THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY

convenes the

TENTH MEETING

CAMP LEJEUNE COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE PANEL (CAP) MEETING

TELECONFERENCE

OCTOBER 8, 2008

The verbatim transcript of the

Meeting of the Camp Lejeune Community Assistance

Panel held at the ATSDR, Chamblee Building 106,

Conference Room A, Atlanta, Georgia, on Oct. 8,

2008.

STEVEN RAY GREEN AND ASSOCIATES NATIONALLY CERTIFIED COURT REPORTING 404/733-6070

CONTENTS

Oct. 8, 2008

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS PERRI RUCKART AND FRANK BOVE	5
UPDATE ON WATER MODELING MORRIS MASLIA	8
RECAP OF JULY 16, 2008 CAP MEETING PERRI RUCKART	52
UPDATE ON NAS MEETING FRANK BOVE	64
HEALTH SURVEY DISCUSSION FRANK BOVE AND PERRI RUCKART	74
UPDATE ON FY09 BUDGET	94
COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	101

TRANSCRIPT LEGEND

The following transcript contains quoted material. Such material is reproduced as read or spoken.

In the following transcript: a dash (--) indicates an unintentional or purposeful interruption of a sentence. An ellipsis (. . .) indicates halting speech or an unfinished sentence in dialogue or omission(s) of word(s) when reading written material.

- -- (sic) denotes an incorrect usage or pronunciation of a word which is transcribed in its original form as reported.
- -- (phonetically) indicates a phonetic spelling of the word if no confirmation of the correct spelling is available.
- -- "uh-huh" represents an affirmative response, and "uh-uh" represents a negative response.
- -- "*" denotes a spelling based on phonetics, without reference available.
- -- "^" represents inaudible or unintelligible speech or speaker failure, usually failure to use a microphone or multiple speakers speaking simultaneously; also telephonic failure.

PARTICIPANTS

(alphabetically)

BOVE, FRANK, ATSDR
BRIDGES, SANDRA, CAP, CLNC
BYRON, JEFF, COMMUNITY MEMBER
CLAPP, RICHARD, SCD, MPH, PROFESSOR
ENSMINGER, JERRY, COMMUNITY MEMBER
GROS, MICHAEL, COMMUNITY MEMBER (not present)
MCCALL, DENITA, COMMUNITY MEMBER
PARTAIN, MIKE, COMMUNITY MEMBER
RUCKART, PERRI, ATSDR
SIMMONS, MARY ANN, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS PUBLIC HEALTH
CENTER
TOWNSEND, TOM

PROCEEDINGS

(1:00 p.m.)

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

1	calling from Boston.
2	MS. SIMMONS (by Telephone): Mary Ann
3	Simmons, Portsmouth, Virginia.
4	MS. RUCKART: Unfortunately, Jerry has told
5	us that Denita will not be able to join us,
6	and we're still waiting to see
7	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): She told me
8	if she got home in time from her treatment
9	that she would get on the line.
10	MS. RUCKART: Okay, and we're still hopeful
11	that Sandra Bridges will be able to call in.
12	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Tom with us
13	yet?
14	MS. RUCKART: And Tom, that's right. Tom,
15	are you on?
16	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): I tried to
17	call Sandra, and I can never get a hold of
18	her. So I knew everybody else would be here.
19	MS. RUCKART: Tom, is Tom Townsend on?
20	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): I don't think so.
21	I haven't heard him.
22	MS. RUCKART: We have a majority of people
23	so we really should just go ahead and get
24	started. If they call in later, that would be
25	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 faceto-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

1	phones if you're not actually speaking because
2	we're getting a lot of feedback, and it's very
3	hard to hear what's being said by the speaker.
4	So we appreciate that. Thank you.
5	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): I hear all
6	that laughter. That's coming from somebody's
7	office.
8	MR. BYRON: This is Jeff, and I agree with
9	you.
10	MS. RUCKART: There's no one laughing here
11	in the room so it must be coming from
12	someone's conference call line, someone else
13	who's out there beside ATSDR.
14	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Mike, is that
15	you?
16	MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): Yeah, it may be
17	me. I'm walking outside right now.
18	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Whoever it is
19	needs to turn off the TV then.
20	(Whereupon, a brief discussion with the
21	sound technician ensued.)
22	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): This is Jeff. I
23	can still hear them in the background.
24	MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): It's not me
25	because I'm outside.

1 (Whereupon, a brief discussion with the 2 sound technician ensued.) 3 MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Well, we have to 4 move on because these guys --5 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Go ahead, 6 Morris. I'm sorry. 7 MR. MASLIA: Okay, that's fine. As I was 8 saying so we're waiting to consolidate all the 9 comments on Chapter I. And just to clarify so 10 there's no misunderstanding, these comments 11 are not technical revisions to the model or to 12 the analyses but rather to the way the report 13 is written. Just to make sure when I say 14 consolidate comments, that's what we mean by 15 that. 16 And we are currently putting together, 17 we're working on drafting the Chapter J Report 18 as well as a supplemental information, which 19 is Chapter K, which will contain some 20 discussions about Well TT-23. 21 With respect to Hadnot Point we have completed all the database development with 22 23 the exception of going over the ten years of 24 operational data for about 80 wells. And I 25 believe the last time I talked with Scott

1 Williams he said their contractor was about 75 2 or 80 percent of the way through scanning that 3 information in for us. 4 We have brought a contractor on board 5 to help us with that as well as to help us 6 with other aspects of the Hadnot Point 7 analyses. And at this point we are also in 8 the initial stages of preparing for the expert 9 review panel that will take place the second 10 week in January. 11 And that's it. I'll be happy to 12 answer any questions. 13 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): This is Jerry 14 Ensminger. Morris, what is that reference to TT-23? 15 16 MR. MASLIA: What I said was Chapter K will 17 contain some errata and some extra, further 18 explanations as to the start-up date of TT-23 19 or further justifying the sort of data that we 20 used in the model as well as some erroneous 21 sampling data that --22 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Let me ask 23 you this, what's the update as far as the 24 start-up date? 25 MR. MASLIA: What we have in the model, what

1 was published in Chapter A and Chapter C, we 2 started the model in August of '84. 3 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Okay, what 4 are these -- do you have new documents that 5 prove that this thing didn't start until August of '84? 6 7 MR. MASLIA: No, we have no documents that 8 contradict that. 9 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): So I know 10 that Scott Williams had made mention that they 11 had some work orders that showed that they weren't doing, ^ the grass before they could 12 13 pour the slab or anything. 14 MR. MASLIA: There is a document that he 15 supplied us recently, and all it is is a one-16 line entry that says soil treatment for 17 termite taking place on November 21st, '83. 18 That doesn't tell us whether that's the date 19 of the drawing, the date of the activity or 20 what. But if you assume that's the date of 21 the activity, of soil treatment, you could not pour a concrete slab 'til after that, and then 22 23 you couldn't start putting in equipment 'til 24 after that. So that puts us right up in '84 25 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

1	back on water in 1985. Okay? Because Jerry
2	has a very valid point, and I don't know, but
3	it sounds to me like I guess my question to
4	Morris is what did they provide as far as the
5	electrical wiring to the pump? Anything?
6	MR. MASLIA: We've got a drawing that really
7	does not, it's not an electrical drawing. We
8	don't have it shows
9	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Just basic well
10	house construction?
11	MR. MASLIA: Yeah, basically like that.
12	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): What's it dated?
13	MR. MASLIA: We don't have a date on it, but
14	
15	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Who is the person
16	who was contracted to write this up?
17	MR. MASLIA: Well, all we have is a cover
18	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): They'll have a
19	purchase order from the military to have done
20	that work.
21	MR. MASLIA: No, I don't have a purchase
22	order.
23	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): I said that they
24	will have, the contractor who did the drawing
25	will have a purchase order.

