FINAL REPORT

"HEALTH EFFECTS OF LOW LEVEL IONIZING RADIATION"

CONTRACT NRC-01-78-011

NETIC RESEARCH, INC.

POOR ORIGINAL

Seybold Road

1393 068

Madison, Wisconsin 53719 • Phone 608-273-0350 7911260 \$024

NOTICE

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for accuracy, com leteness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

Technical Report Documentation Page

· •

1. Report No.	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.		
4. Title and Subtitle		5. Report Date		
		Tanuary 1979		
Health Effects of 1 Radiation	Low Level Ionizing	6. Performing Organization Code		
		8. Performing Organization Report No.		
7. Author's) David Redmon	nd, Lawrence A. Klimko,			
Performing Gramination Name and A	44	10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)		
Vinatia Dagaarah	Tao			
Kinetic Research, .	inc.	11 Contract or Grant No.		
6613 Seybold Road	-			
Madison, WI 53/19	9	NRC-01-78-011		
		13. Type of Report and eriod Covered		
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Addre	53	Final Report		
U. S. Nuclear Regul	latory Commission	October, 1978 through		
Office of Standards	s Development	January, 1979		
Washington, D. C.	20555	14. Sponsoring Agency Code		
Abstract This paper reports the re Regulatory Commission pur exposure, and work histo who were deceased by the	esults of an analysis of a da rported to contain selected i ry data for workers employed end of 1972.	ata tape provided by the Nuclear information including mortality, at the Hanford Atomic Facility		
16. Abstract This paper reports the re Regulatory Commission pur exposure, and work histor who were deceased by the The intent of the study to cancer on exposure to other variables provided derived. The analysis m discriminant analysis, c	esults of an analysis of a da rported to contain selected i ry data for workers employed e end of 1972. was to analyze this data for b low level ionizing radiation I. If possible, dose response ethods used included descript categorical analysis, and line	ata tape provided by the Nuclear information including mortality, at the Hanford Atomic Facility dependencies of death due n with proper control for e relationships were to be tive univariate analysis, ear logistic regression.		
16. Abstract This paper reports the re- Regulatory Commission pur- exposure, and work histor who were deceased by the The intent of the study of to cancer on exposure to other variables provided derived. The analysis m discriminant analysis, c Unfortunately, examinati discovered during the pr the conclusion that the representation of the tr workers. In particular, not consistent with the Therefore, while analysis that the results of this the real world.	esults of an analysis of a da rported to contain selected is ry data for workers employed end of 1972. was to analyze this data for low level ionizing radiation . If possible, dose response ethods used included descript ategorical analysis, and line on of the data and investigat toject concerning this data ar data provided is not a consis- tue facts concerning the expos- the data provided has certain data as it is reported to be as of the data is presented, of analysis accurately reflect	ata tape provided by the Nuclear information including mortality, at the Hanford Atomic Facility dependencies of death due n with proper control for e relationships were to be tive univariate analysis, ear logistic regression. tion of background material nd its sources has lead to stent, reliable, and authentic sure experience of Hanford in characteristics which are at its most reliable source. one should not presume relationships which exist in		
 Abstract This paper reports the refrequlatory Commission pure exposure, and work histor who were deceased by the The intent of the study to cancer on exposure to other variables provided derived. The analysis mediscriminant analysis, contervariables provided derived. The analysis mediscriminant analysis, contervariables provided derived. The analysis, conterval, examinating the provided during the provided duri	esults of an analysis of a da rported to contain selected is ry data for workers employed end of 1972. was to analyze this data for low level ionizing radiation low level ionizing radiation low level ionizing radiation low level ionizing radiation low level ionizing radiation the possible, dose response ethods used included descript ategorical analysis, and line con of the data and investigat roject concerning this data and data provided is not a consis- rue facts concerning the expos- the data provided has certa: data as it is reported to be is of the data is presented, of analysis accurately reflect lemiology, Health lation, Occupational through etry, Logistic anford Atomic hogenesis	At tape provided by the Nuclear information including mortality, at the Hanford Atomic Facility dependencies of death due n with proper control for e relationships were to be tive univariate analysis, ear logistic regression. tion of background material nd its sources has lead to stent, reliable, and authentic sure experience of Hanford in characteristics which are at its most reliable source. one should not presume relationships which exist in Statement t is available to the public it he National Technical tion Service, Springfield, a, 22161.		
 Abstract This paper reports the representation of the study to cancer on exposure to other variables provided derived. The analysis mediscriminant analysis, contervariables provided derived. The analysis mediscriminant analysis, contervariables provided derived. The analysis mediscriminant analysis, contervariables provided derived. The analysis, conterval, examination of the transformer during the provided dur	esults of an analysis of a da rported to contain selected is ry data for workers employed end of 1972. was to analyze this data for low level ionizing radiation low level ionizing radiation low level ionizing radiation low level ionizing radiation the possible, dose response ethods used included descript ategorical analysis, and line on of the data and investigat coject concerning this data and data provided is not a consis- rue facts concerning the expos- the data provided has certa- data as it is reported to be s of the data is presented, of analysis accurately reflect demiology, Health ation, Occupational through etry, logistic anford Atomic Nogenesis 20. Security Clessif. (of this page)	At tape provided by the Nuclear information including mortality, at the Hanford Atomic Facility dependencies of death due n with proper control for e relationships were to be tive univariate analysis, ear logistic regression. tion of background material nd its sources has lead to stent, reliable, and authentic sure experience of Hanford in characteristics which are at its most reliable source. one should not presume relationships which exist in		
 Abstract This paper reports the re Regulatory Commission pur exposure, and work histor who were deceased by the The intent of the study to to cancer on exposure to other variables provided derived. The analysis m discriminant analysis, c Unfortunately, examinati discovered during the pr the conclusion that the representation of the tr workers. In particular, not consistent with the Therefore, while analysis that the results of this the real world. 7. Key Words 10 izing Radiation, Epid Effects of Ionizing Radi Health, Radiation Dosime Models, Radiobiology, Ha Facility, Cancer, Carcin 19. Security Cleased. (of this report) Unclassified 	esults of an analysis of a da rported to contain selected is ry data for workers employed end of 1972. was to analyze this data for low level ionizing radiation l. If possible, dose response ethods used included descripted ategorical analysis, and line con of the data and investigate roject concerning this data are data provided is not a consist rue facts concerning the exposed the data provided has certain data as it is reported to be s of the data is presented, of analysis accurately reflect lemiology, Health ation, Occupational through etry, Logistic anford Atomic togenesis 20. Security Clessif. (of this page) Unclassified	At tape provided by the Nuclear information including mortality, at the Hanford Atomic Facility dependencies of death due n with proper control for e relationships were to be tive univariate analysis, ear logistic regression. tion of background material nd its sources has lead to stent, reliable, and authentic sure experience of Hanford in characteristics which are at its most reliable source. one should not presume relationships which exist in Statement tt is available to the public the National Technical tion Service, Springfield, a, 22161. 21. No. of Pages 22. Price		

and a

0Ľ

*

1. 20. 1

A. A.

5

:

1 ð

Form DOT F 1700.7 (8-72)

Reproduction of completed page authorized

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to gratefully acknowledge the consulting contributions of Dr. J. Crowley, Dr. A. Tsiatis, and especially Dr. K. Clifton. In addition, the CTM, Dr. M. Parsont, provided welcome encouragement.

Personnel at other institutions who provided helpful background materials include Dr. W. Weyzen, Howard Fore, Dr. B. Breitenstein, and Kenneth Heid. Their assistance is appreciated.

The dedicated and hardworking efforts of our Administrative Assistant, Kathy Ragan, in the administration of this project and preparation of the final manuscript was invaluable and is gratefully appreciated.

. 1393 071

LIST OF FIGURES

		Page
1.	Copy of the documentation provided with the data by NRC.	8
2.	Reported source summary of exposure data at Hanford from Ref. 13.	21
3.	Reported preliminary sample record from Oak Ridge for Hanford data as reported in Ref. 13.	22
4.	Average yearly dose received by exposed workers while employed based on semi-time averaged doses.	24
5.	Percent of deaths due to cancer as a function of age for whites in various population.	41
6.	Percent of deaths from respiratory cancer for exposed white males as a function of age at death.	63
7,	log $\left[p/(1-p)\right]$ for exposed white males as a function of age at death, where p is the percent of deaths from respiratory cancer versus non-cancer.	64
8.	Scatterplot of DOS6-10 versus initial year of employment for exposed white males with respiratory cancer or no cancer as cause of death. Cases with DOS6-10 less or equal to 15 have not been plotted.	70
9.	Scatterplot of DOS11-15 versus initial years of employment for exposed white males with respiratory cancer or no cancer as cause of death. Cases with dose less or equal to 10 have not been plotted.	70
10.	Scatterplot of DOS16-20 versus initial years of employment for exposed white males with respiratory cancer or no cancer as cause of death. Cases with dose less or equal to 25 have not been plotted.	71
11.	Scatterplot of DOS6-10 versus year of death for exposed white males with respiratory cancer or no cancer as cause of death. Cases with DOS6-10 less or equal to 15 have not been plotted.	71
12.	Scatterplot of DOS11-15 versus year of death for exposed white males with respiratory cancer or no cancer as cause of death. Cases with dose less or equal to 10 have not been plotted.	72

	LIST OF FIGURES (CONT.)	Page
13.	Scatterplot of DOS16-20 versus year of death for exposed white males with respiratory cancer or no cancer as cause of death. Cases with dose less or equal to 25 have not been plotted.	72
L4.	Plot of average DOS6-10 for workers with the specified initial year of employment. Only exposed white males with respiratory cancer or no cancer as cause of death are used.	74
15.	Plot of average DOS11-15 for workers with the specified initial year of employment. Only exposed white males with respiratory cancer or no cancer as cause of death are used.	74
16.	Plot of average DOS16-20 for workers with the specified initial year of employment. Only exposed white males with respiratory cancer or no cancer as cause of death are used.	75
17.	Plot of average DOS6-10 for workers with specified year of death. Only exposed white males with respiratory cancer or no cancer as cause of death are used.	75
18.	Plot of average DOS11-15 for workers with the specified year of death. Only exposed white males with respiratory cancer or no cancer as cause of death are used.	76
19.	Plot of average DOS16-20 for workers with the specified year of death. Only exposed white males with respiratory cancer or no cancer as cause of	

1393 073

76

5

death are used.

