to make sure when I say consolidate comments, that’s what we mean by that.

And we are currently putting together, we’re working on drafting the Chapter J Report as well as a supplemental information, which is Chapter K, which will contain some discussions about Well TT-23.

With respect to Hadnot Point we have completed all the database development with the exception of going over the ten years of operational data for about 80 wells. And I believe the last time I talked with Scott
Williams he said their contractor was about 75 or 80 percent of the way through scanning that information in for us.

We have brought a contractor on board to help us with that as well as to help us with other aspects of the Hadnot Point analyses. And at this point we are also in the initial stages of preparing for the expert review panel that will take place the second week in January.

And that’s it. I’ll be happy to answer any questions.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): This is Jerry Ensminger. Morris, what is that reference to TT-23?

MR. MASLIA: What I said was Chapter K will contain some errata and some extra, further explanations as to the start-up date of TT-23 or further justifying the sort of data that we used in the model as well as some erroneous sampling data that --

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Let me ask you this, what’s the update as far as the start-up date?

MR. MASLIA: What we have in the model, what
was published in Chapter A and Chapter C, we started the model in August of ’84.

**MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone):** Okay, what are these -- do you have new documents that prove that this thing didn’t start until August of ’84?

**MR. MASLIA:** No, we have no documents that contradict that.

**MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone):** So I know that Scott Williams had made mention that they had some work orders that showed that they weren’t doing, ^ the grass before they could pour the slab or anything.

**MR. MASLIA:** There is a document that he supplied us recently, and all it is is a one-line entry that says soil treatment for termite taking place on November 21st, ’83. That doesn’t tell us whether that’s the date of the drawing, the date of the activity or what. But if you assume that’s the date of the activity, of soil treatment, you could not pour a concrete slab ‘til after that, and then you couldn’t start putting in equipment ‘til after that. So that puts us right up in ’84 as to where we have it in the model.
MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Well, let me ask you this because I know something about termite treatments and insect treatments. They don’t treat the ground here before they pour a slab to construct a home. They treat around the foundation. So, I mean, I’ve got a real problem with this TT Well 23 thing --

MR. MASLIA: Well --

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): -- because -- now, hear me out, please.

MR. MASLIA: Okay.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): You know, we’ve been told all these years that that TT well 23 was not constructed until the summer of 1984. Now we find the well drillers’ logs and the well was drilled in March of 1983. It was confirmed and verified by the well driller of 7th of April, the day before the permit for that well construction expired, which was on the 8th of April, 1983.

We also have a document, a CLW document, that’s dated 0-7-0-7, which is on a memorandum written by the foreman of the utility operators, and they were complaining about the ability to get enough raw water out
of the well field to Tarawa Terrace, Camp
Johnson, and that one new well had been
constructed already, which I would lead to
believe that that was TT-25, and that a new
one was under construction or going to be
under construction very shortly.

Well, now we know -- and that thing
was written on the 30th of March. If they were
having trouble in March and over the winter
meeting raw water demands for those areas, I
know damn well they were having trouble
meeting raw water demands in July.

So why would I believe that they had a
brand new well with 160-some gallon capacity,
which is what that well tested out at by the
draw-down test done by the well driller, why
would one believe that they had that asset
there? They were already complaining about
not having enough water, and they didn’t use
that damn thing for two more summers? I’m
sorry.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): This is Jeff
Byron. Not to mention, you know, that
residents of Tarawa Terrace received notice
from the base commander asking them to cut
back on water in 1985. Okay? Because Jerry
has a very valid point, and I don’t know, but
it sounds to me like I guess my question to
Morris is what did they provide as far as the
electrical wiring to the pump? Anything?

MR. MASLIA: We’ve got a drawing that really
does not, it’s not an electrical drawing. We
don’t have -- it shows --

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Just basic well
house construction?

MR. MASLIA: Yeah, basically like that.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): What’s it dated?

MR. MASLIA: We don’t have a date on it, but

--

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Who is the person
who was contracted to write this up?

MR. MASLIA: Well, all we have is a cover --

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): They’ll have a
purchase order from the military to have done
that work.

MR. MASLIA: No, I don’t have a purchase
order.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): I said that they
will have, the contractor who did the drawing
will have a purchase order.
MR. MASLIA: Okay.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): In a government job he may be required to hold that for 30 years as far as I know. I know I’m required to hold anything that has to do with a jet engine moving part for 30 years.

MR. MASLIA: All these --

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): I know it’s a different field.

MR. MASLIA: -- all these arguments still do not tell us when they continuously supplied water, and that has to do with demand, demand from what we used in the model. And if your argument is that, well, let’s ignore the information that the Marine Corps gave us on a month-by-month basis -- because in the ‘80s we have monthly supply -- then you need to throw the entire model out.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): No, I’m not --

MR. MASLIA: That’s the choice --

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): -- we’re suggesting that maybe what they’ve given you is incomplete.

MR. MASLIA: Then you need to throw every piece of data out that they gave us. That’s
your choice.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): This is Jerry Ensminger again. These people --

MR. MASLIA: Now, I --

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): -- hear me out. This stuff about these samples that were taken in July of ’84, now, either they lied, told a lie about those samples to fit their scenario or the samples were taken and they really were knowingly pumping poison water out of the new well. So no matter which scenario you take, they’re lying.

Now, you know, this lends to credibility. And whenever we uncover these documents, these ^ documents, when I find letters written by the EPA back to Camp Lejeune referring to meetings that took place in 1986, meetings that took place between the EPA Region 4 representatives and Camp Lejeune and NAVFAC representatives at Camp Lejeune, when they reference in those letters conversations that took place, and this is in 1986, when they state in that letter that it was determined in this meeting that while they had found contamination in the supply wells,
the contamination had never reached the
distribution plant.

Now, I found, and Mike Partain found,
a technical working committee minutes which
were court recorded, a stenographer, in 1988,
August of 1988. Cheryl Barnett (ph), who is
now a high ranking official with NAVFAC Incom
(ph) at Norfolk, and Bob Alexander who was the
environmental engineer for Camp Lejeune, where
the mayor pro tem of Jacksonville was included
in this meeting, and that man asked some very,
very legitimate and accurate questions. I
called him the other day and thanked him for
asking these questions because I’ve got both
of these officials in lies.

Bob Alexander and Cheryl Barnett, they
said they had no idea that this stuff was in
their water prior to the NAVFAC program
testing. That was a damn lie. These people
knew this shit four years before. Now, you
want me to believe these people? I’m sorry.
When I have this stuff in black and white, and
they are knowingly lying, I have a real
problem with swallowing this crap about this
well.
DR. BOVE: Jerry, this is Frank. I think there’s a couple things going on here. One is that the modeling is relying on monthly production information. And so based on that we did the water modeling. Now we have to use some information in order to do --

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Yes, I know that.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): We agree.

DR. BOVE: Now, that’s one thing. So we used what was given to us in terms of the production wells. So now for the purpose of the epidemiologic study, it does make a difference, of course, what the exposure levels were on a month-by-month basis.

And so the question is whether if we’re off by a month, two, three, four, five months, whatever we’re off if we’re off, how that might affect the exposure assessment in terms of what the contamination levels were during 1984, the first half of 1984, if that well was online before August of ’84. So that’s one issue.

There’s a separate issue as to the honesty or, you know, who said what and when
they were said. And that’s an issue that’s, if it’s important to you and important to the CAP, but it’s not necessarily important to the study. So I want to separate those things out. You’ve done a lot of research. Mike’s done a lot of research. All of you have done a lot of work to point out errors or deception or whatever you want to call it, and that’s fine. But for the study’s purposes we just want to make sure we’re doing the exposure assessment as best we can.

**MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone):** This stuff, you know, these actual lies lends to the credibility of the information that they’re providing you guys to do your work with.

**DR. BOVE:** But if we don’t use the production well information on a month-by-month basis, then we have no model, and so that’s what Morris is saying.

**MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone):** This is Mike Partain. Here’s something I want to throw in here. The monthly production that we know from your information and that is what was produced at Tarawa Terrace. However, we don’t know the components of what wells went in to
create that monthly production.

I talked to the well, water treatment plant operator a couple weeks ago, and he was describing to me and Jerry how these wells were haphazardly pumped. There was no systematic water -- water treatment plant operator had their own preference of what wells they wanted to run, and if you’ve got this well running a year and a half before they say, it’s affecting the level of contamination at the well.

And if we don’t know what was being pumped, that’s going to also affect the contamination because if they’re pumping well TT-26 all the time, well, you’re going to have a consistent level of contamination. Now, one of the questions I wanted to ask about while we’re doing all this is have we put in writing to the Marine Corps for the plant logs and received the denial from them that they don’t have them?