1 MR. MASLIA: Okay. 2 MR. BYRON (by Telephone): In a government 3 job he may be required to hold that for 30 4 years as far as I know. I know I'm required 5 to hold anything that has to do with a jet 6 engine moving part for 30 years. 7 MR. MASLIA: All these --8 MR. BYRON (by Telephone): I know it's a 9 different field. 10 MR. MASLIA: -- all these arguments still do 11 not tell us when they continuously supplied 12 water, and that has to do with demand, demand from what we used in the model. And if your 13 14 argument is that, well, let's ignore the 15 information that the Marine Corps gave us on a 16 month-by-month basis -- because in the '80s we 17 have monthly supply -- then you need to throw 18 the entire model out. 19 MR. BYRON (by Telephone): No, I'm not --20 MR. MASLIA: That's the choice --21 MR. BYRON (by Telephone): -- we're 22 suggesting that maybe what they've given you 23 is incomplete. 24 MR. MASLIA: Then you need to throw every 25 piece of data out that they gave us. That's

your choice.

2 3

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

4

MR. MASLIA: Now, I --

5

6

7

MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): -- hear me This stuff about these samples that were out. taken in July of '84, now, either they lied, told a lie about those samples to fit their

8

scenario or the samples were taken and they

9 10

really were knowingly pumping poison water out

11

of the new well. So no matter which scenario

12

you take, they're lying.

13

Now, you know, this lends to

14

credibility. And whenever we uncover these

15 16 documents, these ^ documents, when I find

letters written by the EPA back to Camp

17

Lejeune referring to meetings that took place

18

in 1986, meetings that took place between the

19

EPA Region 4 representatives and Camp Lejeune

20

and NAVFAC representatives at Camp Lejeune,

21

when they reference in those letters

22

conversations that took place, and this is in

23

1986, when they state in that letter that it

had found contamination in the supply wells,

24

was determined in this meeting that while they

25

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.

I think

1 DR. BOVE: Jerry, this is Frank. 2 there's a couple things going on here. One is 3 that the modeling is relying on monthly production information. And so based on that 4 5 we did the water modeling. Now we have to use 6 some information in order to do --7 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Yes, I know 8 that. 9 MR. BYRON (by Telephone): We agree. 10 DR. BOVE: Now, that's one thing. So we 11 used what was given to us in terms of the 12 production wells. So now for the purpose of the epidemiologic study, it does make a 13 14 difference, of course, what the exposure 15 levels were on a month-by-month basis. 16 And so the question is whether if 17 we're off by a month, two, three, four, five 18 months, whatever we're off if we're off, how 19 that might affect the exposure assessment in 20 terms of what the contamination levels were 21 during 1984, the first half of 1984, if that 22 well was online before August of '84. 23 that's one issue. 24 There's a separate issue as to the 25 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

1 monthly data in all of '78 and then '81, '82 2 and then I think '83 and '84. Besides the 3 production or raw water data and the water 4 coming into the plant, we also at that time 5 had water level measurements, which we used to 6 calibrate the model, as well as some 7 concentration measurements. Now, the fact is 8 TT-26 was measured at about 1,500, a maximum 9 value of 1,580 parts per billion. In order 10 for any well, whether it be TT-23 or any other 11 well, to have an impact, to significantly 12 either dilute it or increase the concentration 13 at the water treatment plant, they would have 14 to have a concentration greater than 1,500 15 parts per billion. So no matter when -- and I 16 say this -- no matter when they turned on TT-17 23, it would not impact the concentration 18 being delivered to the residents of Tarawa 19 Terrace because in mixing at the water treatment plant it was taken over by the 20 21 concentration of TT-26. The only way --22 MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): But it was --23 MR. MASLIA: -- and the only way --24 MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): -- TT-23 is 25 being run, Morris. It's going to raise your

1 low end of your concentration. 2 MR. MASLIA: There is no low end. 3 all significantly in the hundreds parts per 4 billion by that time. 5 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Okay, okay, let me ask you this. This is Jerry Ensminger 6 7 by the way. Let me ask you this. Let's say, 8 okay, TT-26 had 1,580 parts per billion. 9 Let's say TT-23 was put online in '83 and when 10 they turned off TT-26 to give it a rest, they 11 slam on TT-23. So then you're getting a 12 continual slough. Instead of giving a break, 13 you know, they were running them together, 14 you're getting a continual slough here. 15 MR. MASLIA: But not at 1,500. The model in fact shows --16 17 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): I mean, TT-23, you could just about, I could just about 18 19 throw a damn golf ball up to where 26 was at. 20 MR. MASLIA: No, no, TT-23, the minute we 21 turned it on in the model had several hundred parts per billion in it. And it's not going 22 23 to get that much higher than that. It's 24 significantly further away from the source. 25 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Morris,

1 there's a natural gradient in there. 2 MR. MASLIA: Being interrupted by the well 3 pumping. 4 MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): Another factor, 5 Morris, too, is TT-23 showed benzene in the 6 well. What's not to say that there's, you 7 know, where did that benzene come from? that showing up in the other wells? 8 9 MR. MASLIA: Not that I know of. 10 MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): But are we 11 addressing the benzene that was in the water? 12 MR. MASLIA: We addressed it in Chapter E. 13 MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): Okay, Chapter E 14 you say, Morris? 15 MR. MASLIA: Chapter E. There's a section 16 on a detailed discussion in Chapter E on, not 17 model, but actually measured contaminants at 18 well TT-23, TT-25 and TT-26. 19 MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): Are we going to 20 bring that up -- go ahead. 21 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): How do you 22 get higher TCE levels than you do of PCE if 23 TCE is a daughter product of the major 24 contaminant? You can't have a daughter 25 product that has higher concentrations than

1 the parent product. 2 MR. MASLIA: Unless the sample as an error 3 did not take place. 4 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Hey, they're 5 the ones that claimed it did in the scenario they were trying to sell back then. 6 7 MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): Well, another 8 concern, too, that I have, Morris, is this. 9 Have we got benzene showing up in TT-23? 10 There are two wells that I believe were shut 11 down and one was listed as collapsed in the 12 '70s up by the interest of TT-2; there were 13 some above-ground storage tanks that were 14 leaking like a sieve. What's not to say that those wells were picking up stuff, too? 15 16 mean, I know there's no --17 MR. MASLIA: Let me explain again, because I think it's gotten lost in our discussions not 18 19 just today but over the past year or two. 20 When we said we were going to use modeling, we 21 made it clear to Frank and anybody else who's 22 doing epi work that we felt we could model on 23 a monthly basis. We could not model each 24 individual hour or minute or even, for 25 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?