LIST OF TABLES

I

I

I

I

I

		Page
1.	Number of deaths by sex and race.	12
2.	Number and percentage of cases characterized as being exposed.	12
3.	Cancer groupings used for the purpose of analysis.	13-14
4.	Mean doses by cause of death. Comparison between results of Mancuso, et al. (Ref. 1), and results of current analysis.	36
5.	Proportions of death due to cancer by age and dose for male workers. Comparison between results of Mancuso, et al. (Ref. 1), and results of current analysis.	37
6.	An example of a chi-square analysis of dose versus cause of death.	39
7.	Breakdown of cases for various subgroups considered in the analysis.	42
8.	Summary of stepwise discriminant analyses, showing the order in which the variables were chosen for inclusion in the model.	45-49
9.	Means of variables used in discriminant analysis of respiratory cancers; no cancers group includes all non-cancer deaths.	57
10.	Standard deviation of variables used in discriminant analysis of respiratory cancers; no cancer group includes all non-cancer deaths.	58
11.	F-ratios at initial step of discriminant analysis on exposed white males using two groups: death from respiratory cancer and death from non-cancer.	59
12.	F-ratios, classification functions and classification matrix at first step of discriminant analysis on exposed white males using two groups: death from respiratory cancer and death from non-cancer.	n 60
13.	F-ratios, classification functions and classification matrix at second step of discriminant analysis on exposed white males using two groups: death from respiratory cancer and death from non-cancer.	n 61
14.	F-ratios, classification functions and classification matrix at third step of discriminant analysis on exposed white males using two groups: death from respiratory cancer and death from non-cancer.	n 62
15.	Numbers of and percent of respiratory cancers as a function of age for exposed white males.	63
	vi 1707 07	٨

LIST OF TABLES (CONT.)

16. Results of fitting eight logistic regression models using respiratory cancer and no cancer as the two response categories. Only exposed white males are included in the model. Variables which have no entry for a particular model were not used in that model. For each model, the first value under the variable is the coefficient of that variable in the logistic regression model, while the second value (below in parentheses) is the chi-square value for a test of statistical significance of that variable. All chi-square values have one degree of freedom.

1393 075

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I

SECTION	1.0	Introduction	PAGE 1- 3
SECTION	2.0	The Data	4
	2.1	Summary of Primary Conclusions From the Background Review	5
	2.2	Historical Background	6-11
	2.3	General Characteristics of the Data	12-14
	2.4	Issues Relating to Radiation Dose	15
	2.4.1	Penetrating Dose	16-17
	2.4.2	Dosimetry Aspects	18-25
	2.4.3	Pre- and Post- Employment Doses	26-28
	2.5	Other Concerns	29
	2.5.1	Other Exposures	29
	2.5.2	Cause of Death	30
	2.5.3	Initial and Final Year of Employment and Total Years of Employment	30-31
	2.5.4	Monitored versus Exposed	31
	2.6	Comparison to Data of T. Mancuso	32-37
SECTION	3.0	Data Analysis	38
	3.1	Methodology and Data Survey Results	38-42
	3.1.1	Discriminant Analyses	43-52
	3.1.2	Logistic Regression Models	53-55
	3.2	Further Detailed Analysis of Respiratory Cancer	56-77
SECTION	4.0	Principle Conclusions	78-79
SECTION	5.0	References	80-31

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT.)

APPENDICES PAGE Appendix A Univariate Distributions of All Variables Except Race, Sex, and Exposed-Unexposed For All Cases and For Exposed White Males A-1 - A-23 Appendix B Cause of Death Distribution B-1 - B-14 Appendix C Program and Output Which Reviews Dose Time Histories and Generates Average Yearly Dose of Workers C-1 - C-9 Appendix D Definition of Variable Names D-1 - D-4 Appendix E Summary of Logistic Modeling E-1 - E-6

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years a considerable amount of attention has come to focus on the biological effects of low levels of ionizing radiation as a possible occupational hazard for workers in the atomic industry. Historically, radiation protection criteria have attempted to provide conservative guidelines for avoidance of harm consistent with reasonable practicability in the workplace. In current recommendations permissable levels have been set based in part on data gathered at dose levels and in circumstances quite different from those prevalent in occupational situations (e.g. Japanese atomic bomb victims, radiotherapy patients, and the like). Until recently there have not been extensive and reliable analyses of the effects of chronic, low dose exposures to ionizing radiation in a large human population.

In 1964 a large scale epidemological study of employees in AEC contractor facilities was undertaken in a project funded by AEC and directed by Dr. Thomas F. Mancuso of the University of Pittsburgh. This project, "Study of the Lifetime Health and Mortality Experience of Employees of ERDA (earlier AEC) Contractors" culminated in the publication of a paper by Mancuso, Alice Stewart, and George Kneale in <u>Health Physics</u> (Ref. 1) wherein definite statistical associations were reported between the incidence of various types of cancer and exposure to radiation for workers at the Hanford (Washington) Atomic Facility. The analysis also produced estimates of doubling doses for certain cancers which were much lower than had generally been estimated previously.

-1-

Mancuso's findings have resulted in considerable discussion and have motivated further analyses and re-analyses of exposure and mortality data from Hanford. The work presented in this paper is an analysis of certain data provided by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission purported to contain causes of death, exposure records, and other pertinent information for workers once employed at Hanford and now deceased. This data was to be analyzed for the possible dependence of death due to cancer on exposure to ionizing radiation including derivation of dose response relationships where appropriate.

The statistical methodologies selected were descriptive univariate examinations of the data, discriminant analysis, categorical methods using chi-square and analysis of trend tests, and linear logistic regression. Results of these analysis are presented.

Unfortunately the data provided by NRC was very poorly documented and could not be meaningfully analyzed without further information concerning definitions of terms and units of quantities. In the process of investigating these matters and in attempting to answer other questions which were of concern to us we have discovered a number of problems with the data which cast into doubt any conclusions that might be drawn from the statistical analysis.

Consequently, a large part of the material presented in this report has to do with examination of the data with regard to its consistency, authenticity, reliability, and usefulness for purposes of analysis. It is our conclusion based on the information which we currently have in hand that the data presented to us cannot be regarded as a usable representation of the actual experience of workers at Hanford. In particular, the data does not represent the reported state of the data maintained at its most reliable source. While analysis of the data can be and is presented, one should not and we do not presume that the results of this analysis accurately reflect relationships which exist in the real world.

2.0 THE DATA

In any statistical analysis it is important ... understand the background to the data for two reasons: a) to avoid pitfalls such as confounding effects not represented in the variables under consideration; and, b) to develop meaningful interpretations for the results identified. For these reasons we conducted a background review of the data and have presented the results for the reader in sections 2.1 through 2.5 of this report. More specifically, section 2.1 includes a brief summary of primary conclusions; followed by section 2.2, a discussion of the historical origins of the data; section 2.3, a general characterization of the data; section 2.4, issues relating to the dose variables; and finally, section 2.5 includes issues relating to cause of death and other factors not contained in the data subset.

2.1 Summary of Primary Conclusions From the Background Review

Two primary conclusions have been developed from our background review of the data. The first is that neither all of the available data elements (variables) nor all the available cases have been provided to us for a thorough and complete analysis. This conclusion, in and of itself, is obviously of particular concern since the detail and accuracy with which any analyses can be conducted and subsequent interpretations developed is impeded.

The second primary conclusion is that the authenticity and reliability of the data provided to us for analysis has not been adequately established. Clearly, this conclusion presents problems in making statements about the true "state of nature" based on observations obtained from the data.

It cannot be overemphasized that the above conclusions can significantly influence the understanding and interpretation of the analyses presented in the following sections.

1393 082

de:

2.2 Historical Background

It has become apparent during the project that the exact background details of the data are not fully known by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). The written documentation provided to us at the beginning of the project, shown in its entirety in Figure 1, was inadequate for a thorough understanding of the data and would have provided a serious problem in the interpretation of any analyses conducted. As a result, we have made an effort to identify some of the historical and technical aspects of the data. A brief review of the historical aspects of the data will be provided here.

The study was motivated, at least in part, by a series of events. An understanding of the project can be facilitated by a brief chronological presentation of the events preceding it. Our understanding of this sequence of events is presented below.

In 1964 the Atomic Energy Commission initiated and funded a program entitled, "The study of the lifetime health effects and mortality experience of employees of AEC contractors" under the direction of Dr. Thomas Mancuso at the Universtiy of Pittsburgh's School of Public Health. This program AT(30-1)-3394 was continued under contracts CHAT(11-1)-3428 and E(11-1)-3428 when the Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA) was established incorporating the AEC. The stated purpose of the study is given in the following quote from the abstract of an early progress report:

"The objective of this study is to follow cohort employee populations of selected AEC Contractor installations, to test the feasibility of using personnel, employment, medical and radiation records in establishing the relationships, if any, between mortality

-6-

patterns and levels of radiation exposure. The reason for the study is the absence of empirically tested information pertaining to human populations exposed to recorded low levels of radiation over long periods of time. The procedure devised for the test runs is: to establish a series of cohorts of populations at each facility, those continuously employed as well as those separated, for each year, by tracing these individuals and sibling controls through Social Security records to determine those who have died and their place and date of death; to obtain death certificates to establish age-sex specific death rates; and to analyze causes of death for those with radiation exposure and work-connected health hazards in comparison to appropriate non-exposed controls. The following AEC Contractor facilities have been selected for the test runs: Oak Ridge X10, Oak Ridge Y12, Oak Ridge K25, Hanford and several small feed materials plants. These facilities provide large populations with long intervals of operation. Pilot studies of radiation exposure records of persons exposed in atomic energy facilities will be carried out to determine the average occupational exposure of these populations and appropriate confidence limits in exposure estimates for individuals and various sub-populations."