MR. MASLIA: Let me address, let me address a point that you just made and that happens to be the concentration. When Frank said we relied during the ‘80s, actually we’ve got
monthly data in all of '78 and then '81, '82
and then I think '83 and '84. Besides the
production or raw water data and the water
coming into the plant, we also at that time
had water level measurements, which we used to
calibrate the model, as well as some
concentration measurements. Now, the fact is
TT-26 was measured at about 1,500, a maximum
value of 1,580 parts per billion. In order
for any well, whether it be TT-23 or any other
well, to have an impact, to significantly
either dilute it or increase the concentration
at the water treatment plant, they would have
to have a concentration greater than 1,500
parts per billion. So no matter when -- and I
say this -- no matter when they turned on TT-
23, it would not impact the concentration
being delivered to the residents of Tarawa
Terrace because in mixing at the water
treatment plant it was taken over by the
concentration of TT-26. The only way --

MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): But it was --

MR. MASLIA: -- and the only way --

MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): -- TT-23 is
being run, Morris. It’s going to raise your
low end of your concentration.

MR. MASLIA: There is no low end. It was all significantly in the hundreds parts per billion by that time.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Okay, okay, let me ask you this. This is Jerry Ensminger by the way. Let me ask you this. Let’s say, okay, TT-26 had 1,580 parts per billion. Let’s say TT-23 was put online in ’83 and when they turned off TT-26 to give it a rest, they slam on TT-23. So then you’re getting a continual slough. Instead of giving a break, you know, they were running them together, you’re getting a continual slough here.

MR. MASLIA: But not at 1,500. The model in fact shows --

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): I mean, TT-23, you could just about, I could just about throw a damn golf ball up to where 26 was at.

MR. MASLIA: No, no, TT-23, the minute we turned it on in the model had several hundred parts per billion in it. And it’s not going to get that much higher than that. It’s significantly further away from the source.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Morris,
there’s a natural gradient in there.

MR. MASLIA: Being interrupted by the well pumping.

MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): Another factor, Morris, too, is TT-23 showed benzene in the well. What’s not to say that there’s, you know, where did that benzene come from? Is that showing up in the other wells?

MR. MASLIA: Not that I know of.

MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): But are we addressing the benzene that was in the water?

MR. MASLIA: We addressed it in Chapter E.

MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): Okay, Chapter E you say, Morris?

MR. MASLIA: Chapter E. There’s a section on a detailed discussion in Chapter E on, not model, but actually measured contaminants at well TT-23, TT-25 and TT-26.

MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): Are we going to bring that up -- go ahead.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): How do you get higher TCE levels than you do of PCE if TCE is a daughter product of the major contaminant? You can’t have a daughter product that has higher concentrations than
the parent product.

**MR. MASLIA:** Unless the sample as an error
did not take place.

**MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone):** Hey, they’re
the ones that claimed it did in the scenario
they were trying to sell back then.

**MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone):** Well, another
concern, too, that I have, Morris, is this.
Have we got benzene showing up in TT-23?
There are two wells that I believe were shut
down and one was listed as collapsed in the
'70s up by the interest of TT-2; there were
some above-ground storage tanks that were
leaking like a sieve. What’s not to say that
those wells were picking up stuff, too? I
mean, I know there’s no --

**MR. MASLIA:** Let me explain again, because I
think it’s gotten lost in our discussions not
just today but over the past year or two.
When we said we were going to use modeling, we
made it clear to Frank and anybody else who’s
doing epi work that we felt we could model on
a monthly basis. We could not model each
individual hour or minute or even, for
example, in a distribution system when they
have a line break or a fire, and they turn on hydrants.

No one can do that to my knowledge, and we can’t either. The models are just -- nor is the data calibrated to -- available for that. And that’s the same case with the models that we have presented and published here. They are good to plus or minus a month. They cannot tell you really sub-month in other words. So whether we have a reading on the first of February, the 15th of February or the 28th of February, the model can’t distinguish between that timeline.

It can distinguish between February and March, and that’s as refined as the model is. That has nothing to do with whether we believe or don’t believe the production data we have been given from the Navy, that whether we find on a certain day that there’s a benzene reading or not. The models cannot refine anywhere past a month. So if you have one reading on a given day in a month, the model will never ever see that.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Morris, this is Jerry Ensminger. I’m not -- We’re not
trying to find fault with you, okay? And I really respect what you’ve done. You’ve done a heck of a job with what you got, especially under the conditions you’ve been working under, and I applaud you.

But these people have told so many lies, and they’ve told these lies to beat their story or their scenario over the years. And then they want us to back off and allow them to have their lies because it’s going to affect the work that you’ve already done. This is nothing but a damn ^. We’re chasing our tails.

*MS. RUCKART:* This is Perri. I just wanted to interrupt for a second. If your phone is not on mute, please mute it unless you are speaking because it’s creating a lot of background noise, and it’s very hard to hear what others are saying. And it’s hard for the court reporter to get everyone’s words clear. Thank you.

*MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone):* But we are chasing our tails. It’s like these people were given a free pass every time they want to lie. This is something that’s going to get
resolved after this election, I swear to God.

**MR. MASLIA:** I appreciate that, Jerry, and I’m not, and I empathize, and, yes, I wish we could have data that we felt was 100 percent reliable, that we knew the source; we knew when it was collected, and all that. That’s one of the challenges we face.

But let me again assure you that again when we were told, for example, early on that TT-23 was never operated, we didn’t just go by that. We went by what we did in the model, and the model says we need to turn it on in August, and we did.

**MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone):** I realize that you’re working with what you were given by these lies. But, you know, that doesn’t mean I have to swallow their lies. When I find documents that express all these lies, for God’s sake how much evidence does anybody need to show that these people have lied time after time after time after time?

**MR. BYRON (by Telephone):** Jerry, this is Jeff. I guess to me I think what Morris and those guys are trying to say is what the report has to be based on is the data-driven
report.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): I know that -

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): What we need to know from Morris and Frank is how much of what you’ve been told is opinion driven or hearsay driven by memory versus black-and-white paperwork.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): That’s right.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): I mean, if you could expound on that, Morris, I would appreciate it. But what I ^ seems like data to me.

MR. MASLIA: Where we -- if you want to call it -- rely on or request information from the Marine Corps that one might consider either hearsay or memory or whatever, in this situation it would be, for example, if we needed to know how they operated the distribution system and when they turned on certain pumps, not wells, but pumps. In the situation in Tarawa Terrace we actually think have something going for us because typically, not just at the Marine Corps base but in other situations, typically you do not turn on and
off a water supply well, you know, every 15 minutes or 20 minutes or whatever. You usually turn it on and let it operate continuously. And that the model replicates very well. That’s exactly how we have done it in the model.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): That would be normal industry practice.

MR. MASLIA: Compared to, for example, if you’ve ever been up into the TT pump house that’s still there now, I’ve been in there, and you can see, those are the distribution system pumps. And they will go on and off every 15 minutes. We would need much more interaction or much more input from the Marine Corps on how those things operated than we do necessarily for the groundwater supply wells.

So again, another, if you want, assurance for us that because you operate groundwater supply wells more in a constant mode for a longer period of time, you know, 12 hours or more, the model or the information that we have put into the model is reliable. Another point is, and this is what our cooperator at Georgia Tech did for us, they
did look at different operating scenarios like
not operating TT-26, not operating TT-23.

And they did that, and we can force a
situation where we don’t operate TT-26. And
in that case there is absolutely no
concentration of water above the MCL
throughout the ’60s and the ’70s. So we can
come up with any number of scenarios like
that. And what that does, at the end of the
day then you have to stand back either as the
engineer or the epidemiologist and say does
this scenario make sense.

We did that. Does this scenario make
sense that they would not have operated TT-26
at all? The answer is no. So again, somebody
could come to us and say, well, I can show you
how they operated the supply system and that
they could be very low or no concentrations
above the MCL. And our answer would be the
way to do that is not to operate TT-26, and
that’s not a realistic scenario.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Okay, so in other
words some of this you’re getting from the
operators. Was there written procedures in
the ’80s on how they operated at the pump
house?

MR. MASLIA: Not to our knowledge.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Not to your knowledge. Is there procedures written now?

MR. MASLIA: I have not seen any, but that does not --

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Well, that needs to be asked, and you want to know what revision level they’re at if you want to get it a little clearer. But, you know, from what you’re telling me I understand what you’re saying, and it makes sense. But like I said if you want to know, those are a couple of questions you may need to ask.

MR. MASLIA: Okay.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): That’s all, a recommendation.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): This is Jerry Ensminger. We also discussed the existence of a North Carolina law that prohibited the pumping of any one given well for more than 12 hours. Has anybody checked out the existence of that law?

MR. MASLIA: I believe there is such a law. Again, I don’t believe, at least until the
Marine Corps came under North Carolina law, which I think was in the ‘80s, that that did not apply to them. And again, in the model we did it on a monthly averaged over a day. So in other words so it wouldn’t matter if they operated 12 -- let me go back. If they pumped 100,000 gallons over a month, the model can’t tell the difference whether they do that in one day, ten days or 30 days because it’s averaged over a month.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): And the reason I’m saying this is I would imagine you were talking about in the ‘80s and taking the state took primacy over the Safe Drinking Water Act, the EPA, in what, March of 1980?

