



---

## Uploaded to VFC Website

▶▶ **November 2012** ◀◀

---

This Document has been provided to you courtesy of Veterans-For-Change!

Feel free to pass to any veteran who might be able to use this information!

For thousands more files like this and hundreds of links to useful information, and hundreds of "Frequently Asked Questions, please go to:

[Veterans-For-Change](#)

---

*Veterans-For-Change is a 501(c)(3) Non-Profit Corporation  
Tax ID #27-3820181*

***If Veteran's don't help Veteran's, who will?***

We appreciate all donations to continue to provide information and services to Veterans and their families.

[https://www.paypal.com/cgi-bin/webscr?cmd=\\_s-xclick&hosted\\_button\\_id=WGT2M5UTB9A78](https://www.paypal.com/cgi-bin/webscr?cmd=_s-xclick&hosted_button_id=WGT2M5UTB9A78)

---

**Note:**

VFC is not liable for source information in this document, it is merely provided as a courtesy to our members.



**Item ID Number** 05715

**Not Scanned**

**Author**

**Corporate Author**

**Report/Article Title** *Draft Minutes of the Meeting on September 14, 1987, Science Panel of the Agent Orange Working Group (AOWG) and Minutes of the Meeting on September 14, 1987, Science Panel of the Agent Orange Working Group (AOWG)*

**Journal/Book Title**

**Year** 1987

**Month/Day**

**Color**

**Number of Images** 9

**Description Notes**

\* \* \* \* D R A F T \* \* \* \*

MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 14, 1987  
SCIENCE PANEL OF THE AGENT ORANGE WORKING GROUP

The Science Panel (SP) met from 12 noon until 3:15 pm in Room 729G of the Humphrey Building in Washington, D.C. Dr. Ronald W. Hart, Director of the National Center for Toxicological Research (NCTR) and Chairman of the AOWG SP, presided. Members and guests present at the meeting are listed on the attached sign-in sheet (#1). An agenda was distributed and is attached (#2).

**STATUS REPORT / LIVING DOCUMENT:** Dr. Hart told the SP that the report was complete and being distributed to Mr. Newman, Mr. Meese and members of Congress. SP members copies would be mailed to them later this week. The report is also accessible through the NCTR VAX 780 computer 24 hours a day. Each SP member has been assigned an account and password. Instructions on how to get into the computer are included with each SP Status Report. Update capabilities also reside on the computer system. It is the request of the Chair of AOWG, Mr. Newman, Undersecretary DHHS, that the computer system be updated as new information becomes available. The SP members are therefore, henceforth, requested to keep the system continuously current.

**PRELIMINARY RANCH HAND REPORT:** Dr. Robert Miller, NCI, reported that his committee met last week to review the contractor's (AIC) report on the 2nd round (1985) of the Ranch Hand exams. The report was about 620 pages long with an additional 600 pages of supplemental materials. Dr. Miller indicated that the report was very well done with numerous analyses of the data. Dr. Miller's review committee made eight recommendations mostly dealing with publication of the material. The SP concurred with the suggestion to publish the findings. There is a 52-page draft manuscript dealing with the initial 1982 physical exam and baseline observations. Colonel William Wolfe, USAF, also indicated that manuscripts were being prepared on the CDC/DOD Ranch Handers' TCDD serum levels as well as the half-life study. Ms. Hellen Gelband, OTA, inquired as to the status of the review of the birth defects data from the initial Ranch Hand report. Colonel Wolfe indicated that the verification was on schedule for the approximately 5000 normal births and 300 births with a reported defect; he anticipated the verification to be completed in late 1988. In response to other questions from Ms. Gelband, Colonel Wolfe indicated that the reported neonatal deaths were also still being verified; and the poor peripheral pulse data seen in the 1st exam was not seen in this 2nd round of exams. Dr. Carl Keller, NIEHS, inquired about the elevated incidence of skin cancer seen in the 1st exam; Colonel Wolfe stated that skin cancer was not different from controls for this three-year interval but the incidence was still elevated when taken over the entire study period; however, the level of statistical significance was reduced when compared to the initial reporting period. Dr. Marilyn Fingerhut, NIOSH, inquired as to the validity of the continued use of the initial exposure assessment that was used to determine the cohorts in the Ranch Handers; Colonel Wolfe indicated that for this 2nd round of exams the initial exposure assessment was still being used with caveats included to discount possibilities of misclassification,