Format of Tape

4

Cols.	Content					
1-4	age at death (to nearest tenth)					
5-6	year of initial employment					
7-8	final year of employment					
9-11	total years of employment (to nearest tenth)					
12-14	cause of death (primary cause) ICD 8th revision					
15	race 0 = non-white, 1 = white					
16	sex 0 = female, 1 = male					
17	exposure code $0 = non-exp$, $1 = exp$.					
18-23	cumulative lifetime dose					
24-29	cumulative dose 3 years before death					
30-35	" 5					
36-41	" 10					
42-47	" 15					
48-53	" 20					
54-59	" 25					
60-61	year of death					

Figure 1. Copy of the documentation provided with the data by NRC.

One of the facilities considered by the Mancuso study was the Hanford Atomic Facility in Richland, Washington. Around 1974 Dr. Milham of the Department of Public Health for the State of Washington reported (Ref.2) that his analysis showed an increased incidence of cancer in persons who had worked at Hanford and died in Washington, relative to other persons in the State of Washington. This report spurred analysis of the data which was being collected by Mancuso's study group. Eventually Mancuso, et. al., prepared a paper (Ref.1) which reported a relationship between cancer and low level ionizing radiation. At the same time his contract was terminated by ERDA. In the ensuing furor other persons analyzed the same or similar data including S. Marks of the Battelle Northwest Laboratories (Ref.3) and C. Land of the National Cancer Institute (Ref.4). In addition, Congressional hearings were held (Ref.5). Apparently the NRC was not in a position to address the issue at the hearings and this subsequently led to the current program.

In this program NRC decided to use the data employed by Land, rather than study the manford data stored at Hanford. Thus, a brief review of the origin of Land's data is in order.

Land had originally requested data from the Oak Ridge Data Processing Facility. Oak Ridge had some version of the data collected in the Mancuso study for the Hanford employees. It is not known to us how or when the data given to Land got from Hanford to Oak Ridge. Land requested, apparently in late 1976, a set of variables for analysis. The rationale for the variables selected is not known to us.

-9-

It has been reported to us that the data used by Land is identical with the data used by us. The reported course of events is that a copy of Land's tape was made at Geomet Corporation, a computing services contractor, and was submitted to NRC. NRC then utilized the facilities of Harry Diamond Laboratories to prepare copies of that tape for use by the three contractors on this project. One of those tapes was provided to us. As a consequence of the numerous data handling efforts from Hanford to Hanford Environmental Health Foundation, to Oak Ridge, it is extremely difficult to determine precisely what the available data represents. In an effort to alleviate this problem we requested additional information regarding the data, as well as additional data elements. Our request was not implemented. As an alternative course of action, we took some characteristics of Land's data reported in his study and compared them with the data we received. We did the same with Mancuso's study. The key findings of these comparisons are presented below. A more detailed presentation of these results appears in Section 2.6.

The frequency of each cause of death in our file matches Land's data (Ref. 4), except for two cases in our file which have no cause of death. Our cumulative doses can be shown to be significantly different from Mancuso's reported in Ref. 1. Unfortunately, we were unable to compare cumulative dose frequencies with those in Land's data.

With respect to sample size, we have more cases than Mancuso (Ref. 1), the same number of cases as Land (Ref. 4), and fewer than reported by Mancuso in later reports (Ref. 6 and 7). Perhaps most importantly, we have shown that the

-10-

data we have received has doses in time intervals which are not possible in the data collection scheme purported to have been followed in the Hanford study (Ref 8, 9, 10). Specifically there are 138 cases which have reported dose subsequent to the final year of employment. The details and ramifications of this finding are discussed more fully in Section 2.4.3.

It should be noted that our impression, based on among other things, conversations with Howard Fore at Oak Ridge, is that Dr. Mancuso never requested nor was ever sent a data set identical with that used here and by Land. Whether the problems that exist in this data would be present in data used by Mancuso is open to question. In any case, it is certain that the actual data analyzed in the Mancuso paper (Ref. 1) is not the same as that used by Land and by us.

2.3 General Characteristics of the Data

As discussed in section 2.2 the data is an extracted subset, characterised as Hanford employees who have died, of the larger set which includes employees both living and dead. It does not represent a large number of mantenance workers (~6500) employed by Jones Maintenance Contractors, who are reported to have received higher doses than the average Hanford worker (Ref. 11); nor does it include AEC employees who worked at Hanford.

The data consists of 3992 cases which primarily represent white males as shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Number of Deaths by Sex and Race

SEX

		Male	Female
PACE	White	3585	379
	Other	25	3

Of the 3585 white male cases, 62.1 percent were characterized as exposed as shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Number and Percentage of Cases Characterized as Being Exposed.

SEX

		Male	Female
PACE	White	2226/62.1%	116/30.6%
laice	Other	12/48.0%	0/0%

It should be noted that the use of the term "exposed" may be somewhat misleading, since those employees who

are classified as non-exposed may be the result of them not being monitored for radiation rather than not being exposed to radiation. This issue is discussed more fully in section 2.5.

Histograms of each variable have been made and are contained in Appendix A to facilitate the readers understanding of at least some of the more general features of the data. The histogram presented for each variable is a frequency distribution over the values taken on by the particular variable.

The "cause of death" frequency distribution is included in Appendix B. However, two data omissions in the file must be noted. First, 5 cases had an invalid initial year of employment and the same 5 cases had invalid total years of employment. Secondly, two cases had no cause of death.

For the purposes of relating cancer to radiation various groupings of ICD (revision 8) codes were used. These are indicated below together with the total number of cases and the number of exposed cases for each group.

TABLE 3

Cancer Groupings Used for the Purpose of Analysis

General Description	ICD CODE	Total Exposed White Male Cases	Total Cases
lip, mouth, pharynx	140-149	14	14
esophagus and stomach	150-151	35	57
small intestine	152	1	2
large intestine and rectum	153-154	66	102
liver and bile	155-156	10	20
pancreas	157	32	53

TABLE 3 (Cont.)

Cancer Groupings Used for the Purpose of Analysis

General Description	ICD CODE	Total Exposed White Male Cases	Total Cases
	158	1	3
	159	1	1
	160	2	2
lung	161-163	136	213
bone	170	1	1
	171	3	6
skin	172-173	10	16
breast	174		31
	180		7
	181	에 집중, 연구물 등 가장	
	182-183-184		62
prostate	185	21	42
	186	3	4
	187	7	11
	188		
urinary organs	189	15	25
eye, brain nerves	190-192	18	29
thyroid	193	1	2
	194		1
	195	2	5
	196	- 1979 - 1976	1
secondary lung	197	8	13
	198	2	2
unspecified secondary	199	13	30
	200-202,204	30	44
multiple myeloma	203	8	11
	205-206	7	14
	207-209	2	7

-14-

2.4 Issues Relating to Radiation Dose

An adequate identification of background information for the dose variables contained in the data extract file was not provided. This lack of information was perhaps due in part to the background of the data discussed in section 2.2. In any case thorough documentation of the dosimetry and data collection practices relevant to the dose variables was not provided during the program. In our own review of the Mancuso Study progress reports, it became clear that there were many potential pitfalls which could exist in the data we had received, depending on when, where and how the data extract file was created. In attempting to answer the questions which arose about what the dose data actually represented, it was the case that we time and time again identified inconsistencies between one information source and another (e.g. various persons and written reports) and between information sources and the actual data extract file. It is the prevalence of this inconsistency which perhaps is most troubling in trying to assess just exactly what the data extract file represents. Consequently, we have been able to establish what the data file at Hanford is supposed to represent; we have not been able to determine whether in fact the data we have is representative of that data.

There are at least three areas of uncertainty with respect to the dose variables in the data extract file and one general area relating to the exclusion of data believed to be relevant to a thorough analysis. These are discussed below.

-15-

2.4.1 Penetrating Dose

The dose variable we are supposed to have received is classified by NRC as the "penetrating radiation dose" received by a Hanford employee. Clearly, numerous questions arise as to the definitions and dosimetry used to calculate penetrating dose. These questions are aside from the question of when the dose was received.

It has been reported to us (ref.12) that the penetrating dose variable consists of a summation of various dose sources. Specifically, it is the summation of the gamma, neutron, and Tritium doses plus .35 of the x-ray dose.

It is generally accepted that as a minimum quality factors are necessary in the combination of exposures from various dose sources if such combinations are to be done at all. It has been reported to us that the penetrating dose we have is a simple summation (as described above) of whatever was recorded for each dose source. The next question, then, is what was recorded for each source? To this question we have received two conflicting answers. The first is that quality factors have been applied to the data using 1.0 for gamma rays 10 for fast neutrons, 3 for slow neutrons, 1.0 for x-rays and 1.7 for Tritium, although the value 1.0 may have been used at times for Tritium. To some radio-biologists these quality factors may inadequately reflect the relative efficiencies of each source when interacting with human cells. The other explanation to us was that the data was simply a direct report of various badge readings. It may of course, be the case that both of these reports are correct, but apply to different forms of the Hanford data files. As was stated in section 2.2, which form of the file we have is questionable.

-16-

j,

An issue related to quality factors is the combination of the exposure and dose units, namely Roentgens and rads. This concern is applicable to the understanding of what manipulations were applied to data from pocket ionization chambers.

Further, the use of Tritium is particularly puzzling since Tritium becomes involved with the body through inhalation or other means and represents a contribution to the body burden as opposed to a "penetrating dose". At the same time other internal sources have not been included with the penetrating dose. The issue of whether internal burden should be combined with penetrating dose is open to considerable debate.

2.4.2 Dosimetry Aspects

How the reported doses were obtained in the first place is an important issue quite independent of the possible manipulations discussed in the previous section. Most notably the general pattern for the dosimetry is that procedures changed over time, as might be expected. For some procedure changes the consequences may be significant or at best not be clear; in others it is not clear as to whether certain procedures have actually been implemented in the data set we were provided with. Some of the more notable areas of concern are discussed below.