MR. MASLIA: Somewhere in the ‘80s.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Yeah, 1980. According to our water treatment plant operator contact, they were turning wells on and leaving them on for weeks during the ‘80s. So, I mean, this was ^ . That would have a great impact on your model.

MR. MASLIA: Not really because in other words that’s a legal issue, but when we turn on a well, unless we have some indication,
whether by the model or by a measured water
level to turn it off, then we kept it running.
So in other words, we did not, we didn’t use
this 12-hour limit in the model.

Again, what we used were available
water level measurements, air line
measurements, concentrations and the monthly
production in ’78 and the early ’80s. That’s
really what the model was calibrated against.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): That sounds good.
This is Jeff.

DR. BOVE: And the model does a good job of
predicting what actually was found in the
drinking water. So that’s why we feel good
about the model. And again, there are
different purposes in going on here. The
purpose of the epi study, we want to have
reasonable estimates of what those contaminant
levels were in the water as best we can on a
month-by-month basis, understanding that a
month-by-month basis is real difficult to do
for modeling as well as for determining when
gestational ages are and so on.

So even in a month-by-month basis,
it’s difficult on both the water modeling side
and the epi side although it’s important to
know at the same time what happens on a month-
by-month basis because the birth defects occur
in a short window of time. So we have all
these difficulties in an epidemiologic study,
both on the exposure side and the outcome
side. And we’re trying to do the best we can
given what tools we have.

And I think that for the exposure
assessment, the model does a good job of
estimating exposure. It may not satisfy other
purposes that the modeling could be used for,
but I think it will satisfy the epi study as
much as anything, as much as it can.

**MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone):** Morris, this
is Jerry Ensminger. You said this expert
panel meeting is going to take place in
January?

**MR. MASLIA:** Right now that’s what we
tentatively have it scheduled. We have it
scheduled primarily because we have
representatives from academia. It’s typically
right before they go back to school, the same
reason we did the first one near the end of
March. So if we can’t get it done the second
week of January, then the next available date
I would think would be the end of March.

**MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone):** I thought you
were going to try to have this in this year.

**MR. MASLIA:** No, there’s no possible way
because we have to be able to give them like a
data report from Hadnot Point, and we’re just
in the process of starting to put that
together.

**MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone):** Oh. I would
prefer that you wait until after the
inauguration of the new administration.

**DR. BOVE:** The most important thing, Jerry,
is to have that data report on Hadnot Point
together so that the expert panel can have
something to review. And so that’s the most
important thing. The second most important
ingthing is to have a date where they can make it, and so that’s our focus. We can’t be
driven by the -- I don’t think the election
will have an impact on this issue.

**MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone):** This is Jerry
Ensminger again. On a lighter note, all the
folks that were down at Camp Lejeune or up
near Camp Lejeune in February for that meeting
on ^ Had not -- remember that? They gave us a little tour. We were ^. Everybody remember that?

(Whereupon, severe telephonic interruption ensued.)

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Yeah.

MS. RUCKART: Is anybody watching this meeting over the internet? I’m wondering if this feedback is coming because you might be watching it over the internet at the same time you’re dialing in on the phone.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Hang on. Let me turn it off.

MS. RUCKART: Yeah, I think that might be causing some of this feedback because there’s a delay, and you hear in the background it’s not syncing up.

Also, I heard some beeps indicating that other people have joined us.

MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): Yeah, I did, too.

MS. RUCKART: Is anyone else on the line?

MS. McCALL (by Telephone): I’m here.

MR. TOWNSEND (by Telephone): Yeah, I’m here, and I’ve got to leave in a second. I
want to ask Morris --

MS. RUCKART: Who did I just hear? Was that Denita?

MS. McCALL (by Telephone): Yes.

MS. RUCKART: Welcome, Denita.

MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): Hi, Denita.

MS. RUCKART: Tom, are you on? Tom Townsend?

MR. TOWNSEND (by Telephone): Yeah, I’m here.

MS. RUCKART: Sandra, are you on?

MS. BRIDGES (by Telephone): Yes, I am.

MS. RUCKART: Okay, great, we’re all here. Thanks.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Now where I was at was when we were on that tour, we pulled in between lots 201 and 203, and I specifically pointed out some sick trees on lot 203. Well, I was just down there the other day, and about seven acres of trees had been completely mulched, ground up, and the weeds are just about high enough now to cover up the debris from those trees. They weren’t logged. They were just ground up by that big brush-eating machine that the base got. I’ll
tell you what. That’s all right. I know the story.

MR. MASLIA: This is Morris. Are there any more questions because I do have some other things I need to take care of.

MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): Yeah, Morris, I’ve got a question. This is Mike Partain. Just real quick, you had mentioned when you started running the sample data on well TT-23. What is the running sample data?

MR. MASLIA: In Chapter A -- I forget -- it’s Figure A3. I think it’s page A-16. I’m not sure. But there’s a chronology figure. It’s a full-color figure. I don’t have Chapter A with me. But right around July of ’84 there’s some sample, it lists some sample data, some TCE, PCE.

MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): Yeah, I know what you’re talking about now.

MR. MASLIA: Okay. And, of course, we obtained that from a chronology provided to us by the Marine Corps. The chronology does not have an author on the actual chronology itself, although attached to it is a cover, and there’s an author on the memo transmitting
it. Okay, fine. As we started looking back into it, we started noticing that the exact same verbiage was copied from report to report to report. And what we were trying to find out is what the original source of that data and why for that particular data there are no laboratory samples.

**MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone):** And we’re trying to do the same --

**MR. MASLIA:** Okay, and what we have concluded is that the original report or original of the first time it was cited, which is in a report by McMorris, I believe, the CLW document I don’t have right on my fingertips.

**MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone):** It’s not McMorris. It’s Tom Morris.

**MR. MASLIA:** No, no, no, there’s a report. That’s where the erroneous information comes in. He pulled it from a report from Cheryl -- with a C, C-H-E-R-Y-L -- McMorris. I can give you the CLW document. I don’t have it at my fingertips, but it --

**MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone):** Can you send me that document?

**MR. MASLIA:** Yeah, it’s on the DVD that we
sent. It’s publicly released, but I’ll e-mail you the document number and the document itself. That’s not a problem to do. But in it, and numbers were transcribed from other sample data that occurred in ’85. That’s where the 37 parts per billion comes in. And as well as TCE was confused for PCE.

In other words, trichloroethylene was confused for tetrachloroethylene, and they referred to each of the compounds erroneously. And so what we have concluded -- and this will be in Chapter K report. We have written up an errata explaining this chronology.

And that those -- and I don’t want to call them sample data because we don’t have the laboratory samples, but that information that is listed in that chronology table in Chapter A, that obviously is verbatim from the chronology that ATSDR used in its health assessment, from the Marine Corps, from other chronologies is erroneous and needs to be ignored. It does not -- let me repeat this so everybody is -- it has absolutely no, zero, none effect on the model.

**MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone):** What was
their interest -- I know this doesn’t have anything to do with you, Morris, but what was their damn interest in generating this damn lie in the ‘90s when they created this crap?

**DR. BOVE:** We can’t answer that, Jerry. We can’t answer that. All we know is that it’s not trichloroethylene. It’s perchloroethylene that they were referring to. They referred to perchloroethylene in the document he’s talking about, because I’ve seen it, as TCE. So unfortunately, they got the two mixed up.

**MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone):** Well, wait a minute, Frank. I found samples, and I found analytical data results that list both chemicals.

**DR. BOVE:** But if you read the report, Jerry -- Jerry, Jerry, if you read the report, it says --

**MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone):** I don’t want to interrupt you guys, but I know what report you’re talking about, and it is correct that they mislabeled tetrachloroethylene as TCE --

**DR. BOVE:** Yes, they mislabeled.

**MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone):** -- now, it’s a report from the state of North Carolina in
1987.

DR. BOVE: Right. Now there is that one sample that the state took that had higher trichloroethylene reading than perchloroethylene. And we have one sample there. The lab we think is probably a good lab, so it’s an accurate sample, and there could be several reasons why that could happen in a sample. And we’ll discuss --

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Yes, it had a maintenance shop behind it.

DR. BOVE: Well, that’s one, but there are other possible ways to determine why that happened, and that’ll be in the report including how you took the sample and what was going on with that well before the sample took place. So we’ll address this, but it is the only one. All the other samples show what you’d expect. And we think that it has something to do, but we’ll never be sure, but we think it has something to do with the fact the well was not operating for awhile.

And it could also be how the sample was taken. This happens in the field all the time so that when we hear people say that the
field data is the gold standard, you have to take a step back and say, well, sometimes the field data can mislead. And in this case I think that’s what’s going on here.

**MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone):** Well, one thing I would like to add what Morris was talking about was the Y-84 sampling, and I do understand that with the sample the levels that we’re seeing would not have an effect on the overall reading. However, that report that you mentioned was Cheryl from the ^^. She is misquoting the actual chemical in the water.

But there are several other reports that reference testing done in July of 1984 by the Navy. And we’re not seeing or have not found the analytical bounds for those tests.

**MR. MASLIA:** If you’re referring to these same samples, you will not find those reports. And that’s because of a practice -- and it’s not only used by the Navy. It’s used by every consultant that I know -- is that when they’re doing a report or analysis of an area that someone has already done, they go back and quote a previous report.
And what you fall into the trap of is, in this case when we really are interested in the analytical, you have to go back and find the original source document. So what everybody did -- for example, McMorris misquoted it and transcribed, then someone else quoted the McMorris report. Then someone else quoted that third report and so on.

So you have all these reports that look like you’ve got all this weight of evidence, but when you go through them, you plug back to the McMorris report, which is in error, and we still do not have the original sample data. We provide an explanation why we feel there will not be an analytical report because no sampling was actually had taken place in 8/84.

MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): I don’t mean to cut you off, Morris, but I’m going to have to try to run, but I believe there are documents that predate that North Carolina report that references that July sampling in 1984. I’m going to have to go back and pull my file for that, and I’ll get those together and give you those document numbers. But that would be --
it predates Cheryl’s report and the North Carolina report there, then that throws that out the window as far as the July 1984 sampling. So, I mean, if you read her report, it’s very clear that either she’s writing it for someone else and has no idea what she’s writing about or she’s been given a lot of incorrect information.

**MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone):** Well, and you know, all this stuff was quoted on their technology to justify the fact that they had tested this well; they found it was contaminated and immediately upon ^ they never turned that contaminated well off. But we know that’s a crock of crap. They didn’t turn the well off, so what they’re trying to do here is create a story line to cover their ass, and I’m sick of it.

**DR. BOVE:** Jerry, okay. Morris has to go. Are there any other questions for Morris?

**MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone):** If you would, Morris, the other thing you referenced earlier, if you could e-mail me the document number.

**MR. MASLIA:** The McMorris document?
MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone):  The one where misquoting the TCE?

MR. MASLIA:  Yeah.

MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone):  No, I’ve got that.  I know that one.

MR. MASLIA:  That’s the one I’m referring to.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone):  Hey, Morris?

MR. MASLIA:  Yes.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone):  Don’t forget to vote.

MR. MASLIA:  I’m registered.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone):  You’ve got that early voting.  Get over there and vote.

MR. MASLIA:  Okay, thanks, guys.

MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone):  One last thing before I go because I’ve got to run, too. When we were talking about the different, you know, the methodology ^, one thing that I am concerned about is that the report be used as the final judgment on everything that was in the water and the concentrations in the water.  

Now, I understand that this is an epidemiological modeling for TCE and PCE, but I don’t want, you know, the language of the
report, I don’t want to see or give an opportunity to say, well, that was the only thing there; that’s the only thing we’re dealing with and use it to defend against this panel. Does that make sense?

DR. BOVE: It does, but we have to do what we have to do. And the modeling is going to have to say what we think, you know, the best estimate of the exposures are. And after that --

MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): The modeling dealing with the PCE and the TCE specifically, but it doesn’t preclude that there’s anything else in there like the benzene readings in TT-23, or does it not?

DR. BOVE: Based on monthly averages this is what we have on a monthly average. It’s not going to, the model is not going to tell you what’s in the water on a day-by-day basis.

MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): Okay.

DR. BOVE: And so if you want to make an argument about benzene being in the water on a certain day or a few days, that’s something that the model couldn’t tell you. But, you know, again, you’re using the model for
another purpose then, a purpose that the model
could never really satisfy. It’s really the
best we have, and it’s scientifically, but it
won’t answer all your questions.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): I think the point
is that it reflects that there was benzene in
the water.

MR. MASLIA: No, it will not reflect that
there’s benzene in the water --

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): But the sampling
that you took, those do show that there was
benzene and those are listed in probably in
appendices or the chapter somewhere, right?

MR. MASLIA: Right. In Chapter E. Again, I
would refer you to Chapter E where we do have
a discussion of contaminants in groundwater,
and they specifically address three --

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): But the whole
point is you have to get past the summary and
read the report.

MR. MASLIA: Well, yeah, yeah. You’ve got
to read that --

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): A lot of people
just read the summary that don’t have the
scientific data you have, and they make a lot
of assumptions. The point is is if you’re going to make any assumptions, you better have read the whole report.

MR. MASLIA: That is correct. Our approach was to have a summary document so anyone could sort of see the big picture; what we did; why we did it, and then for the details go to each of the chapter reports.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Right, right, but the point is you were looking at TCE, PCE, but these other chemicals are in the report.

MR. MASLIA: They’re not modeled. They’re -

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): They’re not modeled, but they are in the report, part of the reading.

MR. MASLIA: That is correct.

MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): Okay, that’s all I want to make sure.

And on that note, gentlemen and Denita and Perri, y’all have a great day, and y’all take care.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Okay, you too, but we’re going to continue.

MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): I’m hanging up.
MS. RUCKART: Well, I believe that’s all from Morris, and he is going to be leaving us now. We had put on the agenda just to take a five-minute break. So let’s go ahead and do that now, and we’ll meet back in five minutes.

(Whereupon, a break was taken from 2:05 p.m. to 2:15 p.m.)

MS. RUCKART: I do want to just make sure everybody’s back on so let’s just go around real quick and make sure before we start. So we know Sandra’s on.

MS. BRIDGES (by Telephone): Yes, Sandra Bridges.

MR. TOWNSEND (by Telephone): Tom Townsend.

DR. CLAPP (by Telephone): Dick Clapp.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Jerry Ensminger.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Jeff Byron.

MS. RUCKART: Denita?

MS. SIMMONS (by Telephone): Mary Ann.

MS. RUCKART: Denita, are you on?

(no response)

MS. RUCKART: And then we know Mike had to leave.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Yeah, well,
to answer Sandy’s question, I had my phone on mute because I was getting my dogs back inside, but, yes, I did go down and I actually did get a chance to sit down with Michelle Obama yesterday. And I gave her a complete layout of this nightmare, and they’re fully aware of it.

MS. BRIDGES (by Telephone): What did she say?

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): She started crying.

MS. BRIDGES (by Telephone): She did?

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Yeah.

MS. BRIDGES (by Telephone): That sort of leads us to think that she will help us.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Yeah, but let’s get on with this meeting. We can talk about this later.
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MS. RUCKART: I just want to give a brief summary of the action items from our last meeting in July, and I do have an update from Scott Williams from some of the USMC action items.

Mary Ann, I didn’t know if you wanted
me to give that or if you wanted to.

MS. SIMMONS (by Telephone): Yes, go ahead, Perri, if you don’t mind.

MS. RUCKART: Oh, no, that’s fine.

One thing discussed at the last meeting was a request for the USMC to find out where the search index for the Booz-Allen-Hamilton search of CL water documents is. And the response is that the USMC will review the BAH index document titles for FOIA PA information and provide a copy to the CAP if they would like one.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Yep.

MS. RUCKART: Okay, I thought that --

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Is there a date on that by the way?

MS. RUCKART: No.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Oh, you need to get a date.

MS. RUCKART: Okay, Mary Ann, do you have any information about that?

MS. SIMMONS (by Telephone): I’ll get the date.

MS. RUCKART: There is a request for the DOD to repost the chronology and searchable
library of documents on their Camp Lejeune
website. The response: The USMC elected to
post the GAO chronology on their website as a
discriminate, independent, third party. The
searchable document library website, the
online reading room, is nearly complete.
However, the documents to be placed on the
website are still in review in the
Headquarters Marine Corps’ FOIA Office.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Say what?

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): I know what they
said, but you don’t want to hear it over the
phone; in other words, no. So go on.

DR. BOVE: Well, they said under review so
we’re hoping that they get this online, but
it’s not a no, yet. It may be a no, but it’s
not a no yet.

MS. RUCKART: Well, some positive things to
report that we had discussed generating some
minutes of the meetings between ATSDR and DOD
and providing those to the CAP as well as
external stakeholders who want them. And we
e-mailed the minutes from the June 2008 and
July 2008 meetings to the CAP members, and we
also placed them on the ATSDR Camp Lejeune
website. And CAP members were also provided with the 2009 APOW.

And the CAP wanted to know how they will get copies of correspondence between ATSDR and the DOD, will they be cc’d. We’re not able to cc you, but we will be sharing copies of final official documents as soon as we’re able to get them to you.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Wait a minute. You said final documents, right?