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

1 report. 2 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): I know that -3 4 MR. BYRON (by Telephone): What we need to 5 know from Morris and Frank is how much of what 6 you've been told is opinion driven or hearsay 7 driven by memory versus black-and-white 8 paperwork. 9 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): That's right. 10 MR. BYRON (by Telephone): I mean, if you 11 could expound on that, Morris, I would 12 appreciate it. But what I ^ seems like data 13 to me. 14 MR. MASLIA: Where we -- if you want to call 15 it -- rely on or request information from the 16 Marine Corps that one might consider either 17 hearsay or memory or whatever, in this 18 situation it would be, for example, if we 19 needed to know how they operated the 20 distribution system and when they turned on 21 certain pumps, not wells, but pumps. 22 situation in Tarawa Terrace we actually think 23 have something going for us because typically, 24 not just at the Marine Corps base but in other 25 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

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

24

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. 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

1	house?
2	MR. MASLIA: Not to our knowledge.
3	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Not to your
4	knowledge. Is there procedures written now?
5	MR. MASLIA: I have not seen any, but that
6	does not
7	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Well, that needs
8	to be asked, and you want to know what
9	revision level they're at if you want to get
10	it a little clearer. But, you know, from what
11	you're telling me I understand what you're
12	saying, and it makes sense. But like I said
13	if you want to know, those are a couple of
14	questions you may need to ask.
15	MR. MASLIA: Okay.
16	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): That's all, a
17	recommendation.
18	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): This is Jerry
19	Ensminger. We also discussed the existence of
20	a North Carolina law that prohibited the
21	pumping of any one given well for more than 12
22	hours. Has anybody checked out the existence
23	of that law?
24	MR. MASLIA: I believe there is such a law.
25	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

1 week of January, then the next available date 2 I would think would be the end of March. 3 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): I thought you 4 were going to try to have this in this year. 5 MR. MASLIA: No, there's no possible way 6 because we have to be able to give them like a 7 data report from Hadnot Point, and we're just 8 in the process of starting to put that 9 together. 10 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Oh. I would 11 prefer that you wait until after the 12 inauguration of the new administration. 13 DR. BOVE: The most important thing, Jerry, 14 is to have that data report on Hadnot Point 15 together so that the expert panel can have 16 something to review. And so that's the most 17 important thing. The second most important 18 thing is to have a date where they can make 19 it, and so that's our focus. We can't be 20 driven by the -- I don't think the election 21 will have an impact on this issue. 22 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): This is Jerry 23 Ensminger again. On a lighter note, all the 24 folks that were down at Camp Lejeune or up 25 near Camp Lejeune in February for that meeting

1	on ^ Hadnot remember that? They gave us a
2	little tour. We were ^. Everybody remember
3	that?
4	(Whereupon, severe telephonic interruption
5	ensued.)
6	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Yeah.
7	MS. RUCKART: Is anybody watching this
8	meeting over the internet? I'm wondering if
9	this feedback is coming because you might be
10	watching it over the internet at the same time
11	you're dialing in on the phone.
12	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Hang on. Let me
13	turn it off.
14	MS. RUCKART: Yeah, I think that might be
15	causing some of this feedback because there's
16	a delay, and you hear in the background it's
17	not syncing up.
18	Also, I heard some beeps indicating
19	that other people have joined us.
20	MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): Yeah, I did,
21	too.
22	MS. RUCKART: Is anyone else on the line?
23	MS. McCALL (by Telephone): I'm here.
24	MR. TOWNSEND (by Telephone): Yeah, I'm
25	here, and I've got to leave in a second. I

1 want to ask Morris --2 MS. RUCKART: Who did I just hear? Was that 3 Denita? 4 MS. McCALL (by Telephone): Yes. 5 MS. RUCKART: Welcome, Denita. 6 MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): Hi, Denita. 7 MS. RUCKART: Tom, are you on? 8 Townsend? 9 MR. TOWNSEND (by Telephone): Yeah, I'm 10 here. 11 MS. RUCKART: Sandra, are you on? 12 MS. BRIDGES (by Telephone): Yes, I am. 13 MS. RUCKART: Okay, great, we're all here. 14 Thanks. 15 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Now where I 16 was at was when we were on that tour, we 17 pulled in between lots 201 and 203, and I 18 specifically pointed out some sick trees on 19 lot 203. Well, I was just down there the 20 other day, and about seven acres of trees had 21 been completely mulched, ground up, and the 22 weeds are just about high enough now to cover 23 up the debris from those trees. They weren't 24 logged. They were just ground up by that big 25 brush-eating machine that the base got. I'll

1 tell you what. That's all right. I know the 2 story. 3 MR. MASLIA: This is Morris. Are there any 4 more questions because I do have some other 5 things I need to take care of. 6 MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): Yeah, Morris, 7 I've got a question. This is Mike Partain. 8 Just real quick, you had mentioned when you 9 started running the sample data on well TT-23. 10 What is the running sample data? 11 MR. MASLIA: In Chapter A -- I forget --12 it's Figure A3. I think it's page A-16. I'm 13 not sure. But there's a chronology figure. 14 It's a full-color figure. I don't have 15 Chapter A with me. But right around July of 16 '84 there's some sample, it lists some sample 17 data, some TCE, PCE. 18 MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): Yeah, I know 19 what you're talking about now. 20 MR. MASLIA: Okay. And, of course, we 21 obtained that from a chronology provided to us 22 by the Marine Corps. The chronology does not 23 have an author on the actual chronology 24 itself, although attached to it is a cover, 25 and there's an author on the memo transmitting

1	it. Okay, fine. As we started looking back
2	into it, we started noticing that the exact
3	same verbiage was copied from report to report
4	to report. And what we were trying to find
5	out is what the original source of that data
6	and why for that particular data there are no
7	laboratory samples.
8	MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): And we're
9	trying to do the same
10	MR. MASLIA: Okay, and what we have
11	concluded is that the original report or
12	original of the first time it was cited, which
13	is in a report by McMorris, I believe, the CLW
14	document I don't have right on my fingertips.
15	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): It's not
16	McMorris. It's Tom Morris.
17	MR. MASLIA: No, no, no, there's a report.
18	That's where the erroneous information comes
19	in. He pulled it from a report from Cheryl
20	with a C, C-H-E-R-Y-L McMorris. I can give
21	you the CLW document. I don't have it at my
22	fingertips, but it
23	MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): Can you send me
24	that document?
25	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