One notable change through time appears to have been improvements in badge quality. These improvements have come both in the expansion of dose sources considered (e.g. neutrons, various X-ray sources, etc.) as well as improvements in the badge sensitivity to low level exposures In particular there were at least three different badge types used successively prior to 1964 (ref. 8), each representing an improvement to the previous version. In particular, the ability to accurately assess neutron dose may have been totally inadequate prior to 1950. Further, there have been reports that some doses for workers may have been estimated from work area measurements rather than from actual employee badge readings.

Interpretation of any analysis results would require full consideration of the effects induced by changes in both the sensitivity and quality of the dose data if these effects exist in our data extract file.

-18-

To further complicate matters, procedures in recording the badge data have changed over time. Two changes are notable here. First, the frequency of badge readings has changed dramatically over the years. In the early years badges were read weekly, followed by a change to bi-weekly readings. Subsequently the badges were read monthly and most recently Ladge readings were taken yearly. Keep in mind that up until approximately 1963 or 1964, the badge threshold was approximately 30 mr and that the reporting procedure for the data collection process may have been to record zero dose if the threshold was not exceeded. When there was no badge reading threshold a zero may still have been recorded if the dose were below 20 mr.

The consequence of the procedure used to record the doses in the data collection procedure in conjunction with changes in the badge reading frequencies may be severe. One might expect that for monitored workers the average yearly dose recorded would be lower in the early years and higher in later years, since in the early years it would be hard for the dose to accumulate over the threshold due to frequent badge readings. This could be the case even though the true average dose might be approximately constant over time. One further complicating feature when the badge threshold was not exceeded may be that for the very early data the threshold value may have been reported as the dose and then at a later time a zero may have been reported. If this were the case we would see somewhat higher yearly doses in the early years, a subsequent reduction when zeros were reported, and finally an increase as badge readings intervals were increased. In any case, this type of variation may have severe consequences on the interpretation of the analysis results and a full

-19-

explanation of the procedures used in the data collection process must be available for responsible conclusions to be produced.

Another aspect of the data collection process of concern is the years for which doses from various sources were incorporated into the data. We have conflicting information with regard to this point which may or may not be related to differing forms of the data file. Hanford personnel indicate that the data for each source is complete, back to the initiation of operations. A report in Mancuso's progress reports, at a time when worker exposure records were reported to have been complete, indicates that data for each source is complete back to varying times, at least for the file at Oak Ridge as shown in Figure 2. A preliminary sample output (Figure 3) contained in the same report shows no radiation records for each source prior to the year in which the relevant data is reported on tape in Figure 2.

Certainly things may have changed subsequent to the time of the report but we were unable to locate any mention of these changes in subsequent progress reports. This does not mean changes did not occur, however, because others working on the project began submitting their own progress reports at about this time. However, if the doses at the Oak Ridge Facility were not updated to include doses received prior to those reported in Figure 2, one might expect to see an increase in the average yearly dose over time. Again the consequences of this would be important in the development of conclusions.

-20-

Sources of Exposure Data

• 1

...

N.

Year	Beta-Gamma	X-Ray	Neutron	Tritium	Extremity
1944	Tape				Photometry Records
1945					
1946	•				
1947					"
1948	"				"
1949	"			Bioassay Result	н
1950			Hist. File	Cards	"
1951					
1952	к				
1953	"		"	"	
1954	n		"		
1955	"		"		
1956	n.		."		
1957	•	Tape	"		
1958		"	"		
1959		"	Tape		"
1960		"	"		
1961	"	10	"	Front of 1962 Year End Report	"
1962	"		"	Tape	Tape
1963		"			"
1964				"	"

1393 098

Table 13 - Summary of Sources of Exposure Data at Hanford

Figure 2. Reported Source Summary of Exposure Data at Hanford from Ref. 13.

P

Reported Preliminary Sample Record From Oak Ridge For Hanford Data as Reported in Ref. 13. Figure 3.

Tuble 16 - Print out Showing Content of the Occupational Radiation File, Hanford

. . .15 .12 44. 50° c 00. 54. . 82 ... An. Eu. . 45 2.37 2.50 1.40 .3. 90. 3.62 1.96 .10 EVTRENITY EXTRENTTY EXTREMITY EXTREVITY .0. .15 .12 .45 . 0. . 0. E 2 3 1.24 . 00 19. 2.50 1.40 .82 .3.4 .36 1.49 .77 .10 NIXS 1.1.45 NINS NINS 60. .04 60. 00. 20. .15 . 74 1.26 PINGS PENETUATING 50. 00. ... 00. 41. 1.15 84. 82. 9. PENERATING SUNTE Pr'TTATT, 74 11.1 + u . Er. Deve TRATING 71 STAT INI INI TIALS STATTALS INTTALS -00. 00. 22 u., 0.0. 00. 00. 5. 00. 00. ũu. 00. . P5 40. 00. 0. 00. 2.13 7.47 SUNIS PAGE SUNIB 00. Se. . 00 .0. 00. 00. . 00 00. .00 · 00 NEUTRON TRITIUM HUITIN HUITIA" TRITIUM . 00 .00 .00 00. 00. · 00 .00 00. 00. ANA TOAL 341 . 157 1 TALY YAFF AST MAPE NFUTRON . 38 00. NEUTRON 60. 0.1. 00. 00. 00. 94.1 NFUTRON 5.0 00. 6... 00. 00. 00. 5.0 0. . 6... 00. CCCUPATIONAL RADIATION FILE YARAY .00 0.0 e Y-PAY 00. Y-RAY .0. X-RAY -00 00 00 50 10 12 .1. 35 110 50 100 00 .0 10 PAYROLL MTMBEDS PATROLL NIMAERS PAYROL L NUMBERS SATROLL NUMBERS -oft NAN. C GAMMA GAMMA GAMMA D GANVA .00 .32 55. 94 . n 4 . 6.8 1.15 11.1 20 . 24 1.14 \$5 1 8 41 .12 101 22. Co. 00. BE 1 4 0.3 34 50 16:0 EF TA FFTA 90 90. 10. 10 .05 .04 IF. C J 02. c 0 . 3 Pr SOCIAL SECUTITY AIPPER SPCIAL SECURITY NUMPER SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER SFrijal IY NIIVAEP SITE CODF SITE CODF SITE CODE SITE CODE DATE 96/26/69 1 SOCIAL. YL A4 YEAY YF. AH YF AR 48 46 -44 45 49 48 49 0 % 25 53 4. 50 56 57 85 65 69 24 14 6.4 099 1393

L

-22-

There is yet another conflicting report with regard to the exact nature of the dose data collection procedure. The data for x-rays prior to 1957 may have been combined with the Beta and Gamma doses (Ref.12). The consequences of this effect would depend on exactly how the doses were combined to form the penetrating dose. However, one might suspect that the x-ray data before 1957 (if it's contained in the Beta-Gamma dose) would have a different factor applied (1.0) than the x-ray data after 1957 (.35).

One might expect that the effect of this error if it exists in the data we have, would be to cause a decrease as a function of calendar years in the average yearly doses received by exposed workers while working, assuming a constant true x-ray exposure. The decrease would be caused by an inclusion at full dose in early years up to 1957, but a consideration of only .35 of the full dose after 1957.

1393 100

In an attempt to resolve the above concerns we attempted within the constraints of the variables presented to assess just what the average yearly dose was for those Hanford deaths who are classified as "exposed" in the data extract file. This plot is shown in Figure 4.



Calendar Year

Figure 4. Average Yearly Dose Peccived by Exposed Workers While Employed Based on Semi-time Averaged Doses.

The exact causes for the shape of the curve (Figure 4) may be related to a combination of one or more of the possible effects which may be present in the data as discussed above or perhaps others which will be discussed in the following section. It should also be

1393 101

-24-

recalled that the data provided to us in regard to dose-time histories was in reasonably broad time increments and as such the above plot will reflect a semitime averaged view of the true average yearly dose which would be present if we had more detailed data.

Nevertheless, the implications of the graph are that serious time related effects are present in the data. It emphasizes the need for a detailed description of the exact background for this particular data extract file. Further, the plot suggests that extreme care be used in the interpretation of any analysis results using this data until a full and satisfactory explanation and understanding of this plot is available.

2.4.3 Pre- and Post- Employment Doses

According to several sources (ref. 8, 9, 10), the preemployment doses for workers at Hanford were obtained by first asking the new employee whether there had been any previous employment where exposure might have been experienced. If the answer was affirmative the health records from previous facilities were requested. When and if they were received, they were apparently installed in an off-site radiation record, although the date assigned to the radiation was apparently the date of the receipt of the material at Hanford rather than the time period over which the dose was received. It is not known to us whether these pre-employment off-site radiation exposures have been included in the data we have, since we have seen conflicting reports with regard to its presence or absence from various data sets. If the data extract file did include this pre-employment exposure recorded on the dates received this might contribute in conjunction with other factors to the explanation of the early peak seen in Figure 4. However, it has been pointed out to us that the safety procedures at Hanford may have been very poor in the early years which in conjunction with the badge reading effects discussed earlier may be sufficient to explain this early peak.

With regard to post-employment exposures, it has been consistently reported that these doses were not collected and cannot be present in the data. This facet of the reported data collection procedure has been the most consistently reported feature of the data. We can definitely show that this feature (i.e. the

-26-
non-existence of dose after the final year of employment) is not displayed in the data extract file we have. It is perhaps this contradiction which more strongly than anything else suggests that extreme caution be exercised in any consideration of the analysis results.

We have examined our data file and have found that there are 138 cases for which post-employment doses exist in the dose history. Of these, 130 are white males representing approximately 5.8% of the total 2226 exposed white males in the file. An examination of these cases shows that generally the doses recorded after the final year of employment are likely to be two to three times the total dose recorded during the reported initial and final years of employment at Hanford. The computer program to assess whether post-employment doses exist in the data is contained in Appendix C in conjunction with its output.