MS. RUCKART: The correspondence. You know, we have correspondence between ourselves and the DOD, and we can share with you final correspondence.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Once it’s signed.

MS. RUCKART: Yes.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): And that makes it official, and then you can share that with us.

MS. RUCKART: Yes.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Okay, good. What about their incoming correspondence to you?

MS. RUCKART: That’s really a question for
them.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Why? If you’re the owner of it once you receive it.

DR. BOVE: That’s the position of our higher ups.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Higher ups.

DR. BOVE: Yeah, our feeling is that -- well, not our feeling. We will be transparent. You will know what’s going on.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): By having one side of the conversation?

DR. BOVE: Well, you will also see our response.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Who are you referring to, Frank, when you say your higher ups?

DR. BOVE: Our higher ups.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): I want a name as well as their address.

DR. BOVE: You know who they are.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): No, I don’t. This is official. This is being recorded. I want to know a name.

DR. BOVE: You want to know a name.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Yes.
MR. BYRON (by Telephone): We’re talking about accountability in this country.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Let me ask you. Is it Dr. Sinks?

DR. BOVE: He’s one of our higher ups, yes.

MS. RUCKART: I have to tell you that I read through the transcripts from all our meetings very carefully, and at the last meeting -- I recently was reviewing the transcript so it’s fresh in my mind -- Jerry and Tom had a little interchange where Tom let Jerry know that he was always available. If Jerry had concerns he was welcome to call or e-mail Tom. So this is a perfect thing for you to get in touch with Tom about.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Absolutely, I will, thank you, but I needed to know who it was.

DR. CLAPP (by Telephone): ^ both names.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): What?

DR. CLAPP (by Telephone): These are both Frank and Perri’s higher ups are on the memorandum of understanding that we all got?

DR. BOVE: Yeah, the MOU -- by the way, that was a mistake because the MOU is still in
draft form of when we sent it to you just so you know. I don’t think there’ll be much change in the MOU or any change, but it’s still -- as far as I know -- hasn’t been finalized and signed by both parties so just keep that in mind. We wanted to send --

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): It doesn’t matter because you guys are the only ones that are held to the letter of the law of the damn thing. They don’t live up to anything.

DR. BOVE: Well, I know but, well, whatever. I mean, we’re trying to just make sure you have the documents, and the APOW has been signed by both parties so that’s official. And the MOU will be signed eventually, and when it’s signed, we’ll send you the official version. But it’s really not that different from the APOW, and if you have any questions about the APOW, we should, we can discuss it during this call.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): What’s the amount of money that they requested on the APOW?

MS. RUCKART: Well, Jerry, let’s just table that for a second because we do have that
agenda item listed, and there’s just a few
more things to go through in terms of what
happened at the last meeting. Okay?

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Uh-huh.

MS. RUCKART: There was a request at the
last meeting to put a return by date on the
survey invitation letter to create a sense of
urgency, and we have added some dates to our
materials. And we also discussed sending a
notification letter to participants in the
1999-to-2002 ATSDR survey. And we provided
the names and addresses at the time of the
survey and a letter to the DOD on August 4th.
And I believe that those letters started going
out to the participants of the previous
survey.

It was also discussed at the last
meeting making a web-based survey in such a
way that it could be started and then saved
and then completed later if you couldn’t
finish it all in one sitting. And we have
added procedures for that in our protocol. It
was discussed that ATSDR would share drafts of
the mortality study and cancer incidence study
protocol. So they’re ready and draft
protocols were e-mailed to the CAP on August 15th.

One thing that we also discussed at the last meeting was what particular health conditions we would be asking about in the health survey. It’s like a general catch-all question, and we discussed that we would receive input from any interested parties at the deadline of August 8th. So we have added some more conditions to the health survey. We can discuss that in a little bit.

And then our agenda items for future meetings were the update on the water modeling, the survey and stakeholder analysis feedback. So you have the water modeling update. We’ll talk about the survey here in a few minutes. I do have some information from Scott Williams on the stakeholder analysis feed back.

He says the stakeholder outreach and analysis is 66 percent complete. It is currently in the quantitative phone survey phase. They expect the final report to be completed by the end of the year. He also wanted me to share some information with you
all about the registry process. As of noon yesterday the call center has logged 81,885 unique registrations. There are also an additional 13,667 registrations pending validation to make sure they’re not duplicates.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): That’s good.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): A little more about a hundred grand.

MS. RUCKART: Potentially.

DR. BOVE: Yeah, most of them are the --

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Almost half the way there.

DR. BOVE: Most of them are from the mailing to the DMDC list which had a 210,000 I think it was, and so that’s where most of these are coming from. I think there’s, we’re trying to get Scott to figure out how many were just people who called in that weren’t on the DMDC list, but he was having difficulty doing that because of the way the data was being accumulated by the contractor.

And he couldn’t really, we could only guesstimate what it was, and so we’re still not sure how many people have registered just
because they’ve heard about it from some other
means, whether from the news reports or word
of mouth or whatever.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Yeah, this is
Jeff, and at the last NAS meeting they
expressed the concern that there was delay
because a lot of the members on the website
were not registering with the Marine Corps.
Now, I’m not in favor nor against them
registering in the Marine Corps’ website or
registry for this survey, but I could say that
it was expressed that it was delaying the data
gathering and the information that’s needed to
conduct this by a couple months.

Well, for those people who are
listening to this telecast or this broadcast,
you know, it may behoove you to consider that
and do what is best for your family, and you
have to make that decision on your own. I
wouldn’t allow any website to do that for you.

DR. BOVE: Those that send messages to us,
we’re giving them to the Marine Corps so they
will get registered if they do send an e-mail
to our Camp Lejeune box. But it would be
probably more efficient if they go directly --
not probably. It will be more efficient if they go directly to the Marine Corps.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Well, somebody needs to tell that to somebody named Candy Little.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Well, the Marine Corps has requested that -- this is Jeff Byron -- that I get in contact with Water Survivors and try to persuade them to encourage their membership. And like I said it’s just my personal belief that they could state that it is a delay, but it is still my opinion that each family, or the head of each family, or each individual needs to decide whether they’re giving up information that could be harmful to them in the future.

MS. RUCKART: There’s definitely a delay --

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): They should not allow any other individual, they should consult with a lawyer, and I am no lawyer.

MS. RUCKART: Yes, there’s definitely a delay because I only send those over to the Marine Corps in monthly batches.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): I understand. I’m just repeating it so that the viewers or
the listeners can hear and that it’s on the official record that I told the Marine Corps that there seemed to be some differences between our websites and that my contacting them personally would have no effect. So I’m just bringing it up. They can make that, you know, like I said, each individual should make that up for their own and not allow someone else to tell them what to do.

**MS. RUCKART:** Okay, well, that was all I had in terms of recapping the last meeting. If there are no more questions about that, we can move on to Frank’s update from the NAS meeting.

**UPDATE ON NAS MEETING**

**DR. BOVE:** Well, actually Jeff was there, too. I went over the feasibility assessment and the three studies we were proposing to do. And I think we’ve been over these studies now at least a couple of CAP meetings so I don’t know if I need to go into any depth on them. I’ll just say briefly for the mortality study it will be those who started active duty June ’75 or later and were at Camp Lejeune any time during the period ’75 to ’85.
And civilian employees, they would have had to start work, DOD work, in June of '74 and be on the base any time between '74 and '85. And the reason we have to limit it to that is because the unit code is not in the database, DMDC Personnel Database, until June '75, so we don’t know where they were. If they were active duty before '75, we don’t know where they were.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Unless they got transferred to Lejeune after that time.

DR. BOVE: We still wouldn’t know where they were before that time so --

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Oh, yeah, before that, yeah.

DR. BOVE: So that will -- instead of 210,000, that probably will knock out about a quarter of them, but we’re not sure because we don’t have the raw data. But it’s still an enormous cohort and will be big enough for the purpose of that study.

Now the civilians, it may cut more of them, and that’s a smaller cohort. So it might have a bigger effect on them, but I still think we’ll have 5,000 or so civilians.
It’s a smaller number, a much smaller number, and it may be more difficult to see things among the civilian employees, but that’s what we’re stuck with. And we’re also getting a comparison group from Pendleton or from another Marine base like Pendleton, if there is one like --

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): You mean like Lejeune.

DR. BOVE: Oh, okay, like Lejeune. Pendleton is like Lejeune, and so, yes, either way you want to look at it, yes.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): So since there are no other Marine Corps bases in the continental United States that are, directly mirror each other such as the way that Pendleton and Lejeune do.

DR. BOVE: That’s what our argument has been, too. So that’s the mortality study. There’s more to it, but I think unless you have some questions about it, that’s a pretty straightforward study. The protocol, of course, has been written. We’re submitting it to peer review. It has been submitted to peer review and to our IRB, our Institutional
DR. CLAPP (by Telephone): The National Academy confirms that or concurs with that, right?