but that for the next round of exams and analyses, the TCDD serum levels would also be used to classify exposure. Dr. Keller asked if the levels of significance for the various endpoints was being examined and had there been much change from the first exam to the second; Colonel Wolfe indicated that it was being looked at but not much change had been noted. Dr. Miller made the observation that the outliers could be very interesting and should continue to be monitored. Dr. Al Young, OSTP, asked "What happens now?" Dr. Miller indicated that the summary report should be ready in early October and will be transmitted through the AOWG to the Air Force; however, because of timing considerations, the summary report will also be sent directly to the Air Force. Dr. Hart asked if the SP would be asked to review the summaries before they are released. Colonel Wolfe indicated that the SP would be asked to review the summaries as well as the manuscripts before they are submitted for publication or released. Dr. Fingerhut asked as to the purpose of the SP review; Dr. Hart indicated that a SP review would give a certain amount of credence to any manuscript.

**VA'S PROPORTIONAL MORTALITY (PMR) STUDY:** Dr. Lawrence Hobson, VA, presented a chronology of events concerning this study. About six weeks ago, the VA decided not to release the study and told the courts the same indicating that the study was still being reviewed. Several weeks ago, a reporter called Dr. Hobson and asked him to comment on the CDC article as well as the VA PMR study; Dr. Hobson declined to comment on either study even after it became evident that the reporter had a great deal of inside information already about both studies. After the Times article appeared, there was further pressure on the VA to release the study and then without consulting Dr. Hobson's group, the study was released to the press by someone higher in the management chain. Dr. Hart inquired as to why the newspapers received a copy before the SP, despite the fact that almost a month earlier he had requested a copy in a formal memo; Dr. Kang said that Dr. Hart's letter had been received while he was on vacation, but it was being processed when the release to the press took place. Dr. Houk stated that it was unfortunate that no one on the SP had seen the manuscript before the press, since the last line in the abstract and the last two lines in the manuscript might have been changed or deleted and perhaps the controversy would not have occurred. Dr. Houk handed out the CDC written comments (Attachment #3) on the study and delineated the high spots; he specifically had problems with the 94% agreement with the BIRLS tapes which he felt was very high. Dr. Houk indicated that the VA should consider the written comments provided by the various SP members, revise the manuscript accordingly, and resubmit for publication to another journal as the data needs to be in the open literature. Dr. Fingerhut distributed a copy of her written comments (Attachment #4) and suggested that the SP, or perhaps the group who originally reviewed the protocol, might have been appropriate to review this article. Specifically, Dr. Fingerhut mentioned the consideration of latency, smoking related confounders, and adequacy of the Marine comparison group. In addition, the abstract of this manuscript is a good example of what not to include or a sin of commission. Dr. Kang responded that many