The effects of such data problems are, of course, considerable. If the data indicating that doses are received after the end of employment are simply erroneous, then it reflects on the quality of the remaining data. If the data is correct, but was inadvertently included for some cases in the file, then it implies that doses received after employment at Hanford are not negligible, thus affecting quantitative values of possible dose relationships to cancer. Thus, in either case the effect of this finding is to cast serious concern on the reliability of any results based on this data extract file.

We pointed out this significant finding to the CTM and requested new data. The request for new data was denied, although the CTM did request verification of

-27-

the findings from other research groups working with this data. We see no reason, however, that these findings would not be substantiated by others.

•

2.5 Other Concerns

There are many other concerns with regard to data we did not receive, in addition to the concern for the meaning of the data which we did receive. These additional concerns will be discussed briefly below.

2.5.1 Other Exposures

We have not received data which is available with regard to other exposures. Other exposure information which does exist includes internal and accidental depositions. The lack of information with regard to the several hundred accidental depositions known to exist, not to mention the large amount of internal dose information available, is a serious constraint on the development of a responsible analysis.

If the pre-employment exposures are not included in the data they certainly are available and should be considered, although they should be provided as a separate data element.

Medical x-rays were shown in Mancuso's study to be on the average a significant fraction of the radiation received by a worker. Individual records for various procedures show that some workers could easily have received very large exposure from medical x-rays. This data is available for all workers, and the results of the medical x-ray study seem to point out that this is a source not to be neglected if possible.

Other occupational exposures to such things as carcinogenic materials like asbestos through involvement with specific industries at times other than when at Hanford are not included. They may, however, be available since work histories maintained by the Social Security Administration were used in the data collection effort. The inclusion of this information would be a desirable addition. 1393 106

-29-

2.5.2 Cause of Death

The fact that a worker had died was established using the Social Security Administration (SSA) data file in conjunction with the worker's Social Security number, using the information provided by the SSA death certificates were obtained. The causes of death on the death certificate were recoded by a trained nosologist (ref. 8). The accuracy to which these assessments were made, not to mention potential errors on the death certificates which may be present due to lack of recognition of certain types of cancer in earlier years, is unaddressed. It is the case that up to 6 causes of death were recorded in an order reported to be primary, secondary, and tertiary. The consideration of only the primary cause of death raises serious guestions in the sense of the actual cause of death (e.g. heart failure) which may have been brought on by stresses induced by cancer or treatment for cancer. The extent to which this phenomena may be present in the data cannot be assessed since only the primary cause of death is provided.

2.5.3 Initial and Final Year of Employment and Total Years of Employment

When considered in conjunction with the other data elements provided to us it 's important to at least be aware that these variables do not allow recognition of the situation in which a worker leaves Hanford to work elsewhere and then returns to Hanford after some time interval. A check of all the cases in our data file shows that the variable total years of employment is (to within ±1 year) simply the difference between initial and final years of employment. (The discrepancy

-30-

of ±1 year comes about because total years of employment is recorded to one-tenth year while initial and final years are recorded to one year.) Thus we do not know what the true employment time periods were in this data set.

2.5.4 Monitored versus Exposed

Unfortunately the data we have indicates whether a worker was exposed or not exposed at some time during employment at Hanford. An exposed worker is one for which a dose was recorded. There is another variable available which we did not receive indicating whether the subject was monitored for radiation. One can see that if a worker was not monitored there could be no dose recorded. Thus a "non-exposed" worker did not necessarily receive zero dose. Further, the fact that a worker was monitored would not imply that they were monitored continuously at Hanford nor would an "exposed" worker have been monitored for the entire work period at Hanford. These effects might at least have been addressed if the yearly dose readings and the "monitored" variable had been provided to us.

2.6 Comparison to Data of T. Mancuso

Since the data analyzed in this report is from the same source as that analyzed by Mancuso, Stewart, and Kneale in 1977 (Ref. 1) it seems appropriate to compare the data provided to us with that used in the above paper. Table 4 is a comparison of our data to the data appearing in Table 3 of the Mancuso paper while Table 5 is a similar comparison with Table 11 in that same paper. Both tables are for male workers only.

It can be seen that the actual numbers of cases differ slightly between the two data sets. There are more total cases in our data but there are some causes of death where we have fewer cases either totally or for exposed workers only.

There are also differences in the mean doses which in some cases are not insignificant, most notably for lung and brain cancers. It can also be seen from the mean doses for non-cancers, RES neoplasms, and solid tumors that if there is an effect arising from these differences it is in the direction of reducing the doses received by persons dying of cancer and to increase those received by persons dying of causes other than cancer.

It is curious to note in Table 4 that of five diseases (multiple myeloma, pancreas, brain, lung, and kidney) which in our findings might be suspected to show dependencies of cancer incidence on dose received, three (brain, lung, kidney) show significant reductions in the mean dose relative to Mancuso's data while two (multiple myeloma and pancreas) show no significant

-32-

change. These last two are the same ones for which other researchers (notably Land) have also found significant relationships to radiation. One of these, pancreas, is a disease whose dose distribution is severely affected by increments of data after the final year of employment (see section 2.4.3). Multiple myeloma is characterized in this data by having only 8 exposed cases of which 3 are at anomalously high dose levels. The additional case (the sixth) in which we found suggestions of dose dependence was unspecified secondaries (ICD 199) which is not represented separately in Table 4.

Table 11 in the Mancuso paper is an examination of the trend in proportions of death by cancer as a function of dose controlled for age at death in 10 year intervals. Table 5 compares the proportions found by Mancuso, et. al., with similar proportions derived from the present data. It will be noticed that again the data is generally similar but that there is a tendency for the proportion of cancers at high doses to be reduced and those at low doses to be increased. In fact, if one ranks the differences in order by algebraic magnitude from most positive to most negative, one arrives at the rankings given in Table 3 to which can be applied a Spearman Rank Correlation Test. The rank correlation coefficients are shown in the last column of Table 3. For 5 pairs significance at the .10 level is reached when p exceeds .7 and significance at the .05 level is reached when o exceeds .8. In three age categories the coefficient of rank correlation is .7 or more and it is negative in only one of the five categories.

-33-

Mancuso, et. al., use a test of the same type to examine their data for a correlation of increase in proportion of death by cancer with increasing dose. They find coefficients of rank correlation of 0.1, 0.0, 0.8, 0.5, and 0.9 respectively for the various age groups. The significance of these correlations is tested by comparing the average value of these coefficients to the mean of 0.0 expected from a set of random rankings. In their case, the average is 0.46, which is different from the test mean of 0.0 by more than two standard deviations. We notice that in our data the results are almost the same except in the age group 60-69 where the rankings are changed and the coefficient is reduced from 0.5 to -0.1 thus reducing the average to 0.34 which is not more than two standard deviations away from the null result of 0.0.

The point of examining the comparison between the present data and the Mancule data is not to suggest that results derived by Mancuso, <u>et. al.</u>, would no longer be substantiated by the new data <u>because</u> the new data is different but rather to see whether or not the two sets of data should be considered to be compatible. While it seems that there are systematic differences between the two sets of data, it is more noteworthy that the differences are in fact quite small in magnitude. It is true that the outcome of one certain test cited in the Mancuso paper is altered, but one should recognize that this is more a consequence of the marginal nature of this test than of drastic changes in the data.

What is more bothersome is to understand why two separate extractions from the same data should produce different information, given that the difference is not

-34-

merely the consequence of the accumulations of additional cases as time has gone on.

In a normal sequence of events one would want to investigate the procedures used to prepare both sets of data in order to discover any sources of discrepancy. Since this alternative is not open, one can only note the difference and recognize that there are some uncertainties in the accumulation of the data which may have to be recognized in any evaluation of the results.

1393 112

¢

TABLE 4

MEAN DOSES BY CAUSE OF DEATH Column A - Results of Mancuso, et. al. Column B - Results of Current Analysis

Cause of Death	Total	Cases	Cases	Exposed	Mean Dos	e-Total	Mean Dos	se-Exposed
by ICD Codes	A	В	А	В	А	В	A	В
Non-Cancers								
0-136 Infective	29	322	16	182	43	50	79	90
210-239 Benjam Neoplasms	10	10	4	4	15	15	39	39
244-289 Endocr	54	65	34	40	96	150	153	243
290-389 CNS	36	37	20	21	94	92	169	162
390-458 CVS	1837	1885	1149	1184	105	106	167	168
460-519 Respiratory	194	194	108	107	74	74	133	134
520-577 Digestive	139	140	83	86	114	136	190	221
800-999 Accidents	450	459	271	274	94	98	156	164
580-796 Residue	101	100	57	55	85	43	151	79
RES Neoplasms								
200-202 Lymphomas	34	35	28	28	119	117	145	146
203 Myelomas	11	11	8	8	775	775	1066	1066
204 Lymphatic Leukemia	1 3	3	2	2	19	9	29	28
205 Myeloid Leukemia	11	12	6	6	122	* -1	223	223
206-209 Residue	5	5	3	3	12	12	19	19
Solid Tumors								
140-149 Mouth & Phirynx	24	23	14	1.4	89	79	152	129
151 Stomach	38	38	26	26	60	58	86	85
153 Large Intestine	61	63	48	50	135	133	171	167
154 Rectum	19	19	16	16	99	99	118	118
150,152 Other Intestinal	18	20	10	10	32	28	58	57
155-156 Liver, Gall Bladde	er 18	19	10	10	31	29	200	50
157 Pancreas	49	51	31	32	253	253	399	404
162-163 Lung	192	195	130	129	169	142	249	214
185 Prostate	43	43	21	21	42	42	201	262
189 Kidney	21	23	14	15	187	1/1	122	100
186-188 Other G.U.	15	15	10	10	220	104	261	201
191 Brain Residue	90	92	54	55	81	76	135	127
Totals:								
Non-Cancers	2850	2922	1742	1789	99	102	162	166
PES Neoplasms	64	66	47	47	219	213	299	299
folid Tumors	606	622	395	402	130	119	199	184
TOTAL	3520	3610	: 184	2238	107	107	172	172

¹ Mancuso, T. F., Alice Stewart, and George Kneale, Radiation Exposures of Hanford Workers Dying from Cancer and Other Causes, <u>Health Physics</u>, Vol. 33 (November 1977) p. 376.