DR. BOVE: Well, Jeff, you can chime in because you were there, too. National Academy basically -- Savitz, the Chair, said, well, it sounds like this is a fait accompli. You’re going to do it anyway. And I said, well, yeah, there’s no reason not to. And so they didn’t really say much. Their questions to me were mostly about exposure and the issue of how you can determine where people were on base.

And these are difficult issues, and we’ve been discussing this both internally and with the CAP. We’ve talked about the difficulty of figuring out where units were where on base and with the idea that what we were trying to do when we went up to Camp Lejeune was to rule out whether they were on main side or not. Because most of the barracks are on main side, but there are some that are on other parts of the base.

If we could just figure out which ones
were not on main side, we’d be in good shape. And I think we were able to do that initially, and I think we’ll revisit this as we get closer to the mortality study and double check and make sure that the units we think are on, that are not on main side are definitely not on main side and the ones that are, are. So we’ll be doing that in the next couple of months, and we’ll want your involvement, the CAP’s involvement in that for sure.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Now this expert panel meeting you’re holding on this water modeling in January, we’re going to ?

DR. BOVE: Well, right, right, that’s another topic, but yes. The CAP will be asked to make a recommendation for one or two people to be on the expert panel.

MS. RUCKART: I believe though it will be a public meeting so you can come and sit in the audience.

DR. BOVE: It will definitely be a public meeting, but you will also be asked for a representative, as will the Department of Defense and the Navy and the Marine Corps. So there will be representatives of the CAP and
the Marine Corps on the expert panel, but, yes, the meeting’s definitely open just like the last time and anyone can attend and ask questions from the floor, in fact, because there were questions from the floor at that meeting if I remember right.

We’ve been also talking about doing a cancer incidence study, but we’re putting that one more on the back burner. We’re investigating what cancer registries we might be able to work with and pursuing in that sense, but we’re putting it aside for now because it’s felt that the health survey may be able to answer the question of what cancer issues were at the base.

So just so you know, we’re working with our Division of Cancer Prevention to start the discussion with the cancer registries. We’re going to need their help anyway to confirm the cancers that are reported in the health survey. But the idea of the data linkage study was to use all 50 state cancer registries which has never been done in this country, and we think it’s important to try to pursue it anyway to see if
we can get this kind of network, if not for
this study, for future studies to get all 50
state cancer registries on board and working
together.

So I’m using the Camp Lejeune
situation to try to push this because I think
it’s important and our Cancer Prevention
Division thinks it’s important, too, so we’ll
see how it goes. But instead of putting a lot
of energy into that we’re going to be putting
it into the mortality study and the health
survey. Are there any questions about that?

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Yeah. I
don’t like that idea.

MS. RUCKART: Well, let me say one thing. I
want to add that we do have a cancer incidence
study protocol ready. We’re still moving
forward. We’re going to be seeking peer
review approval and IRB approval so that when
it comes time, if it is necessary to conduct
that study, we will be ready to go, and we
have created some preliminary budgets for
that. So we’re moving forward. Frank’s just
saying we may not need to go down that road,
but we are still progressing with it in case
that need does come up.

DR. BOVE: Okay, I guess the point I’m trying to make is that we need to focus our attention on the health survey and the mortality study. And the cancer incidence data linkage study is really a long shot. As I said it’s never been done before. The 50 state cancer registries have never been used in this way, and so this is unprecedented, and we don’t know if we’ll be successful even getting half of them to work together let alone all 50, but it’s worth the attempt. That’s basically what I’m trying to say.

We haven’t asked for any money for it for fiscal year ’09, but if the health survey does not get the participation rate we want, which is at least 65 percent, then we’ll push much harder to see if this data linkage study can happen. But again, there are these huge obstacles to that study. And as I said the 50 states have never, ever been used in this fashion. So we’re going to have to do some arm twisting, quite a bit of it.

Now just to mention, the Gulf War study, I think there are --
How many states did we, they’re not using even half the state cancer registries.

DR. CLAPP (by Telephone): That’s right.

DR. BOVE: And so, I mean, at one point they were only using six to 12.

DR. CLAPP (by Telephone): Right.

DR. BOVE: Actually, we did talk to Dr. Kang and got a list of states and the issues. And a number of states just either did not want to participate in the study or they wanted an incredible amount of money or they didn’t get back to him. So he’s had some difficulty, and he’s not even dealt with half of them.

So I’m just saying that’s why I’m setting out all these caveats. We think that we might have a better luck than him, but it remains to be seen. So that’s all for that. Now are there any other questions about that study?

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Yeah, I’ve got one. When was this decision made not to go forward with it?

DR. BOVE: Well, I think maybe I said it a little too strongly. It’s not that we’re not going forward with it. We’re pursuing with
the Cancer Division contacting these cancer
registries and eventually we want to have a
conference call with as many of them as
possible. We also are going to meet with them
when they come to conferences and give talks
about this study when there’s a gathering of
these cancer registries.

So it’s not true that we’re not
pursuing it, but we’re putting it on the back
burner in the sense that we’re focusing on the
other two studies first because we know we can
accomplish those two studies. And we don’t
know, we really don’t know, if we can even
accomplish this cancer data linkage study. So
that’s on one side.

Now the other side of the coin is
this, and it is true that the Navy’s position
is that the health survey should be able to
answer this question, and so therefore, a data
linkage study will not be necessary. As I
said, if the health survey has a good
participation rate, then it would be able to
answer this question, and there wouldn’t be
necessarily a need to do the data linkage. So
that’s on that side of the coin.
As I said, I would like to see it happen, and we will pursue with the cancer registries to see that if it is feasible, but we still don’t know if it’s feasible.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Well, this is Jeff Byron again. You’re talking about the participation rate in the health survey. How many of them have actually gone out so far of the 210,000 notices?

HEALTH SURVEY DISCUSSION

DR. BOVE: The health survey hasn’t started yet. I’ll move on to that now, and, Perri, you can chime in, too. But the health survey --

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): What were they saying it was 60-some percent complete?

MS. RUCKART: Okay, there’s a couple things going on. That was their focus group. They were going to conduct a stakeholder analysis to find out about what are the best methods to get people to register.

You know, they -- staff presented something very extensive at the last meeting how they had all the media outreach. They had some things on Yahoo or USAtoday.com, all of
that. And then they were going to be meeting with some stakeholders and getting feedback from them what are the best ways to reach you. Are there certain magazines that people read or things like this. So that is 66 percent complete.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Who was their focus group by the way?

MS. RUCKART: I have no idea. This is the only information I have.

Mary Ann, do you know any more about this?

MS. SIMMONS (by Telephone): I don’t know exactly. I know they did a bunch in Jacksonville, and I’m not sure. I can find out and report back to the CAP if that’s useful.

DR. BOVE: Jerry, that may be the thing that we were talking about this morning. That might be -- because I forgot about this effort that they were doing. But maybe --

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Well, I’m going to tell you what. If they go contacting victims, and these people don’t know anything about what’s going on, these people are going
to slam the damn phone down on them because they don’t want to talk to them.

**DR. BOVE:** That’s going to be up to the Marine Corps to deal with.

**MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone):** That thing that Mary Ann there so she can pass that on. But, I mean, you know, these people are extremely leery of the government now, and unless you work through the people at the website, I’ll tell you what, you’ll be wasting a lot of time because most of these people are going to hang up on them.

**MS. SIMMONS (by Telephone):** Like I said, I’m not real familiar with the study methods, but I can find out. I do believe they had face-to-face meetings with some different groups in Jacksonville so at least there was some face-to-face.

**MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone):** Were they even victims?

**MS. SIMMONS (by Telephone):** I don’t know who they were.

**DR. BOVE:** And we don’t have --

**MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone):** If you don’t contact the victims, this is just more of the
same.

**DR. BOVE:** Okay, Jerry, okay, this is something Mary Ann can take back to the Marine Corps. It has nothing to do with the health survey.

**MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone):** ^.

**MS. RUCKART:** I want to just try to make things a little bit more clear. I think Jeff was having some questions about --

**MR. BYRON (by Telephone):** Yes.

**MS. RUCKART:** -- what’s been going out and the survey. Well, the USMC has the registration process. They were tasked by Congress to identify everybody that they can reasonably identify who was stationed, living or working at Camp Lejeune during the period of drinking water contamination.

And because their DMDC database is limited and doesn’t have information on everybody and the dependents, they cast a wide net and that includes these media campaigns and telling your friends who were there to register with them. So the numbers that I was reporting when Scott had let me know that there were 81,000-and-some unique
registrations and 13,000 more that they’re checking to make sure there’s no duplicates, that’s just their registration efforts.

When we send out the surveys, we’re going to be sending it to everybody who’s in the DMDC database. That’s 210,222 former Marines and Naval personnel. We’re also going to be sending the survey out to people whose information we have from the 1999-to-2002 ATSDR survey. So that’s the parents and children. There were 12,598 children. So it’s all them plus --

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Have they broke it down how many Marines?