comparison groups were looked at and no real differences were found; smoking was a concern to the authors but the available records did not include smoking habits. Dr. Keller distributed his written comments (Attachment #5) and emphasized that a more thorough discussion of all of the findings was necessary and that reference to Agent Orange exposure is unsupportable. Dr. Keller also indicated that the suggestion that more studies need to be done is too open-ended; Dr. Kang responded that an additional 11,000 deaths have been added to the data base over the past three years and the data is being reanalyzed. In this new data, the increased incidence of lung cancer and non-Hodgkins lymphomas is still elevated in the Marines, but not the Army. Dr. Hart wondered what the causative factor was in these apparently real increases? Is it due to Agent Orange (AO) or is something else causing the problems and could our emphasis on AO be masking the real cause. Could there be other things unique about the Marines who served in Vietnam besides serving mainly in I Corps; can these be thoroughly investigated to yield any additional information? Dr. Fingerhut asked whether the part of the country where the Marines were from was considered in any analysis; Dr. Kang said it had not been. Colonel Wolfe asked if the Marine controls were lower for non-Hodgkins lymphoma or were the Vietnam veteran higher; Dr. Kang indicated 'yes' on both accounts. Colonel Wolfe also asked if a larger group of Marines could be used since only a portion of the Marine deaths were included in this study; again, Dr. Kang indicated that it was possible. Dick Christian is attempting to identify those Army Vietnam veterans (approx. 22%) that served in I Corps to see if that subgroup mimics the findings in the Marines. Dr. Fingerhut asked if the Army and Marine control groups had been compared; Dr. Kang indicated that they had not been compared. Dr. Donald Barnes, EPA, distributed his written comments (Attachment #6) and indicated that he thought the paper was basically good and that Dr. Kang had done a good job in addressing the reviewers comments. Dr. Barnes asked if there was any age-related correlation between lung cancer and non-Hodgkins lymphomas? Dr. Kang indicated that the data had not been looked at in that manner. Dr. Miller suggested that a case control study could be conducted on the non-Hodgkins lymphomas cases. Dr. Al Young asked what happens now? Dr. Kang stated that the VA Environmental Hazards Committee has been asked to review the manuscript and will meet on October 15, which is the earliest time possible as other items will also be reviewed by this group. [An unasked question: Why has the VA's Environmental Hazards Committee only now been asked to review this manuscript?] Dr. Houk inquired as to when we might expect a congressional inquiry? In fact, Senator Cranston already has done so and we may not have the luxury to wait until after the VA Committee review to make a report. Dr. Hart requested that the VA get a written review from the Environmental Hazards Committee as soon as possible and circulate the comments to the SP. After all the comments are in, the authors of the manuscript are requested to revise the manuscript as they see fit, and circulate the revised manuscript to key members of the SP and VA Environmental Hazards Committee prior to submission to another journal. The VA concurred with this suggestion. Dr. Houk

inquired as to how we might be able to transmit to the VA upper management that the SP felt that this study was important and should be revised and resubmitted for publication? Dr. Fingerhut stated that all of the comments from the SP were aimed at helping to strengthen the manuscript and to provide a strategy for publication. Dr. Hart requested that the VA take the SP comments as helpful and positive suggestions. It was the consensus opinion of the SP that the VA's Proportional Mortality Study should be published, but that revisions were necessary to its present form.

**VA'S WOMEN VIETNAM VETERAN PROTOCOL:** Dr. Kang stated that the Congress had charged the VA to do this study through the contract mechanism both for the design and conduct of the protocol. Up until this point, the VA has only considered contractual matters and has made no attempt to alter the science. Ms. Gelband indicated that the OTA review has already been conducted and the summary report is being circulated to the OTA review panel. Dr. Houk distributed his written comments (Attachment #7) and indicated that he had serious doubts about the design of the study, including the apparent lack of any quality control/quality assurance features. Dr. Fingerhut distributed her written comments (Attachment #8) and indicated two major omissions which were (1) absence of a clear characterization of comparison groups and (2) absence of a clear and thorough evaluation of all confounders to be encountered. Dr. Jeff Lybarger, ATSDR, asked if all references to the TCDD exposure would be deleted in light of the recent CDC studies? Everyone agreed that they should be dropped. Dr. Lybarger also asked if the nurses in Vietnam were volunteers? Several issues were discussed as to the "volunteering" of the nurses in Vietnam, each of which could pose problems in the design of this study. Numerous other comments concerning the apparent naivety of the authors of the protocol were discussed. Dr. Houk wondered if the study could even be done due to the normal background of reproductive events. Dr. Hobson stated that Congress and Vietnam veteran women wanted a study, but he can't come up with a reasonable and testable hypothesis or measurable endpoint. Dr. Houk stated that if the SP and OTA agree that a meaningful study can not be done, we should say so. Dr. Keller stated that the SP had come to that conclusion on a previous occasion. Some discussion followed that attempted to delineate a meaningful study with several saying that no testable hypotheses were available, but others indicating that even a descriptive study would be better than nothing. Dr. Fingerhut suggested that a task-force be set up to examine the feasibility of designing a meaningful study. After some further discussion, Dr. Hart indicated that a task-force would be set up to include representatives from NIOSH (Dr. Fingerhut), CDC/CEH, NIEHS, VA, EPA, OTA, NCTR, DOD and would report back to the SP in 90 days. Dr. Houk offered to take the lead role.