² Including 2 with no cause of death (1 exposed).

I

-36-

Proportion of Deaths Due to Cancer by Age and Dose for Male Workers Comparison Between Results of Mancuso, et. al.¹, and Results of Current Analysis

					a second second second	and the second second	
Age	0	1-19	20-99	100-499	500 +	Total	ρ
≦ 39.9	11.5/ 113	13.1/ 61	10.2/ 59	8.0/ 25	20.0/ 10	11.6/ 268	.9
	9.3/ 108	10.9/ 55	8.6/ 58	8.3/ 24	22.2/ 9	9.8/ 254	or
	2.2/1 or 2	2.2/2 or 1	1.6/3	3/4	-2.2/5	1.8	1.0
40.0-49.9	11.3/ 203	18.3/ 82	21.9/146	22.8/ 79	9.5/ 21	17.0/ 531	
	13.0/ 185	15.9/ 82	21.9/137	23.0/ 74	11.8/ 17	17.3/ 495	.4
	-1.7/4	2.4/1	.0/2	2/3	-2.3/5	3	
50.0-59.9	20.9/ 340	14.2/155	23.6/199	20.9/158	26.8/ 56	20.7/ 908	
	19.3/ 331	16.1/137	24.5/200	21.9/155	31.0/ 58	21.2/ 881	.7
	1.6/1	-1.9/4	9/2	-1.0/3	-4.2/5	5	
60.0-69.9	22.9/ 375	23.2/164	26.2/260	24.1/191	21.7/ 60	23.9/1050	.8
	22.2/ 360	21.6/162	26.6/248	25.0/184	22.6/ 53	23.7/1007	or
	.7/2	1.6/1	4/3	9/4 or 5	9/4 or 5	.2	.9
≥ 70.0	13.5/ 341	10.4/183	18.3/246	18.3/71	41.7/ 12	15.0/ 853	
	13.6/ 352	11.6/189	17.5/251	18.9/ 74	29.4/ 17	15.1/ 883	5
	1/3	-1.2/5	.8/2	6/4	12.3/1	1	
	17.4/1372	15.8/645	21.8/910	21.4/524	23.3/159	19.1/3610	.9
Total	16.9/1336	15.7/625	21.7/894	22.0/511	25.3/154	19.0/3520	or
	.5/1	.1/2 or 3	.1/2 or 3	6/4	-2.0/5	.1	1.0
ρ	.4	.45	.15	.5	6	.2	

DOSE

Mancuso, T.F., Alice Stewart, and George Kneale, Radiation Exposures of Hanford Workers Dying from Cancer and Other Causes, <u>Health Physics</u>, Vol. 33 (November 1977) p. 376.

KEY: % cancer deaths/total cases - Current Results % cancer deaths/total cases - Mancuso Results Difference in percents/rank

T

-37-

3.0 DATA ANALYSIS

The general data analysis methodology employed together with a summary of the data survey analyses are contained in Section 3.1. The discussion is, however, limited to a brief overview. A more detailed analysis of respiratory cancers is contained in Section 3.2.

3.1 Methodology and Data Survey Results

The analysis methodology employed was comprehensive in that it applied a number of differing analytical tools to the data. The approach relied, however, not only on the use of differing statistical procedures but also on the consideration of a wide variety of subject groupings.

The data was first reviewed to identify the univariate distributions present in the data. An example of this procedure for the whole data set is contained in Appendix A. Similar distributions were developed for various case subgroups. These subgroups included cases accepted when filtering for various race-sex groupings, followed by subsequent filters on exposure and various causes of death. At the completion of this procedure it was apparent that if race and sex were to be considered as relevant factors, then only the white male group had an adequate number of cases for the analysis approach anticipated. All remaining statistical analyses considered only cases which were white males.

Following the univariate review various bivariate relationships were examined for the white male subgroup. Cumulative dose comparisons with various causes of death were examined for various groups.

1393 115

In general, chi-square and t-test analyses were used to evaluate whether notable effects were being observed. An example of such an analysis is shown in Table 6 where the expected and observed dose frequencies for various causes of death are compared using the chi-square method.

-38-

EXPECTED FREQUENCIES ARE FRINTED BELOW OBSERVED FREQUENCIES

**

CAUSE OF DEATH

	ا [0-139		240-4 412=7	09 I 99 I	410-4	IIII	800=9	1 991	157	I	161-	163	200-2	202	I 140-2	1094	TOTALS
4 1	1 1 -50 1	r 9 r 8	2.81 2.81	418 399	1 .51	355 369	.0I	148 138	.51	14 15	.51	55 70	.31	17	5.5	I 123 I 120	.91	1139
TANTA 5	2 1 1-150	1 4 1 4	.71	208 213	1 1	208 197	.3I	. 63 74	.11	8 8	1 1 .81	48 37	I .61	7 8	.31	63	.71	609
4 15	7 1 Juoi	2	.71	77 76	1 .81	68 70	1 .91	26 26	I .61	3 3	1 .21	11 13	.51	23	.01	30 23	1- 1 .31	219
2 	4 I 301+ I	. 2	1 .81	70 83	I .1I	83 73	I . 81	31 28	1 . 91	7 3	1 . 41	22 14	I .6I	43	.21	18 25	1- I .2I	237
	ALS I	1	7 I	77	3 1	71	4 I	26	3 1	3:	2 1	13	6 1	3	0 I	23	4 I	2204
101		.01 .10 .03	+ + +	.85 .15 .00	+ + +	.53 .58 .12	+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++	. 65 1. 65 . 01	+ + +	.39 .08 .01	+ + +	3.32 2.89 .47	++++++	.14 .20 .32	+ + +	.04 .04 1.96	+ + +	
		.02		= 2	6.93	7	T	.17	Ŧ	3.58	+	3.72	'	.19	+	2.04	+	
*E)	kcludi	ing IC	D 1	70, 17	74,	193,	205	, 206,	20)3, 21	0-2	:39						
	Tab]	le 6.	An Ve	exam rsus	ple Caus	of a se of	Chi Dea	-squa th.	re	Analys	sis	of Do	ose					

-39-

In addition, rank tests were used in an attempt to approximate results previously obtained by others. These are reported in section 2.6.

Due to the uncertainty in the validity of cases characterized as unexposed, as discussed in section 2.5.4, it was decided at this point that further survey analysis would consider two general groups. The first group would include both the exposed and unexposed white male (EUWM) workers. The second group would contain simply the exposed white male (EWM) workers.

The varying radio-sensitivity of cancers depending on the particular cells affected was recognized and considered important enough to call for separation of primary causes of death into consistent cancer groups. The ICDA codes used to group various cancers is shown in Table 3 contained in section 2.3. Only those cancer groups which had more than eight cases were considered in subsequent analyses.

In general, subsequent analyses considered the response as the probability of a particular cancer and no-cancer. The cancer group would include those cases which fell within a particular group specified by Table 3. The no-cancer group would contain cases with a primary cause of death which was not considered to be a cancer. However, we could clearly see the effects accidents had on the percent of cases which died of cancer as a function of ages, as shown in Figure 5. We recognized that accident deaths from external causes are not diseases and may be considered to be a competing risk which might mask the effects of radiation due to the strong dependence of accidental death on age. As a result, our subsequent survey analyses considered two

-40-

1393 117



igure 5. Percent of Deaths Due to Cancer As a Function of Age for White Males in Various Populations

additional subgroups of the EUWM and EWM groups mentioned previously. These additional subgroups where characterized by the non-cancer group containing either all non-cancers or all non-accident non-cancers, and denoted by the letters ALL or NA respectively. Thus, actually four general groups were evaluated for each cancer group of interest. These were 1) The exposed and unexposed white male workers with all non-cancers (EUWM-ALL); 2) The exposed and unexposed white male workers with accidental deaths excluded from the non-cancer group (EUWM-NA); 3) The exposed white males with all non-cancers (EWM-ALL); and 4) The exposed white males with no accidental deaths included in the non-cancer group (EWM-NA). The number of cases available in each group is shown felow:

EUWM-ALL EUWM-NA

EWM-ALL EWM-NA

139 119

Ł

Non-Cancers	2895	2446	1776	1508
All Cancers	684	684	449	449
Total	3579	3130	2225	1957

Table 7 Breakdown of Cases for Various Subgroups Considered in the Analysis.

It should be noted that the data provided in the above table excludes some cases in the data set which contained invalid codes for one or more variables.

-42-

3.1.1 Discriminant Analyses

.

Having identified the general groups of data to be considered it was desired to scan the data on a detailed basis to identify those variables which exhibited a relationship to the incidence of particular cancers for each data group. An automated procedure to select relevant variables was desirable since an additional 15 variables (shown in Appendix D) had been created from the original data elements given to us. Stepwise discriminant analysis was particularly suited to this task, since the response groups could characterize a particular cancer (e.g. pancreas) and no-cancer.

The program used to do the discriminant analyses was BMDP7M. The procedure is based on the assumption of equal population covariances for the groups (as well as multivariate normality of the discriminating variables, but this normality assumption is usually not critical). The sample variances of many of the discriminating variables are different enough between the groups that one could question the assumption of equal population covariances. However, since the goal in using discriminant analysis was simply to pick out those variables which bear a strong relationship to the incidence of cancer, it was felt that the above objection would present no serious problem. The cure for unequal population covariances is to use quadratic discrimination, but it was felt that this procedure would not produce a set of discriminating variables different from that obtained from linear discriminant analysis. Furthermore, quadratic discriminant analysis is sensitive to departures from normality. (See Lacherbruch, pg. 20.) At the conclusion of the analysis it did, however, appear that in some cases the analysis did suffer from lack of homogeneity of variance.