MS. RUCKART: It’s 210,222.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Yeah, as far as how many of them have responded so that we can get a 65 percent participation rate?

DR. BOVE: We haven’t sent the survey out yet.

MS. RUCKART: What we’re doing right now is the preliminary work to identify who’s going to get a survey. We’re going to send a survey to the 210,222 Marines and Naval personnel who we can get current addresses for. But first
of all we can’t even send surveys yet because we haven’t gotten OMB approval. That’s going to happen sometime early next year.

So this is all the legwork to find out who we can identify who’s going to get a survey. Then there’s a multi-step process. They’re going to get a pre-notice letter letting them know a survey will be coming. Then they’re going to get the survey, and then we’re going to have multiple follow-up attempts to encourage participation if we don’t hear back.

So this is all pre-sending out the survey. All these numbers we’re giving you are just the Marines’ efforts to attempt to notify and register as many people as possible.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Well, I have a question. This is Jerry. Frank, when do these protocols go up to OMB?

DR. BOVE: First they have to get through our CDC process, and it’s still going through our CDC process which includes now getting approval from our Institutional Review Board
before it will leave the CDC and go to OMB. So the earliest date I would think it would get to OMB would be sometime at the end of this year. And I think that we will be sending the surveys out sometime this spring.

First, we’re going to send a small group of surveys out just to test the system and then the rest of the surveys will probably be sent out near the end of the spring. And then there’s a two-to-three month process where doing repeat mailings as Perri just pointed out, and even if that doesn’t work, a phone call if we can get their phone number as well as e-mail notices if we have an e-mail address.

So given all that the surveys should finally be out, and then we would be getting the data back sometime later next year. So that’s how we sort of had it figured out.

There are, from the survey, the ATSDR survey, I estimate about 4,000 Marines in that survey that are not already in the DMDC database, and so if you count 4,000 Marines plus their 12,500 spouses and 12,500 children, you get something like 29,000 total from the
survey that are not duplicated by DMDC
database.

And the civilians will also, all 8,085
civilians, where we, again, get current
addresses. And we’re going to use a locator
firm that specializes in getting current
addresses. So we feel if the people have an
address, we’ll pretty much find it. So most
of these surveys should go to a person, not to
a dead letter office.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Well, the
point I’m getting at is I would prefer to wait
until the Mayflower moving van moves away from
the White House with the current residents’
belongings before the OMB gets a look at this
thing.

DR. BOVE: Well, Jerry, I understand that.
But I think that I don’t foresee any problem
with OMB. I think that --

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): I do.

DR. BOVE: -- well, I know you do. But in
terms of the scientific validity of this
survey I think we’re on pretty firm ground.
Now, there will be comments, and we’ll have to
deal with them, but I don’t think that, I
don’t anticipate a major problem. If there is, then we won’t get approval until after the Mayflower moving van leaves, but --

**MS. RUCKART:** But keep in mind --

**DR. BOVE:** -- we’re trying to move forward and get this moving as quickly as we can because there’s the other consideration that people have wanted this survey for a long time to get started, and we want to try to get it as quickly as possible to happen.

**MS. RUCKART:** But keep in mind also that this survey was mandated by Congress and OMB is going to be fully aware of that.

**DR. BOVE:** Is fully aware.

**MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone):** Dick Cheney don’t give a shit.

**DR. BOVE:** All right. Okay.

Now there is one issue about the survey that I just want to emphasize that we mentioned also to the NAS panel, and that is that our focus is on those people we can identify by these databases, the DMDC database, which includes the Marines and civilians and that includes Camp Pendleton sample as well, and the ATSDR survey of 1999-
2002, and any next of kin of those who’ve died that get identified through the mortality study. So those are the people we will send the survey out and focus our analysis on.

There is then another group of people. They will also get a survey but will have to be analyzed separately, and that is those people who we just find out about because they registered. They’re not in any of these computerized databases. And we’re doing that in order to make sure we have an unbiased sample to begin with, that we’re not already biasing our sample at the initial stage.

There will be issues of bias in terms of how many people participate, but if the participation rate is high enough, that can be minimized as well. But we want to start out with an unbiased sample, and so we want to identify people by these computerized databases.

MR. TOWNSEND (by Telephone): Mary Ann?

MS. SIMMONS (by Telephone): Oh, yes, sir.

MR. TOWNSEND (by Telephone): Tom here. Is it possible to be a participant in the survey if you were at Camp Lejeune prior to those
dates?

DR. BOVE: Yeah, Tom --

MS. SIMMONS (by Telephone): I think they’re encouraging everybody prior to 1985.

DR. BOVE: Tom, this is how it will work. If you are in the, if you’re not part of the 210,000 former active duty from ’75 to ’85, if you’re not in that database, and you’re not in the ATSDR survey, then you would probably only be known because you registered. And therefore, you would get a survey, but you would be analyzed separately from the larger group.

And the reason again is to have an initial, unbiased sample. If it turns out that the information from those who registered is very similar to the rest of the people, then we might be able to combine it. But we want to keep it separate because we want to start off with an unbiased group.

MR. TOWNSEND (by Telephone): Okay. On the focus group ^ does exist?

MS. RUCKART: Tom, can you please speak up? We’re having a hard time hearing you.

MR. TOWNSEND (by Telephone): Maybe my
microphone’s no good.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Speak into it.

DR. BOVE: Yeah, speak into it.

MR. TOWNSEND (by Telephone): It’s sort of an on my ear kind of thing. Can you hear me now?

DR. BOVE: Yeah.

MR. TOWNSEND (by Telephone): I did give Headquarters a long time ago when we were talking about this, I gave them a whole scenario of what I thought were appropriate media venues to search. I don’t know who they finally came up with, but --

DR. BOVE: You’re talking about the focus groups now?

MR. TOWNSEND (by Telephone): Yeah.

DR. BOVE: Yeah, again, we don’t have any say over, I don’t know anything about them. We haven’t seen any protocol or anything. This is something the Marine Corps is doing, and you’d really have to direct your question to them. We don’t know what, you know, this is their effort.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): An effort to stop
the study.

DR. BOVE: No, I think it’s an effort to, as Perri was outlining it, but that’s all we know.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): I understand that, but --

DR. BOVE: But that’s all we know.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): -- come up with is not enough respondents who are not going to do the study is what they’ll say.

DR. BOVE: No, no, no. It has nothing to do with the study. The study has absolutely nothing to do with the study or any of the studies we’re doing. It has something to --

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Okay, well, I’m getting a little confused about all what we’re talking about and trying to clarify it.

DR. BOVE: And I think that it gets confusing also because the registration effort that the Marine Corps is doing --

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Is it all encompassing?

DR. BOVE: The way to think about this is that they are developing a large database of people who they can then provide updates to
including the results of any of our studies or any other findings. They’ll have this huge mailing database that they can then send information to. And --

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): My original question was how does that registration, what is the percentage of people that we’re looking for that are in the 210,000 list?

DR. BOVE: Again, that would be a question about who gets newsletters or whatever else the Marine Corps decides to send to people. The health survey is different. The health survey is going to go out to everyone in these databases, everyone.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Everyone.

DR. BOVE: Whether you’ve registered or not. Registration has nothing to do with it, and these focus groups have nothing to do with it. It’s totally separate. We thought -- at one time they were connected, and we thought it was just too confusing and also there was this bias issue, and we thought let’s keep things separate.

We went over that in a phone, a conference call with the CAP last time around,
the last conference call we had. And we also went over this with the Navy, and so I think we’re all on board now with the idea that the registration process is something that will be useful to disseminate information, but that the health survey is going to be sent to everybody in those databases regardless of whether they register or not. Okay?

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Yup. I just wondered if you knew if there was a percentage of respondents that were the initial 210 that we’re looking at for the mortality study, right?

DR. BOVE: Well, okay, for the registrations -- forget about the studies, okay?

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Okay.

DR. BOVE: Let’s just talk about the, if you want to talk about the registrations, Perri read out how many have registered. My understanding is that they mailed it to all the addresses they had from the DMDC database that were correct addresses.

So if they have close to 100,000, and they mailed it out to close to 200,000 -- I think it was like 150,000 that they have
actual addresses for. This is a question actually for Scott Williams. So that will give you some sense that they’re still getting registrations back. So that’s what’s going on there. But we haven’t done our studies yet. We haven’t done the mortality study yet. Again, we have to go through IRB and peer review process. That study won’t start till next year, too.

**MS. RUCKART:** But, Jeff, let me must clarify something for you. For the mortality study, the population who is going to be included is totally separate from the registration process.