1 their interest -- I know this doesn't have 2 anything to do with you, Morris, but what was 3 their damn interest in generating this damn 4 lie in the '90s when they created this crap? 5 DR. BOVE: We can't answer that, Jerry. can't answer that. All we know is that it's 6 7 not trichloroethylene. It's perchloroethylene 8 that they were referring to. They referred to 9 perchloroethylene in the document he's talking 10 about, because I've seen it, as TCE. 11 unfortunately, they got the two mixed up. 12 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Well, wait a 13 minute, Frank. I found samples, and I found analytical data results that list both 14 15 chemicals. 16 DR. BOVE: But if you read the report, Jerry 17 -- Jerry, Jerry, if you read the report, it says --18 19 MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): I don't want to 20 interrupt you guys, but I know what report 21 you're talking about, and it is correct that 22 they mislabeled tetrachloroethylene as TCE --23 DR. BOVE: Yes, they mislabeled. 24 MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): -- now, it's a 25 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 --

1 it predates Cheryl's report and the North 2 Carolina report there, then that throws that 3 out the window as far as the July 1984 4 sampling. So, I mean, if you read her report, 5 it's very clear that either she's writing it for someone else and has no idea what she's 6 7 writing about or she's been given a lot of 8 incorrect information. 9 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Well, and you 10 know, all this stuff was quoted on their 11 technology to justify the fact that they had 12 tested this well; they found it was contaminated and immediately upon ^ they never 13 14 turned that contaminated well off. But we 15 know that's a crock of crap. They didn't turn 16 the well off, so what they're trying to do 17 here is create a story line to cover their 18 ass, and I'm sick of it. 19 DR. BOVE: Jerry, okay. Morris has to go. 20 Are there any other questions for Morris? 21 MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): If you would, 22 Morris, the other thing you referenced 23 earlier, if you could e-mail me the document 24 number. 25 MR. MASLIA: The McMorris document?

1	MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): The one where
2	misquoting the TCE?
3	MR. MASLIA: Yeah.
4	MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): No, I've got
5	that. I know that one.
6	MR. MASLIA: That's the one I'm referring
7	to.
8	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Hey, Morris?
9	MR. MASLIA: Yes.
10	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Don't forget
11	to vote.
12	MR. MASLIA: I'm registered.
13	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): You've got
14	that early voting. Get over there and vote.
15	MR. MASLIA: Okay, thanks, guys.
16	MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): One last thing
17	before I go because I've got to run, too.
18	When we were talking about the different, you
19	know, the methodology ^, one thing that I am
20	concerned about is that the report be used as
21	the final judgment on everything that was in
22	the water and the concentrations in the water.
23	Now, I understand that this is an
24	epidemiological modeling for TCE and PCE, but
25	I don't want, you know, the language of the

1 report, I don't want to see or give an 2 opportunity to say, well, that was the only 3 thing there; that's the only thing we're 4 dealing with and use it to defend against this panel. Does that make sense? 5 6 DR. BOVE: It does, but we have to do what 7 we have to do. And the modeling is going to 8 have to say what we think, you know, the best 9 estimate of the exposures are. And after that 10 11 MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): The modeling dealing with the PCE and the TCE specifically, 12 13 but it doesn't preclude that there's anything 14 else in there like the benzene readings in TT-15 23, or does it not? 16 DR. BOVE: Based on monthly averages this is 17 what we have on a monthly average. It's not 18 going to, the model is not going to tell you 19 what's in the water on a day-by-day basis. MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): Okay. 20 21 DR. BOVE: And so if you want to make an 22 argument about benzene being in the water on a 23 certain day or a few days, that's something 24 that the model couldn't tell you. But, you 25 know, again, you're using the model for

1	another purpose then, a purpose that the model
2	could never really satisfy. It's really the
3	best we have, and it's scientifically, but it
4	won't answer all your questions.
5	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): I think the point
6	is that it reflects that there was benzene in
7	the water.
8	MR. MASLIA: No, it will not reflect that
9	there's benzene in the water
10	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): But the sampling
11	that you took, those do show that there was
12	benzene and those are listed in probably in
13	appendices or the chapter somewhere, right?
14	MR. MASLIA: Right. In Chapter E. Again, I
15	would refer you to Chapter E where we do have
16	a discussion of contaminants in groundwater,
17	and they specifically address three
18	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): But the whole
19	point is you have to get past the summary and
20	read the report.
21	MR. MASLIA: Well, yeah, yeah. You've got
22	to read that
23	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): A lot of people
24	just read the summary that don't have the
25	scientific data you have, and they make a lot

1	of assumptions. The point is is if you're
2	going to make any assumptions, you better have
3	read the whole report.
4	MR. MASLIA: That is correct. Our approach
5	was to have a summary document so anyone could
6	sort of see the big picture; what we did; why
7	we did it, and then for the details go to each
8	of the chapter reports.
9	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Right, right, but
10	the point is you were looking at TCE, PCE, but
11	these other chemicals are in the report.
12	MR. MASLIA: They're not modeled. They're -
13	_
14	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): They're not
15	modeled, but they are in the report, part of
16	the reading.
17	MR. MASLIA: That is correct.
18	MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): Okay, that's
19	all I want to make sure.
20	And on that note, gentlemen and Denita
21	and Perri, y'all have a great day, and y'all
22	take care.
23	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Okay, you too,
24	but we're going to continue.
25	MR. PARTAIN (by Telephone): I'm hanging up.
	1

1	MS. RUCKART: Well, I believe that's all
2	from Morris, and he is going to be leaving us
3	now. We had put on the agenda just to take a
4	five-minute break. So let's go ahead and do
5	that now, and we'll meet back in five minutes.
6	(Whereupon, a break was taken from 2:05 p.m.
7	to 2:15 p.m.)
8	MS. RUCKART: I do want to just make sure
9	everybody's back on so let's just go around
10	real quick and make sure before we start. So
11	we know Sandra's on.
12	MS. BRIDGES (by Telephone): Yes, Sandra
13	Bridges.
14	MR. TOWNSEND (by Telephone): Tom Townsend.
15	DR. CLAPP (by Telephone): Dick Clapp.
16	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Jerry
17	Ensminger.
18	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Jeff Byron.
19	MS. RUCKART: Denita?
20	MS. SIMMONS (by Telephone): Mary Ann.
21	MS. RUCKART: Denita, are you on?
22	(no response)
23	MS. RUCKART: And then we know Mike had to
24	leave.
25	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Yeah, well,