-43-

At each step of the discriminant analysis the BMDP program computes an F-statistic for each variable to enter which measures the amount of discriminating power which that variable has. As new variables are entered, the F-statistic for variables previously entered can decrease to the point where the old variable is no longer providing significant discrimination. In such a case, the old variable may be removed at some step. This removal did not occur in our discriminant analyses. For the set of discriminating variables determined at each step of the stepwise procedure, the BMDP program computes the probability of membership for each case in each group and uses this probability to classify each case into the group for which it has the highest probability of membership. The probability is a posterior probability based on a prior probability distribution of group membership specified by the user. In our discriminant runs we always specified equal priors since we were interested solely in the relationship between the incidence of cancer and the variables characterizing the workers history, and we did not want to make use of information about the relative frequency of occurrence of various causes of death. In our runs the probability of overall correct classification varied roughly from 50% to 90%. When using two groups, the probability of correct classification of a particular cancer occasionally dropped below 50%. A more complete description of the computational aspects of discriminant analysis appears in Ref. 14.

Table 3 summarizes the discriminant analysis results obtained for each specific cancer considered. The specific cancer groups considered are shown along the top edge of the table. Under each cancer label are four columns.

-44-

	RESPIRATORY 161-163					REC 153-	TAL -154		ESOPHAGEAL & STOMACH 150-151			
VARIABLE	1 EUWM- ALL	2 EUWM- NA	3 EWM- ALL	4 EWM- NA	l EUWM- ALL	2 EUWM- NA	3 EWM- ALL	4 EWM- NA	l EUWM- ALL	2 EUWM- NA	3 EWM- ALL	4 EWM- NA
1 DEATHAGE 2 INITLYR 3 FINALYR 4 TOTALYR 5 EXPOSURE	c	3 * C	2	2	* 1	2	*	*				
6 CUMDOSE 7 CDOS 3+ 8 CDOS 5+ 9 CDOS 10+ 10 CDOS 15+									**	**		
11 CDOS 20+ 12 CDOS 25+ 13 YRDEATH 14 DT1 15 DT2	2 3∆	2						**		*	1	1
16 DT3 17 DOS0-3 18 DOS 4-5 19 DOS6-10 20 DOS11-15	*		*									
21 DOS16-20 22 DOS21-25 23 DOS25+ 24 MAXDOS 25 TMAXDOS	4	**	3	3								
26 AGE SQ 27 CAUSE	1	1	1	1	**				1	1	2	*
No. Cancers No. Non-cancers % c.c. cancer % c.c. non-cancer	202 2895 67.3 57.0	202 2446 64.9 54.1	136 1776 58.8 56.3	136 1508 ~1.5 63.5	82 2895 80.5 38.7	82 2446 73.2 47.8	66 1776	66 1508	56 2895 73.2 40.8	56 2446	35 1776 57.1 60.8	35 1508 54.3 60.7

TABLE 8 Summary of stepwise discriminant analyses, showing the order in which the variables were chosen for inclusion in the model.

-45-

		PANCREAS 157				PHOCYTIC 200-20	C LEUKE 4, 204	MIA	PROSTATE 185			
VARIABLE	l EUWM- ALL	2 EUWM- NA	3 EWM- ALL	4 EWM- NA	1 EUWM- ALL	2 EUWM- NA	3 EWM- ALL	4 EWM- NA	l EUWM- ALL	2 EUWM- NA	3 EWM- ALL	4 EWM- NA
1 DEATHAGE 2 INITLYR 3 FINALYR 4 TOTALYR 5 EXPOSURE	**				1 C	1 C	1	1	1 C	1 c	1	1
6 CUMDOSE 7 CDOS 3+ 8 CDOS 5+ 9 CDOS 10+ 10 CDOS 15+												
11 CDOS 20+ 12 CDOS 25+ 13 YRDEATH 14 DT1 15 DT2			**			**	**	**				
16 DT3 17 DOS0-3 18 DOS 4-5 19 DOS6-10 20 DOS11-15	1	1	*	1	*	*						
21 DOS16-20 22 DOS21-25 23 DOS25+ 24 MAXDOS 25 TMAXDOS	*		***	*	**	2	***		2	2	*	*
26 AGE SQ 27 CAUSE	2	*										
o. Cancers o. Non-cancers c.c. cancer c.c. non-cance	51 2895 21.6 88.1	51 2446 13.7 91.7	32 1776 21.9 90.4	32 1508 21.9 90.8	38 2895 68.4 63.7	38 2446 73.7 66.9	30 1776 63.3 58.7	30 1508 66.7 61.8	43 2895 62.8 61.6	43 2446 62.8 61.7	21 1776 66.7 57.5	21 1508 57.1 56.2

-46-

1393 123

TABLE 8 Summary of Discriminant Analyses (cont.)

			BR/ 190-	AIN -192			KID 18	NEY 39			MOUTH 1 140	PHARYNX -149	:
	VARIABLE	EUWM- ALL	EUWM- NA	EWM- ALL	4 EWM- NA	EUWM- ALL	EUWM- NA	BWM- ALL	ewm- NA	EUWM- ALL	EUWM- NA	EWM- ALL	EWM- NA
	1 DEATHAGE 2 INITLYR 3 FINALYR 4 TOTALYR 5 EXPOSURE	2	1	2	1								*
	6 CUMDOSE 7 CDOS 3+ 8 CDOS 5+ 9 CDOS 10+ 10 CDOS 15+												
1	11 CDOS 20+ 12 CDOS 25+ 13 YRDEATH 14 DT1 15 DT2	3	2	3	2	**	2	1					
	16 DT3 17 DOS0-3 18 DOS 4-5 19 DOS6-10 20 DOS11-15	**	*	**		1	1	* 2	1				
	21 DOS16-20 22 DOS21-25 23 DOS25+ 24 MAXDOS 25 TMAXDOS	1	3	*	**	*							**
No. No. % c	26 AGE SQ 27 CAUSE Cancers Non-cancers .c. cancer .c. non-cancer	* 2895 59.3 69.4	27 2446 66.7 69.5	18 1776 72.2 72.4	18 1508 77.8 68.2	2895 22.7 91.2	22 2446 45.5 73.2	** 1776 53.3 72.2	15 1508 80.0 61.5	1 2895 78.3 41.6	1 2446 78.3 41.1	* 1776	14 1508

-47-

. 1393 124

TABLE 8 Summary of Discriminant Analyses (cont.)

	UNSPECIFIED SECONDARY 199					LI\ 155-	/ER -156		SKIN CANCER 172-173			
VARIABLE	1 EUWM- ALL	2 EUWM- NA	3 EWM- ALL	4 EWM- NA	1 EUWM- ALL	2 EUWM- NA	3 EWM- ALL	4 EWM- NA	1 EUWM- ALL	2 EUWM- NA	3 EWM- ALL	4 EWM- NA
1 DEATHAGE 2 INITLYR 3 FINALYR 4 TOTALYR 5 EXPOSURE	*	**	2	*			1	•	*	1	1 ** *	1 ** *
6 CUMDOSE 7 CDOS 3+ 8 CDOS 5+ 9 CDOS 10+ 10 CDOS 15+					**							
11 CDOS 20+ 12 CDOS 25+ 13 YRDEATH 14 DT1 15 DT2				**					**			
16 DT3 17 DOS0-3 18 DOS-4-5 19 DOS6-10 20 DOS11-15												
21 DOS16-20 22 DOS21-25 23 DOS25+ 24 MAXDOS 25 TMAXDOS	1 **	*	1	1	*							
26 AGE SQ 27 CAUSE No. Cancers No. Non-cancers % c.c. cancer % c.c. non-cancer	27 2895 11.1 94.2	27 2446	13 1776 53.8 74.7	13 1508 23.1 91.9	1 2895 73.7 41.6	19 2446	10 1776 70.0 57.8	10 1508	13 2446	13 2446 53.8 62.5	10 1776 60.0 63.7	10 1508 60.0 65.5

TABLE 8 Summary of Discriminant Analyses (cont.)

0

-48-

2

-

1393 125

	SEC	NDARY 1	LUNG CAU 97	NCER	M	MULTIPLE MYELOMA 203				
VARIABLE	l EUWM- ALL	2 EUWM- NA	3 EWM- ALL	4 ENM- NA	l EUWM- ALL	2 EUWM- NA	3 EWM- ALL	4 EMM- NA		
1 DEATHAGE 2 INITLYR 3 FINALYR 4 TOTALYR 5 EXPOSURE				*						
6 CUMDOSE 7 CDOS 3+ 8 CDOS 5+ 9 CDOS 10+ 10 CDOS 15+										
11 CDOS 20+ 12 CDOS 25+ 13 YRDEATH 14 DT1 15 DT2	1	1								
16 DT3 17 DOS0-3 18 DOS 4-5 19 DOS6-10 20 DOS11-15					2	2	* 2	* 2		
21. DOS16-20 22 DOS21-25 23 DOS25+ 24 MAXDOS 25 TMAXDOS					1	1 3	1 3 **	1 3 **		
26 AGE SQ 27 CAUSE No. Cancers No. Non-cancers % c.c. cancer % c.c. non-cancer	16 2895 43.8 62.6	16 2446 63.8 65.6	8 1776	8 1508	11 2895 27.3 97.3	11 2446 27.3 97.3	8 1776 37.5 97.2	8 1508 37.5 97.0		

1393 126

TABLE 8 Summary of Discriminant Analyses (cont.)

1

-49-

These columns correspond to the four groups which were to be considered as mentioned previously. Specifically, the first column corresponds to the EUWM-ALL group, the second the EUWM-NA group. Column 3 contains the results of the analysis using the EWM-ALL group and column 4 the results of the analysis of the EWM-NA group for the particular cancer group of interest. The rows correspond to the variables considered for selection during the discriminant analysis. The numbers which appear in the columns correspond to the order in which each variable was selected for inclusion in the classification function. Up to five variables were allowed to be selected by the discriminant analysis as long as the F-statistic exceeded 3.0. The maximum number ever selected was 4. At the bottom of each column is presented a number of cases in each of the response groups and the correct classification percentage which resulted from the final classification function. Stars in the table indicate variables which would have been selected after the last variable selected if the F to enter had been set lower.

The letter C by the variable "exposure" indicates that this variable had an F-statistic of more than 2 on the initial step. For the EWM-ALL and EWM-NA "exposure" of course was not considered since all cases in these groups were exposed by definition.