There was unanimous agreement from the SP that this protocol would not adequately answer the basic questions that it was designed to cover. Furthermore, it is the opinion of the SP that a Vietnam veteran women's validity study can not be designed or conducted.

\*\*\*\*\* DRAFT \*\*\*\*\*

Page 5 - AOWG Science Panel - September 14, 1987

**OLD/NEW BUSINESS:** Colonel Stebbing inquired if anyone knew why the GAO was going back over Dick Christian's Congressional written testimony concerning the exposure assessment procedures. No one indicated that they knew why.

Dr. Hart thanked everyone for their input and hoped that the next meeting would be shorter than the past two. The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Prepared by John F. Young, Ph.D.  
Executive Secretary  
AOWG Science Panel

---

Approved by Ronald W. Hart, Ph.D.  
Chairman  
AOWG Science Panel

---

MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 14, 1987  
SCIENCE PANEL OF THE AGENT ORANGE WORKING GROUP

The Science Panel (SP) met from 12 noon until 3:15 pm in Room 729G of the Humphrey Building in Washington, D.C. Dr. Ronald W. Hart, Director of the National Center for Toxicological Research (NCTR) and Chairman of the AOWG SP, presided. Members and guests present at the meeting are listed on the attached sign-in sheet (#1). An agenda was distributed and is attached (#2).

**STATUS REPORT / LIVING DOCUMENT:** Dr. Hart told the SP that the report was complete and being distributed to Mr. Newman, Mr. Meese and members of Congress. SP members copies would be mailed to them later this week. The report is also accessible through the NCTR VAX 780 computer 24 hours a day. Each SP member has been assigned an account and password. Instructions on how to get into the computer are included with each SP Status Report. Update capabilities also reside on the computer system. It is the request of the Chair of AOWG, Mr. Newman, Undersecretary DHHS, that the computer system be updated as new information becomes available. The SP members are therefore, henceforth, requested to keep the system continuously current.

**PRELIMINARY RANCH HAND REPORT:** Dr. Robert Miller, NCI, reported that his committee met last week to review the contractor's (AIC) report on the 2nd round (1985) of the Ranch Hand exams. The report was about 620 pages long with an additional 600 pages of supplemental materials. Dr. Miller indicated that the report was very well done with numerous analyses of the data. Dr. Miller's review committee made eight recommendations mostly dealing with publication of the material. The SP concurred with the suggestion to publish the findings. There is a 52-page draft manuscript dealing with the initial 1982 physical exam and baseline observations. Colonel William Wolfe, USAF, also indicated that manuscripts were being prepared on the CDC/DOD Ranch Handers' TCDD serum levels as well as the half-life study. Ms. Hellen Gelband, OTA, inquired as to the status of the review of the birth defects data from the initial Ranch Hand report. Colonel Wolfe indicated that the verification was on schedule for the approximately 5000 normal births and 300 births with a reported defect; he anticipated the verification to be completed in late 1988. In response to other questions from Ms. Gelband, Colonel Wolfe indicated that the reported neonatal deaths were also still being verified; and the poor peripheral pulse data seen in the 1st exam was not seen in this 2nd round of exams. Dr. Carl Keller, NIEHS, inquired about the elevated incidence of skin cancer seen in the 1st exam; Colonel Wolfe stated that skin cancer was not different from controls for this three-year interval but the incidence was still elevated when taken over the entire study period; however, the level of statistical significance was reduced when compared to the initial reporting period. Dr. Marilyn Fingerhut, NIOSH, inquired as to the validity of the continued use of the initial exposure assessment that was used to determine the cohorts in the Ranch Handers; Colonel Wolfe indicated that for this 2nd round of exams the initial exposure assessment was still being used with caveats included to discount possibilities of misclassification, but that for the next round of exams and analyses, the TCDD serum levels would also be used to classify exposure. Dr. Keller asked if the levels of significance for the various endpoints was being examined and had there been much change from the first exam to the second; Colonel Wolfe indicated



that it was being looked at but not much change had been noted. Dr. Miller made the observation that the outliers could be very interesting and should continue to be monitored. Dr. Al Young, OSTP, asked "What happens now?" Dr. Miller indicated that the summary report should be ready in early October and will be transmitted through the AOWG to the Air Force; however, because of timing considerations, the summary report will also be sent directly to the Air Force. Dr. Hart asked if the SP would be asked to review the summaries before they are released. Colonel Wolfe indicated that the SP would be provided copies of the summaries and manuscripts after they have been reviewed by Dr. Miller's Advisory Committee and before they are released. Dr. Fingerhut asked as to the purpose of the SP review; Dr. Hart indicated that a SP review would give a certain amount of credence to any manuscript.