1	to answer Sandy's question, I had my phone on
2	mute because I was getting my dogs back
3	inside, but, yes, I did go down and I actually
4	did get a chance to sit down with Michelle
5	Obama yesterday. And I gave her a complete
6	layout of this nightmare, and they're fully
7	aware of it.
8	MS. BRIDGES (by Telephone): What did she
9	say?
10	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): She started
11	crying.
12	MS. BRIDGES (by Telephone): She did?
13	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Yeah.
14	MS. BRIDGES (by Telephone): That sort of
15	leads us to think that she will help us.
16	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Yeah, but
17	let's get on with this meeting. We can talk
18	about this later.
19	RECAP OF JULY 16, 2008 CAP MEETING
20	MS. RUCKART: I just want to give a brief
21	summary of the action items from our last
22	meeting in July, and I do have an update from
23	Scott Williams from some of the USMC action
24	items.
25	Mary Ann, I didn't know if you wanted

1	me to give that or if you wanted to.
2	MS. SIMMONS (by Telephone): Yes, go ahead,
3	Perri, if you don't mind.
4	MS. RUCKART: Oh, no, that's fine.
5	One thing discussed at the last
6	meeting was a request for the USMC to find out
7	where the search index for the Booz-Allen-
8	Hamilton search of CL water documents is. And
9	the response is that the USMC will review the
10	BAH index document titles for FOIA PA
11	information and provide a copy to the CAP if
12	they would like one.
13	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Yep.
14	MS. RUCKART: Okay, I thought that
15	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Is there a date
16	on that by the way?
17	MS. RUCKART: No.
18	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Oh, you need to
19	get a date.
20	MS. RUCKART: Okay, Mary Ann, do you have
21	any information about that?
22	MS. SIMMONS (by Telephone): I'll get the
23	date.
24	MS. RUCKART: There is a request for the DOD
25	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

1 website. And CAP members were also provided 2 with the 2009 APOW. 3 And the CAP wanted to know how they 4 will get copies of correspondence between 5 ATSDR and the DOD, will they be cc'd. 6 not able to cc you, but we will be sharing 7 copies of final official documents as soon as 8 we're able to get them to you. 9 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Wait a 10 minute. You said final documents, right? 11 MS. RUCKART: The correspondence. You know, 12 we have correspondence between ourselves and 13 the DOD, and we can share with you final 14 correspondence. 15 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Once it's 16 signed. 17 MS. RUCKART: Yes. 18 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): And that 19 makes it official, and then you can share that 20 with us. 21 MS. RUCKART: Yes. 22 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Okay, good. 23 What about their incoming correspondence to 24 you? 25 MS. RUCKART: That's really a question for

1	them.
2	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Why? If
3	you're the owner of it once you receive it.
4	DR. BOVE: That's the position of our higher
5	ups.
6	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Higher ups.
7	DR. BOVE: Yeah, our feeling is that
8	well, not our feeling. We will be
9	transparent. You will know what's going on.
10	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): By having one
11	side of the conversation?
12	DR. BOVE: Well, you will also see our
13	response.
14	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Who are you
15	referring to, Frank, when you say your higher
16	ups?
17	DR. BOVE: Our higher ups.
18	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): I want a name
19	as well as their address.
20	DR. BOVE: You know who they are.
21	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): No, I don't.
22	This is official. This is being recorded. I
23	want to know a name.
24	DR. BOVE: You want to know a name.
25	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Yes.

1	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): We're talking
2	about accountability in this country.
3	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Let me ask
4	you. Is it Dr. Sinks?
5	DR. BOVE: He's one of our higher ups, yes.
6	MS. RUCKART: I have to tell you that I read
7	through the transcripts from all our meetings
8	very carefully, and at the last meeting I
9	recently was reviewing the transcript so it's
10	fresh in my mind Jerry and Tom had a little
11	interchange where Tom let Jerry know that he
12	was always available. If Jerry had concerns
13	he was welcome to call or e-mail Tom. So this
14	is a perfect thing for you to get in touch
15	with Tom about.
16	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Absolutely, I
17	will, thank you, but I needed to know who it
18	was.
19	DR. CLAPP (by Telephone): ^ both names.
20	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): What?
21	DR. CLAPP (by Telephone): These are both
22	Frank and Perri's higher ups are on the
23	memorandum of understanding that we all got?
24	DR. BOVE: Yeah, the MOU by the way, that
25	was a mistake because the MOU is still in

1 draft form of when we sent it to you just so 2 you know. I don't think there'll be much 3 change in the MOU or any change, but it's 4 still -- as far as I know -- hasn't been 5 finalized and signed by both parties so just keep that in mind. We wanted to send --6 7 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): It doesn't 8 matter because you guys are the only ones that 9 are held to the letter of the law of the damn 10 thing. They don't live up to anything. 11 DR. BOVE: Well, I know but, well, whatever. 12 I mean, we're trying to just make sure you have the documents, and the APOW has been 13 14 signed by both parties so that's official. 15 And the MOU will be signed eventually, and 16 when it's signed, we'll send you the official 17 version. But it's really not that different from the APOW, and if you have any questions 18 19 about the APOW, we should, we can discuss it 20 during this call. 21 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): What's the 22 amount of money that they requested on the 23 APOW? 24 MS. RUCKART: Well, Jerry, let's just table 25 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 $15^{\rm th}$.

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

1 all about the registry process. As of noon 2 yesterday the call center has logged 81,885 3 unique registrations. There are also an 4 additional 13,667 registrations pending 5 validation to make sure they're not duplicates. 6 7 MR. BYRON (by Telephone): That's good. 8 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): A little more 9 about a hundred grand. 10 MS. RUCKART: Potentially. 11 DR. BOVE: Yeah, most of them are the --12 MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Almost half the 13 way there. 14 DR. BOVE: Most of them are from the mailing 15 to the DMDC list which had a 210,000 I think 16 it was, and so that's where most of these are 17 coming from. I think there's, we're trying to 18 get Scott to figure out how many were just 19 people who called in that weren't on the DMDC list, but he was having difficulty doing that 20 21 because of the way the data was being 22 accumulated by the contractor. 23 And he couldn't really, we could only guesstimate what it was, and so we're still 24 25 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 1 2 they go directly to the Marine Corps. 3 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Well, 4 somebody needs to tell that to somebody named 5 Candy Little. MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Well, the Marine 6 7 Corps has requested that -- this is Jeff Byron 8 -- that I get in contact with Water Survivors 9 and try to persuade them to encourage their 10 membership. And like I said it's just my 11 personal belief that they could state that it 12 is a delay, but it is still my opinion that 13 each family, or the head of each family, or 14 each individual needs to decide whether 15 they're giving up information that could be 16 harmful to them in the future. 17 MS. RUCKART: There's definitely a delay --18 MR. BYRON (by Telephone): They should not 19 allow any other individual, they should 20 consult with a lawyer, and I am no lawyer. 21 MS. RUCKART: Yes, there's definitely a 22 delay because I only send those over to the 23 Marine Corps in monthly batches. MR. BYRON (by Telephone): I understand. 24 25 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.