**MR. BYRON (by Telephone):** Right, that’s the 210,000 we’re looking for, right?

**MS. RUCKART:** Exactly. But we don’t have to look for them in terms of knowing their address or anything like that because of the data linkage. We’re just going to send their names and social security numbers, which we’ll get from the DMDC, to various databases and find out if they’re dead or alive. And if they’re dead, send their names to the National Death Index to find out their cause of death.
There’s going to be no contact -- if they’re dead, there really can’t be, but it doesn’t matter. The registration process is a completely separate effort than the mortality study.

**MR. BYRON (by Telephone):** Right. I just wondered is there a correlation, is the people we’re trying to, I guess that hasn’t been done yet so that we won’t know. And I was wondering is there a percentage of respondents for the registrations that are also in the 210?

**MS. RUCKART:** Yeah, I believe it’s a high percentage, but I don’t have, you know, exact numbers.

**MR. BYRON (by Telephone):** If we need 65 percent, I’m trying to gauge where we’re at now.

**MS. RUCKART:** No, no, that 65 percent is totally separate. Let me just tell you again. We have, the Marines are doing their efforts to register people because they were tasked to do that by Congress. That’s really an outreach thing so they can send information about what’s going on or what has happened at
the base.

Now for our survey, let’s think about is as this. We are not even at time zero for our survey. Once we send that out, we’re talking about 65 percent of all the surveys we send out to the 210,000, plus that 29,000 that Frank said. So if you think about it in terms of 210,222 plus 29,000, you know, it’s 65 percent of that group.

**MR. BYRON (by Telephone):** That clears it up. I thought we had to have 65 percent of this 210,000.

**DR. BOVE:** No, no, what we’re doing is --

**MR. BYRON (by Telephone):** I’m sorry. I was confused.

**DR. BOVE:** -- that’s all right. It’s difficult. One more time with the survey though so you understand. There’s 210,000 and change former active duty. They get the survey. There are 8,000 civilians. They get the survey. There are about 29,000 additional people from the ATSDR survey. They get the survey. There’s 50,000 Camp Pendleton former active duty. They get a survey, and 10,000 civilians from Pendleton, they get the survey.
And I think if you add it all up, it’s something like 307,000. Just so you know it’s probably the largest survey ever done except for the census as far as I know. So it would be 65 percent of 307,000.

MS. RUCKART: Which I think is 195,000.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): That clarified it.

DR. BOVE: So it’s a big survey, and that’s why we’re focusing our attention on this survey because it’s a mammoth undertaking. And the mortality study is less, much less so but still an undertaking, and we’re focusing our attention on getting those things going as we’ll be reanalyzing the small for gestational age study and finishing up the case control study. So we have a lot on our plate in the next year.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Hey, you guys, I’ve got to go.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Okay, Jerry.

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): I’ll talk to you all tomorrow.

DR. BOVE: So that’s pretty much what I said to the NAS. The additional, we were asked to
look at additional outcomes. We decided to expand our literature search to include not just occupational studies that involved trichloroethylene and perchloroethylene and, of course, the drinking water studies, but to also look at occupational studies that involve any solvents, any organic solvents.

And based on that search we were able to add a few more diseases that we would want to ask questions about in this survey. And those included a motor neuron disease or ALS, which is also called Lou Gehrig’s disease, multiple sclerosis, endometriosis, and we’re going to have a question on infertility to deal with some of the issues that were raised, I think, by Mike Partain at the last meeting.

So those are the additional ones that weren’t on the original list. We have a long list of ones. This list is diseases that have been found in maybe one study or several studies, but we’re not saying that the solvents actually caused these diseases. We don’t know. There’s some evidence, or at least there’s been an association in at least one study, and so therefore, we feel it’s
important to focus on them. So we’re not trying to make a statement that the exposures definitely caused these outcomes. That’s why we’re not sure. That’s why we want to study them.

So that’s the list. It’s a pretty long list now, and it’s in your, we did send out the testimony I gave at the NAS, the slides, and it’s in one of the slides.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Right, I have the list.

DR. BOVE: So that’s all.

And then we want to move on to the next item? Are there any questions on these studies?

(no response)

UPDATE ON FY09 BUDGET

MS. RUCKART: Well, we also just wanted to announce that we have the signed fiscal year ‘09 plan of work the APOW and that the DOD has agreed to provide us with the funds we requested for Fiscal Year ‘09 so that we can do all the work that we propose to do. So that’s very good news.
DR. BOVE: Do you have any questions on the APOW that we sent out to you?

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): No.

MS. BRIDGES (by Telephone): No.

MS. RUCKART: Well, that’s pretty much what we had proposed to discuss. Are there any other questions?

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Not that I can think of now, but if you’ve got a minute, Frank, afterwards or if I could call you tomorrow or something, I’d appreciate it --

DR. BOVE: Sure, any time.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): -- referring to the last meeting of the NAS.

DR. BOVE: One thing that the NAS panel encouraged me to do was to get moving on the reanalysis of the small for gestational age study. They said, well, even if you don’t have the water modeling results, you can at least duplicate what was done in the previous study with exposed versus unexposed. And so I am cleaning up the dataset and probably will have it cleaned up in the next couple of weeks.

And we’ll be able to actually do an
initial look certainly at exposed versus unexposed taking into account any interconnection issue as well. So I can do that and will do that. But I really would like to analyze this data using the actual estimates for Hadnot Point. And so I guess this is something we can explore later, discuss later, whether you think it’s a good idea to do all the analysis and report at one shot or whether to split it up and report the exposure versus unexposed analysis and then release the later analysis using the actual monthly estimates.

And I’d prefer to do it at one shot, but I’m willing to listen to a discussion of that. Maybe we can talk about that at the next CAP meeting, and I’ll let you know how far along I’ve gotten.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): I’d rather be face-to-face for that one personally.

DR. BOVE: Yeah, I think that’s, yeah. I’m just letting you know though I am working on it so that I can do it either way.

MS. RUCKART: Well, that’s a perfect lead in. I just wanted to remind everybody that we
talked about some dates for a potential next face-to-face meeting. Especially for those who are a few minutes late to the call the dates under consideration are Wednesday, December 10th; Monday, December 15th; Tuesday, December 16th; Thursday, December 18th. Now, Christopher Stallard, our facilitator, is available on those days, but he wanted me to let you know that he’s just getting back from Africa in mid-December, so Wednesday, December 10th. He thinks he can make it, but there’s a slight chance that would not work out for him so he said to go ahead and keep it on the table, but just to let you know there’s a slight chance he may not be able to come on that day so if you want to take that into consideration.

**MR. BYRON (by Telephone):** Definitely, because I like him as a moderator.

**MS. RUCKART:** Okay, well, I mean, he’s pretty sure he can but, you know, there’s that question there if he will be back in time. And it would be good if I could have your responses by October 24th so that we can go ahead and get everybody’s travel. I’m going
to send an e-mail about this. I’m just
mentioning it now so that you can begin to
think about it. But I will send all these
dates to you by e-mail.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Okay.

Dr. Clapp?

DR. CLAPP (by Telephone): Yes.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): I’m going to
probably call you, too, concerning the genetic
issues I brought up with the NAS just to get
your opinion on whether my argument was --

MS. BRIDGES (by Telephone): Yes, Sandra
Bridges back on because I was cut off.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): -- did you copy
that?

DR. CLAPP (by Telephone): Yes. I’m about
to go to a class right now, so it’ll have to
be tomorrow if that’s all right?

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Yeah, that would
be fine. Is there a particular time?

DR. CLAPP (by Telephone): Around noon time
actually, a little before noon, 11?

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Okay, and you’re
on the east coast?

DR. CLAPP (by Telephone): Yeah.
MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Okay, sounds good.

DR. CLAPP (by Telephone): Talk to everybody later.

MS. RUCKART: Well, I think that wraps up our meeting today. Thanks for calling in and for bearing with us through some of these little technical difficulties. But one good piece of good news to report, we do have ten individual microphones. So when we come and we meet in person in December, it’ll be really nice. Everyone will have their own microphone, just about everyone will.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Progress marches on.

Are you available to talk later or do you want to just do it right after everybody hangs up?

DR. BOVE: Is he talking to me?

Me? I’m available.

MR. BYRON (by Telephone): So long everybody.

MS. BRIDGES (by Telephone): I’d like your number in order to reach -- I’m sorry.

MS. RUCKART: Dick Clapp?
MS. BRIDGES (by Telephone): No, you.
MS. RUCKART: Me?
MS. BRIDGES (by Telephone): Yeah. If I can or can you give me a call?
MS. RUCKART: Yeah, you mean today you want me to call you?
MS. BRIDGES (by Telephone): Yeah or tomorrow, either one.
MS. RUCKART: Well, I’m not going to be here tomorrow, so it will have to either be today or next week.
MS. BRIDGES (by Telephone): That’ll be fine. I’ll be here.
MS. RUCKART: Okay, I can call you in a little bit.
MS. BRIDGES (by Telephone): Okay, thanks.
(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 3:09 p.m.)
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