**VA'S PROPORTIONAL MORTALITY (PMR) STUDY:** Dr. Lawrence Hobson, VA, presented a chronology of events concerning this study. About six weeks ago, the VA decided not to release the study and told the courts the same indicating that the study was still being reviewed. Several weeks ago, a reporter called Dr. Hobson and asked him to comment on the CDC article as well as the VA PMR study; Dr. Hobson declined to comment on either study even after it became evident that the reporter had a great deal of inside information already about both studies. After the Times article appeared, there was further pressure on the VA to release the study and then without consulting Dr. Hobson's group, the study was released to the press by someone higher in the management chain. Dr. Hart inquired as to why the newspapers received a copy before the SP, despite the fact that almost a month earlier he had requested a copy in a formal memo; Dr. Kang said that Dr. Hart's letter had been received while he was on vacation, but it was being processed when the release to the press took place. Dr. Houk stated that it was unfortunate that no one on the SP had seen the manuscript before the press, since the last line in the abstract and the last two lines in the manuscript might have been changed or deleted and perhaps the controversy would not have occurred. Dr. Houk handed out the CDC written comments (Attachment #3) on the study and delineated the high spots; he specifically had problems with the 94% agreement with the BIRLS tapes which he felt was very high. Dr. Houk indicated that the VA should consider the written comments provided by the various SP members, revise the manuscript accordingly, and resubmit for publication to another journal as the data needs to be in the open literature. Dr. Fingerhut distributed a copy of her written comments (Attachment #4) and suggested that the SP, or perhaps the group who originally reviewed the protocol, might have been appropriate to review this article. Specifically, Dr. Fingerhut mentioned the consideration of latency, smoking related confounders, and adequacy of the Marine comparison group. In addition, the abstract of this manuscript is a good example of what not to include or a sin of commission. Dr. Kang responded that many comparison groups were looked at and no real differences were found; smoking was a concern to the authors but the available records did not include smoking habits. Dr. Keller distributed his written comments (Attachment #5) and emphasized that a more thorough discussion of all of the findings was necessary and that reference to Agent Orange exposure is unsupportable. Dr. Keller also indicated that the suggestion that more studies need to be done is too open-ended; Dr. Kang responded that an

additional 11,000 deaths have been added to the data base over the past three years and the data is being reanalyzed. In this new data, the increased incidence of lung cancer and non-Hodgkins lymphomas is still elevated in the Marines, but not the Army. Dr. Hart wondered what the causative factor was in these apparently real increases? Is it due to Agent Orange (AO) or is something else causing the problems and could our emphasis on AO be masking the real cause. Could there be other things unique about the Marines who served in Vietnam besides serving mainly in I Corps; can these be thoroughly investigated to yield any additional information? Dr. Fingerhut asked whether the part of the country where the Marines were from was considered in any analysis; Dr. Kang said it had not been. Colonel Wolfe asked if the Marine controls were lower for non-Hodgkins lymphoma or were the Vietnam veteran higher; Dr. Kang indicated 'yes' on both accounts. Colonel Wolfe also asked if a larger group of Marines could be used since only a portion of the Marine deaths were included in this study; again, Dr. Kang indicated that it was possible. Dick Christian is attempting to identify those Army Vietnam veterans (approx. 22%) that served in I Corps to see if that subgroup mimics the findings in the Marines. Dr. Fingerhut asked if the Army and Marine control groups had been compared; Dr. Kang indicated that they had not been compared. Dr. Donald Barnes, EPA, distributed his written comments (Attachment #6) and indicated that he thought the paper was basically good and that Dr. Kang had done a good job in addressing the reviewers comments. Dr. Barnes asked if there was any age-related correlation between lung cancer and non-Hodgkins lymphomas? Dr. Kang indicated that the data had not been looked at in that manner. Dr. Miller suggested that a case control study could be conducted on the non-Hodgkins lymphomas cases. Dr. Al Young asked what happens now? Dr. Kang stated that the VA Environmental Hazards Committee has been asked to review the manuscript and will meet on October 15, which is the earliest time possible as other items will also be reviewed by this group. [An unasked question: Why has the VA's Environmental Hazards Committee only now been asked to review this manuscript?] Dr. Houk inquired as to when we might expect a congressional inquiry? In fact, Senator Cranston already has done so and we may not have the luxury to wait until after the VA Committee review to make a report. Dr. Hart requested that the VA get a written review from the Environmental Hazards Committee as soon as possible and circulate the comments to the SP. After all the comments are in, the authors of the manuscript are requested to revise the manuscript as they see fit, and circulate the revised manuscript to key members of the SP and VA Environmental Hazards Committee prior to submission to another journal. The VA concurred with this suggestion. Dr. Houk inquired as to how we might be able to transmit to the VA upper management that the SP felt that this study was important and should be revised and resubmitted for publication? Dr. Fingerhut stated that all of the comments from the SP were aimed at helping to strengthen the manuscript and to provide a strategy for publication. Dr. Hart requested that the VA take the SP comments as helpful and positive suggestions. It was the consensus opinion of the SP that the VA's Proportional Mortality Study should be published, but that revisions were necessary to its present form.