1 And civilian employees, they would 2 have had to start work, DOD work, in June of '74 and be on the base any time between '74 3 4 and '85. And the reason we have to limit it 5 to that is because the unit code is not in the 6 database, DMDC Personnel Database, until June 7 '75, so we don't know where they were. 8 they were active duty before '75, we don't 9 know where they were. 10 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Unless they 11 got transferred to Lejeune after that time. 12 DR. BOVE: We still wouldn't know where they 13 were before that time so --14 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Oh, yeah, 15 before that, yeah. 16 DR. BOVE: So that will -- instead of 17 210,000, that probably will knock out about a 18 quarter of them, but we're not sure because we 19 don't have the raw data. But it's still an 20 enormous cohort and will be big enough for the 21 purpose of that study. Now the civilians, it may cut more of 22 23 them, and that's a smaller cohort. So it 24 might have a bigger effect on them, but I 25 still think we'll have 5,000 or so civilians.

1 It's a smaller number, a much smaller number, 2 and it may be more difficult to see things 3 among the civilian employees, but that's what 4 we're stuck with. And we're also getting a 5 comparison group from Pendleton or from another Marine base like Pendleton, if there 6 7 is one like --8 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): You mean like 9 Lejeune. 10 DR. BOVE: Oh, okay, like Lejeune. 11 Pendleton is like Lejeune, and so, yes, either 12 way you want to look at it, yes. 13 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): So since 14 there are no other Marine Corps bases in the 15 continental United States that are, directly 16 mirror each other such as the way that 17 Pendleton and Lejeune do. 18 DR. BOVE: That's what our argument has 19 been, too. So that's the mortality study. 20 There's more to it, but I think unless you 21 have some questions about it, that's a pretty 22 straightforward study. The protocol, of 23 course, has been written. We're submitting it 24 to peer review. It has been submitted to peer 25 review and to our IRB, our Institutional

Review Board, so that's moving along.

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

1 were not on main side, we'd be in good shape. 2 And I think we were able to do that initially, 3 and I think we'll revisit this as we get 4 closer to the mortality study and double check 5 and make sure that the units we think are on, 6 that are not on main side are definitely not 7 on main side and the ones that are, are. So 8 we'll be doing that in the next couple of 9 months, and we'll want your involvement, the 10 CAP's involvement in that for sure. 11 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Now this 12 expert panel meeting you're holding on this water modeling in January, we're going to ^ ? 13 14 DR. BOVE: Well, right, right, that's 15 another topic, but yes. The CAP will be asked 16 to make a recommendation for one or two people 17 to be on the expert panel. 18 MS. RUCKART: I believe though it will be a 19 public meeting so you can come and sit in the 20 audience. 21 DR. BOVE: It will definitely be a public 22 meeting, but you will also be asked for a 23 representative, as will the Department of 24 Defense and the Navy and the Marine Corps. So 25 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 se 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.

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 --

1 How many states did we, they're not 2 using even half the state cancer registries. 3 DR. CLAPP (by Telephone): That's right. 4 DR. BOVE: And so, I mean, at one point they 5 were only using six to 12. 6 DR. CLAPP (by Telephone): Right. 7 DR. BOVE: Actually, we did talk to Dr. Kang 8 and got a list of states and the issues. 9 a number of states just either did not want to 10 participate in the study or they wanted an 11 incredible amount of money or they didn't get 12 back to him. So he's had some difficulty, and 13 he's not even dealt with half of them. 14 So I'm just saying that's why I'm 15 setting out all these caveats. We think that 16 we might have a better luck than him, but it 17 remains to be seen. So that's all for that. 18 Now are there any other questions about that 19 study? 20 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Yeah, I've 21 got one. When was this decision made not to 22 go forward with it? 23 DR. BOVE: Well, I think maybe I said it a 24 little too strongly. It's not that we're not 25 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

1	to slam the damn phone down on them because
2	they don't want to talk to them.
3	DR. BOVE: That's going to be up to the
4	Marine Corps to deal with.
5	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): That thing
6	that Mary Ann there so she can pass that on.
7	But, I mean, you know, these people are
8	extremely leery of the government now, and
9	unless you work through the ^ the people at
10	the website, I'll tell you what, you'll be
11	wasting a lot of time because most of these
12	people are going to hang up on them.
13	MS. SIMMONS (by Telephone): Like I said,
14	I'm not real familiar with the study methods,
15	but I can find out. I do believe they had
16	face-to-face meetings with some different
17	groups in Jacksonville so at least there was
18	some face-to-face.
19	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Were they
20	even victims?
21	MS. SIMMONS (by Telephone): I don't know
22	who they were.
23	DR. BOVE: And we don't have
24	MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): If you don't
25	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

1 registrations and 13,000 more that they're 2 checking to make sure there's no duplicates, 3 that's just their registration efforts. 4 When we send out the surveys, we're 5 going to be sending it to everybody who's in 6 the DMDC database. That's 210,222 former 7 Marines and Naval personnel. We're also going 8 to be sending the survey out to people whose information we have from the 1999-to-2002 9 10 ATSDR survey. So that's the parents and 11 children. There were 12,598 children. 12 it's all them plus --13 MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Have they broke 14 it down how many Marines? 15 MS. RUCKART: It's 210,222. 16 MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Yeah, as far as 17 how many of them have responded so that we can 18 get a 65 percent participation rate? 19 DR. BOVE: We haven't sent the survey out 20 yet. 21 MS. RUCKART: What we're doing right now is the preliminary work to identify who's going 22 23 to get a survey. We're going to send a survey 24 to the 210,222 Marines and Naval personnel who 25 we can get current addresses for. But first

1 of all we can't even send surveys yet because 2 we haven't gotten OMB approval. That's going 3 to happen sometime early next year. 4 So this is all the legwork to find out 5 who we can identify who's going to get a 6 survey. Then there's a multi-step process. 7 They're going to get a pre-notice letter 8 letting them know a survey will be coming. 9 Then they're going to get the survey, and then 10 we're going to have multiple follow-up 11 attempts to encourage participation if we 12 don't hear back. 13 So this is all pre-sending out the 14 survey. All these numbers we're giving you 15 are just the Marines' efforts to attempt to 16 notify and register as many people as 17 possible. 18 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Well, I have 19 a question. This is Jerry. 20 Frank, when do these protocols go up 21 to OMB? DR. BOVE: First they have to get through 22 23 our CDC process, and it's still going through 24 our CDC process which includes now getting 25 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

1 survey that are not duplicated by DMDC 2 database. 3 And the civilians will also, all 8,085 4 civilians, where we, again, get current 5 addresses. And we're going to use a locator 6 firm that specializes in getting current 7 addresses. So we feel if the people have an 8 address, we'll pretty much find it. So most 9 of these surveys should go to a person, not to 10 a dead letter office. 11 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Well, the 12 point I'm getting at is I would prefer to wait 13 until the Mayflower moving van moves away from 14 the White House with the current residents' 15 belongings before the OMB gets a look at this 16 thing. 17 DR. BOVE: Well, Jerry, I understand that. 18 But I think that I don't foresee any problem 19 with OMB. I think that --20 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): 21 DR. BOVE: -- well, I know you do. But in 22 terms of the scientific validity of this 23 survey I think we're on pretty firm ground. Now, there will be comments, and we'll have to 24 25 deal with them, but I don't think that, I

1 don't anticipate a major problem. If there 2 is, then we won't get approval until after the 3 Mayflower moving van leaves, but --4 MS. RUCKART: But keep in mind --5 DR. BOVE: -- we're trying to move forward 6 and get this moving as quickly as we can 7 because there's the other consideration that 8 people have wanted this survey for a long time 9 to get started, and we want to try to get it 10 as quickly as possible to happen. 11 MS. RUCKART: But keep in mind also that 12 this survey was mandated by Congress and OMB 13 is going to be fully aware of that. 14 Is fully aware. DR. BOVE: 15 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Dick Cheney 16 don't give a shit. 17 DR. BOVE: All right. Okay. 18 Now there is one issue about the 19 survey that I just want to emphasize that we 20 mentioned also to the NAS panel, and that is 21 that our focus is on those people we can 22 identify by these databases, the DMDC 23 database, which includes the Marines and 24 civilians and that includes Camp Pendleton 25 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

1	dates?
2	DR. BOVE: Yeah, Tom
3	MS. SIMMONS (by Telephone): I think they're
4	encouraging everybody prior to 1985.
5	DR. BOVE: Tom, this is how it will work.
6	If you are in the, if you're not part of the
7	210,000 former active duty from '75 to '85, if
8	you're not in that database, and you're not in
9	the ATSDR survey, then you would probably only
10	be known because you registered. And
11	therefore, you would get a survey, but you
12	would be analyzed separately from the larger
13	group.
14	And the reason again is to have an
15	initial, unbiased sample. If it turns out
16	that the information from those who registered
17	is very similar to the rest of the people,
18	then we might be able to combine it. But we
19	want to keep it separate because we want to
20	start off with an unbiased group.
21	MR. TOWNSEND (by Telephone): Okay. On the
22	focus group ^ does exist?
23	MS. RUCKART: Tom, can you please speak up?
24	We're having a hard time hearing you.
25	MR. TOWNSEND (by Telephone): Maybe my

1 microphone's no good. 2 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Speak into 3 it. 4 DR. BOVE: Yeah, speak into it. 5 MR. TOWNSEND (by Telephone): It's sort of 6 an on my ear kind of thing. Can you hear me 7 now? 8 DR. BOVE: Yeah. 9 MR. TOWNSEND (by Telephone): I did give 10 Headquarters a long time ago when we were 11 talking about this, I gave them a whole 12 scenario of what I thought were appropriate 13 media venues to search. I don't know who they 14 finally came up with, but --15 DR. BOVE: You're talking about the focus 16 groups now? 17 MR. TOWNSEND (by Telephone): Yeah. 18 DR. BOVE: Yeah, again, we don't have any 19 say over, I don't know anything about them. 20 We haven't seen any protocol or anything. 21 This is something the Marine Corps is doing, 22 and you'd really have to direct your question 23 to them. We don't know what, you know, this 24 is their effort. 25 MR. BYRON (by Telephone): An effort to stop

1	the study.
2	DR. BOVE: No, I think it's an effort to, as
3	Perri was outlining it, but that's all we
4	know.
5	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): I understand
6	that, but
7	DR. BOVE: But that's all we know.
8	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): come up with
9	is not enough respondents who are not going to
10	do the study is what they'll say.
11	DR. BOVE: No, no, no. It has nothing to do
12	with the study. The study has absolutely
13	nothing to do with the study or any of the
14	studies we're doing. It has something to
15	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Okay, well, I'm
16	getting a little confused about all what we're
17	talking about and trying to clarify it.
18	DR. BOVE: And I think that it gets
19	confusing also because the registration effort
20	that the Marine Corps is doing
21	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Is it all
22	encompassing?
23	DR. BOVE: The way to think about this is
24	that they are developing a large database of
25	people who they can then provide updates to

1 including the results of any of our studies or 2 any other findings. They'll have this huge 3 mailing database that they can then send 4 information to. And --5 MR. BYRON (by Telephone): My original 6 question was how does that registration, what 7 is the percentage of people that we're looking 8 for that are in the 210,000 list? 9 DR. BOVE: Again, that would be a question 10 about who gets newsletters or whatever else 11 the Marine Corps decides to send to people. 12 The health survey is different. The health 13 survey is going to go out to everyone in these databases, everyone. 14 15 MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Everyone. 16 DR. BOVE: Whether you've registered or not. 17 Registration has nothing to do with it, and 18 these focus groups have nothing to do with it. 19 It's totally separate. We thought -- at one time they were connected, and we thought it 20 21 was just too confusing and also there was this 22 bias issue, and we thought let's keep things 23 separate. 24 We went over that in a phone, a 25 conference call with the CAP last time around,

1 the last conference call we had. And we also 2 went over this with the Navy, and so I think 3 we're all on board now with the idea that the 4 registration process is something that will be 5 useful to disseminate information, but that 6 the health survey is going to be sent to 7 everybody in those databases regardless of 8 whether they register or not. Okay? 9 MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Yup. I just 10 wondered if you knew if there was a percentage 11 of respondents that were the initial 210 that 12 we're looking at for the mortality study, 13 right? 14 DR. BOVE: Well, okay, for the registrations 15 -- forget about the studies, okay? 16 MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Okay. 17 DR. BOVE: Let's just talk about the, if you 18 want to talk about the registrations, Perri 19 read out how many have registered. My 20 understanding is that they mailed it to all 21 the addresses they had from the DMDC database 22 that were correct addresses. 23 So if they have close to 100,000, and 24 they mailed it out to close to 200,000 -- I 25 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.

1 There's going to be no contact -- if they're 2 dead, there really can't be, but it doesn't 3 matter. The registration process is a 4 completely separate effort than the mortality 5 study. MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Right. 6 I just 7 wondered is there a correlation, is the people 8 we're trying to, I guess that hasn't been done 9 yet so that we won't know. And I was 10 wondering is there a percentage of respondents 11 for the registrations that are also in the 12 210? 13 MS. RUCKART: Yeah, I believe it's a high 14 percentage, but I don't have, you know, exact 15 numbers. 16 MR. BYRON (by Telephone): If we need 65 17 percent, I'm trying to gauge where we're at 18 now. 19 MS. RUCKART: No, no, that 65 percent is 20 totally separate. Let me just tell you again. 21 We have, the Marines are doing their efforts 22 to register people because they were tasked to 23 do that by Congress. That's really an 24 outreach thing so they can send information 25 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.