**VA'S WOMEN VIETNAM VETERAN PROTOCOL:** Dr. Kang stated that the Congress had charged the VA to do this study through the contract mechanism both for the

design and conduct of the protocol. Up until this point, the VA has only considered contractual matters and has made no attempt to alter the science. Ms. Gelband indicated that the OTA review has already been conducted and the summary report is being circulated to the OTA review panel. Dr. Houk distributed his written comments (Attachment #7) and indicated that he had serious doubts about the design of the study, including the apparent lack of any quality control/quality assurance features. Dr. Fingerhut distributed her written comments (Attachment #8) and indicated two major omissions which were (1) absence of a clear characterization of comparison groups and (2) absence of a clear and thorough evaluation of all confounders to be encountered. Dr. Jeff Lybarger, ATSDR, asked if all references to the TCDD exposure would be deleted in light of the recent CDC studies? Everyone agreed that they should be dropped. Dr. Lybarger also asked if the nurses in Vietnam were volunteers? Several issues were discussed as to the "volunteering" of the nurses in Vietnam, each of which could pose problems in the design of this study. Numerous other comments concerning the apparent naivety of the authors of the protocol were discussed. Dr. Houk wondered if the study could even be done due to the normal background of reproductive events. Dr. Hobson stated that Congress and Vietnam veteran women wanted a study, but he can't come up with a reasonable and testable hypothesis or measurable endpoint. Dr. Houk stated that if the SP and OTA agree that a meaningful study can not be done, we should say so. Dr. Keller stated that the SP had come to that conclusion on a previous occasion. Some discussion followed that attempted to delineate a meaningful study with several saying that no testable hypotheses were available, but others indicating that even a descriptive study would be better than nothing. Dr. Fingerhut suggested that a task-force be set up to examine the feasibility of designing a meaningful study. After some further discussion, Dr. Hart indicated that a task-force would be set up to include representatives from NIOSH (Dr. Fingerhut), CDC/CEH, NIEHS, VA, EPA, OTA, NCTR, DOD and would report back to the SP in 90 days. Dr. Houk offered to take the lead role.

There was unanimous agreement from the SP that this protocol would not adequately answer the basic questions that it was designed to cover. Furthermore, it is the opinion of the SP that a Vietnam veteran women's validity study can not be designed or conducted.

**OLD/NEW BUSINESS:** Colonel Stebbing inquired if anyone knew why the GAO was going back over Dick Christian's Congressional written testimony concerning the exposure assessment procedures. No one indicated that they knew why.

Dr. Hart thanked everyone for their input and hoped that the next meeting would be shorter than the past two. The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Prepared by John F. Young, Ph.D.  
Executive Secretary, AOWG Science Panel

Approved by Ronald W. Hart, Ph.D.  
Chairman, AOWG Science Panel