1 And I think if you add it all up, it's 2 something like 307,000. Just so you know it's 3 probably the largest survey ever done except 4 for the census as far as I know. So it would 5 be 65 percent of 307,000. MS. RUCKART: Which I think is 195,000. 6 7 MR. BYRON (by Telephone): That clarified 8 it. 9 DR. BOVE: So it's a big survey, and that's 10 why we're focusing our attention on this 11 survey because it's a mammoth undertaking. 12 And the mortality study is less, much less so 13 but still an undertaking, and we're focusing 14 our attention on getting those things going as 15 we'll be reanalyzing the small for gestational 16 age study and finishing up the case control 17 study. So we have a lot on our plate in the 18 next year. 19 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): Hey, you 20 guys, I've got to go. 21 MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Okay, Jerry. 22 MR. ENSMINGER (by Telephone): I'll talk to 23 you all tomorrow. 24 DR. BOVE: So that's pretty much what I said 25 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

1 important to focus on them. So we're not 2 trying to make a statement that the exposures 3 definitely caused these outcomes. That's why 4 we're not sure. That's why we want to study 5 them. 6 So that's the list. It's a pretty 7 long list now, and it's in your, we did send 8 out the testimony I gave at the NAS, the 9 slides, and it's in one of the slides. 10 MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Right, I have the 11 list. 12 DR. BOVE: So that's all. And then we want to move on to the 13 14 next item? 15 Are there any questions on these 16 studies? 17 (no response) 18 UPDATE ON FY09 BUDGET 19 MS. RUCKART: Well, we also just wanted to 20 announce that we have the signed fiscal year 21 '09 plan of work the APOW and that the DOD has 22 agreed to provide us with the funds we 23 requested for Fiscal Year '09 so that we can 24 do all the work that we propose to do. So

that's very good news.

25

1	DR. BOVE: Do you have any questions on the
2	APOW that we sent out to you?
3	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): No.
4	MS. BRIDGES (by Telephone): No.
5	MS. RUCKART: Well, that's pretty much what
6	we had proposed to discuss. Are there any
7	other questions?
8	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Not that I can
9	think of now, but if you've got a minute,
10	Frank, afterwards or if I could call you
11	tomorrow or something, I'd appreciate it
12	DR. BOVE: Sure, any time.
13	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): referring to
14	the last meeting of the NAS.
15	DR. BOVE: One thing that the NAS panel
16	encouraged me to do was to get moving on the
17	reanalysis of the small for gestational age
18	study. They said, well, even if you don't
19	have the water modeling results, you can at
20	least duplicate what was done in the previous
21	study with exposed versus unexposed. And so I
22	am cleaning up the dataset and probably will
23	have it cleaned up in the next couple of
24	weeks.
25	And we'll be able to actually do an

1 initial look certainly at exposed versus 2 unexposed taking into account any 3 interconnection issue as well. So I can do 4 that and will do that. But I really would 5 like to analyze this data using the actual 6 estimates for Hadnot Point. And so I guess this is something we can explore later, 7 8 discuss later, whether you think it's a good 9 idea to do all the analysis and report at one 10 shot or whether to split it up and report the 11 exposure versus unexposed analysis and then 12 release the later analysis using the actual 13 monthly estimates. 14 And I'd prefer to do it at one shot, 15 but I'm willing to listen to a discussion of 16 that. Maybe we can talk about that at the 17 next CAP meeting, and I'll let you know how 18 far along I've gotten. 19 MR. BYRON (by Telephone): I'd rather be 20 face-to-face for that one personally. 21 DR. BOVE: Yeah, I think that's, yeah. 22 just letting you know though I am working on 23 it so that I can do it either way. 24 MS. RUCKART: Well, that's a perfect lead 25 I just wanted to remind everybody that we

24

25

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

1	to send an e-mail about this. I'm just
2	mentioning it now so that you can begin to
3	think about it. But I will send all these
4	dates to you by e-mail.
5	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Okay.
6	Dr. Clapp?
7	DR. CLAPP (by Telephone): Yes.
8	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): I'm going to
9	probably call you, too, concerning the genetic
10	issues I brought up with the NAS just to get
11	your opinion on whether my argument was
12	MS. BRIDGES (by Telephone): Yes, Sandra
13	Bridges back on because I was cut off.
14	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): did you copy
15	that?
16	DR. CLAPP (by Telephone): Yes. I'm about
17	to go to a class right now, so it'll have to
18	be tomorrow if that's all right?
19	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Yeah, that would
20	be fine. Is there a particular time?
21	DR. CLAPP (by Telephone): Around noon time
22	actually, a little before noon, 11?
23	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Okay, and you're
24	on the east coast?
25	DR. CLAPP (by Telephone): Yeah.

1	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Okay, sounds
2	good.
3	DR. CLAPP (by Telephone): Talk to everybody
4	later.
5	MS. RUCKART: Well, I think that wraps up
6	our meeting today. Thanks for calling in and
7	for bearing with us through some of these
8	little technical difficulties. But one good
9	piece of good news to report, we do have ten
10	individual microphones. So when we come and
11	we meet in person in December, it'll be really
12	nice. Everyone will have their own
13	microphone, just about everyone will.
14	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): Progress marches
15	on.
16	Are you available to talk later or do
17	you want to just do it right after everybody
18	hangs up?
19	DR. BOVE: Is he talking to me?
20	Me? I'm available.
21	MR. BYRON (by Telephone): So long
22	everybody.
23	MS. BRIDGES (by Telephone): I'd like your
24	number in order to reach I'm sorry.
25	MS. RUCKART: Dick Clapp?

1	MS. BRIDGES (by Telephone): No, you.
2	MS. RUCKART: Me?
3	MS. BRIDGES (by Telephone): Yeah. If I can
4	or can you give me a call?
5	MS. RUCKART: Yeah, you mean today you want
6	me to call you?
7	MS. BRIDGES (by Telephone): Yeah or
8	tomorrow, either one.
9	MS. RUCKART: Well, I'm not going to be here
10	tomorrow, so it will have to either be today
11	or next week.
12	MS. BRIDGES (by Telephone): That'll be
13	fine. I'll be here.
14	MS. RUCKART: Okay, I can call you in a
15	little bit.
16	MS. BRIDGES (by Telephone): Okay, thanks.
17	(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 3:09
18	p.m.)
19	
20	

CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER

STATE OF GEORGIA COUNTY OF FULTON

I, Steven Ray Green, Certified Merit Court Reporter, do hereby certify that I reported the above and foregoing on the day of Oct. 8, 2008; and it is a true and accurate transcript of the testimony captioned herein.

I further certify that I am neither kin nor counsel to any of the parties herein, nor have any interest in the cause named herein.

WITNESS my hand and official seal this the 19th day of Oct., 2008.

STEVEN RAY GREEN, CCR, CVR-CM, PNSC

CERTIFIED MERIT COURT REPORTER

CERTIFICATE NUMBER: A-2102