To illustrate the interpretation of the table, consider the respiratory cancer analyses. The first of the four columns under this heading is a summary of the results found when the exposed and unexposed white males were considered. The response groups were, on the one hand, those cases with a cause of death described as respiratory cancer in Table 3, and on the other, those

-50-

cases with a non-cancer cause of death including accidental causes of death. We can see at the bottom of the column that there were 2895 non-cancer cases considered which were compared with 202 respiratory cancer cases. The first variable selected was AGESQ, measuring age squared as defined in Appendix D. Note that before any variables had entered the model, the exposure variable was found to be mildly significant as indicated by the C next to exposure. At the second step of the analysis, the variable YRDEATH entered. YRDEATH represents the calendar year of death. The third variable which entered the model was DT1 which is the time interval between the initial year of employment and the year of death. The fourth variable to enter was the dose which was recorded as being received in the time interval 16 to 20 years prior to death. We can also see that other dose variables might have entered the model had the F-to-enter been set low enough, as indicated by the stars. One star means it had the highest F-statistic at that point, two stars the second highest, etc.

We can also see that the correct classification function was 67.3% for the respiratory cancers and 57.0% for the no-cancer group. Thus from this column we have an indication of those variables which are likely to provide the best predicative capability for the incidence of respiratory cancer from those variables considered for the EUWM-ALL group.

A number of features present in Table 8 are perhaps worth noting. As a general rule, AGE or AGESQ appear as important factors in modeling the incidence of cancer

for most cancer groups. Pancreas (157) cancer for the EWM-ALL and EWM-NA groups are notable exceptions, as are kidney cancers (189), unspecified secondary cancers (199), and multiple myeloma (203). Various calendar year effects such as the year of death (YRDEATH), initial year (INITLYR), and various length of time indicators such as total years of employment (TOTALYR), time from maximum dose (TMAXDOS) and DT1, DT2 and DT3 all appear as variables of interest for one cancer group or another. However, their significance may be classified in a general way as very marginal except in a few cases.

A very notable feature in the table is that the cumulative dose (CUMDOSE) was never selected as a variable to enter any model. The fact that the doses received in specific time intervals (e.g. DOS 4-5: dose received in the time interval four to five years prior to death) were selected on numerous occasions, explains the fact that the total cumulative dose was not selected. This fact may simply reflect the concept that there is a latency period between dose and cancer incidence, although the time intervals available to us and the manner in which the time intervals are modeled, are likely to be only a simple minded version of the true relationships. Notable by the inclusion of dose variables in their classification functions are: Respiratory Cancer (161-163), Pancreas (157), Brain (190-192), Kidney (189), Unspecified Secondary cancers (199), and Multiple Myeloma (203). In addition, dose variables were remotely sensitive although not selected in a number of other cancer groups.

and a

The interpretation of the inclusion of the dose variables in the classification functions are of course subject to the concerns identified in section 2.

1393 129

-52-

3.1.2 Logistic Regression Models

In the case of a model with two possible responses, e.g., death from cancer and death from cause other than cancer, the logistic regression model expresses the probability of one response as $p=e^{Y}/(1+e^{Y})$, or equivalently, as log [p/(1-p)] = y where $y = \alpha + \Sigma \beta_j x_j$ is a linear combination of the covariates x, with unknown parameters α and β_j which are to be estimated. The probability of the other response is then 1 - p. The parameters α and β_i are estimated by the method of maximum likelihood. The logistic regression model has several features which make it more appealing than a model in which the data is categorized. First, the logistic regression model can handle continuous covariates as continuous variables. There is no need to categorize these variables; and since the choice of cutpoints is somewhat arbitrary and subjective, one would like to avoid splitting a variable into categories, if possible. Also, in the logistic regression model the probability comes out as a continuous function of a continuous covariate such as dose. There are no jumps in probabilility as one crosses a boundary. A second consideration which favors the logistic regression model over a categorical model is that when one is dealing with a number of categorical variables the number of cells increases rapidly and the number of observations per cell goes down rapidly. The categorical analysis does not behave well with small cell counts. Finally, the logistic regression model usually results in a simpler model since it contains only one parameter for each independent variable in the model. A possible objection to the logistic model is that it postulates a very specific form for the response probability, i. e., that log [p/(1-p)] be a linear function of the independent

1393 130

-53-

variables. However, if this relationship is not linear, one can add square terms, etc. to the model to achieve the desired linearity.

The stepwise discriminant analyses have identified a number of specific cancers in which some dose variable was selected. The next step in our approach at this point is to model the probability of death from cancer as a function of the variables suggested by the discriminant analyses. However, in view of the serious questions raised in section 2 concerning the data, most notably, 1) The marked increase in average dose over the years which the workers received, 2) The failure to distinguish between monitored and not-monitored cases, 3) The failure to distinguish internal depositions, and 4) The occurrence of 138 cases which have relatively large doses recorded after the final year of employment, we feel that no reliable interpretation can be placed on such models. Nevertheless, if one is willing to accept the data at face value, such models may be of interest. We have presented selected models for respiratory cancer, cancer of the pancreas and cancer of the brain in Appendix E. Also, the modeling of respiratory cancer, using exposed workers only, is subjected to a detailed analysis in section 3.2.

In Appendix E for each model the coefficients α and β_j are given, the chi-square value for testing statistical significance of the β_j . (This chi-square value has 1 degree of freedom), the value of $-2 \cdot \log L$, and finally, the decrease in $-2 \cdot \log L$ for the given model relative to the model with a constant alone. The size of $-2 \cdot \log L$ for a given model as compared to that for the constant model may be used as a measure of goodness of fit of the model to the data.

-54-

. 1393 131

For the logistic modeling four subsets of the file of exposed white males were used, 1) all cases, 2) all cases less accidents, 3) exposed cases only, and 4) exposed cases less accidents. The main features of these models are the following. For respiratory cancer, statistical significance of the dose variables is borderline, at best. There seems to be a definite relation between cancer of the pancreas and dose. However, this conclusion is based on approximately 30 pancreas cases, of which 5 had relatively large post-employment doses (generally twice as large as the dose received during employment) recorded in the data file. Because of the uncertainty of the meaning of these doses, we would be hesitant to draw any conclusions until this question is cleared up. For cancer of the brain, the dose received 25 or more years before death is selected by discriminant analysis as being important. When this variable is put in the logistic model it also tests highly significant. However, when age at death and time from initial employment to death are controlled for, the dose variable becomes totally non-significant. We believe that further modeling work is desirable, but must wait until more basic questions concerning the data are answered.

.....

.....

1393 132

-55-

3.2 Further Detailed Analysis of Respiratory Cancer

This group was chosen for further analysis because it had a large number of cases of cancer and because of the relationship of cancer to dose suggested by the discriminant analysis. Since the argument can be made that workers who have zero cumulative lifetime dose are in essentially different occupations from those who have dose, we have chosen here to work with "exposed" workers only, i.e., those whose cumulative lifetime dose is positive. There were a total of 2225 such cases in the file. When the non-respiratory cancers were removed we were left with 1912 cases, of which 136 or 7.1% were deaths from respiratory cancer. A stepwise discriminant analysis was done on this data using two groups, those dying from respiratory cancer (ICD 161-163) and those dying from causes other than cancer (ICD 1-139, 210-999). Twenty-six variables were used, 13 of the variables appearing in the data set originally sent to us, and 13 variables calculated from those, such variables as time from initial employment to death (DT1), dose received 0-3 years before death, etc. The complete list is described · in Appendix D. The means of each of these variables are given in Table 9 and their standard deviations in Table 10 The F-ratios for four steps of the discriminant analysis are given in Tables 11 thru 14. For step 0 (Table 11) it can be seen that the most important variable is AGESO which is defined as $\left[(DEATHAGE-60)/5 \right]^2$. This expression defines AGESQ as a parabola with its vertex at age 60. This particular functional form was suggested by a plot of the percent of cancer deaths vs. categories of age as seen in Figure 6. The data for this plot is in Table 15 below.

-56-

	MEANS			······	
	GROUP =	RESPCANC	NOCANCER	ALL GPS.	
VAR.	TABLE				
1	DEATHAGE	61.08750	60.05327	60.12683	
2	INITLYR	46.97794	46.50507	46.53870	
3	FINALTR	52.47059	54.85541	54.70452	
4	TOTALYR	9.41618	8.07838	8.17354	
5	EXPOSURE	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	
6	CUMDOSE	209.95588	166.43581	169.53138	
7	CDOS 3+	190.44853	147.55630	150.60722	
δ	CDOS 5+	167.57353	128.12331	130.92939	
5	CDUS 10+	100.43362	72.17342	74.61036	
10	CDOS 15+	53.72059	38.81363	39.87395	
11	CDOS 20+	16.56618	15.40428	15.48692	
12	CDOS 25+	4.10 294	4.22122	4.21287	
13	YRDEATH	65.30147	63.97917	64.07322	
14	DT1	18.32353	17.47410	17.53452	
15	012	8.83088	9.32370	9.28870	
16	DT3	13.57721	13.39893	13.41161	
17	DOSO-3	19.50735	18.87950	18.92416	
18	0054-5	22.87500	19.43300	19.67782	
19	D056-10	61.13971	55.94989	56.31904	
20	DOS11-15	52.71323	23.35980	34.73640	
-21-	DOS16-20	37.15441	23.49935	24.36703	
22	DOS21-25	12.46324	11.18300	11.27406	
23	DOS25+	4.10294	4.22128	4.21287	
-24-	MAXDOS	102.31619	89.53209	90.44142	
25	TMAXDOS	13.19853	13.53435	13.51046	
26	AGE SQ	3.58075	6.94376	6.70455	
27	CAUSE	.00000	1.00000	.92887	
COUN	NTS	136.	1776.	1912.	

Table 9. Means of variables used in discriminant analysis of respiratory cancers; no cancer group includes all non-cancer deaths.

-57-

1.1

	GROUP. =	RESPCANC	NOCANCER	ALL GPS.	
VAR	TABLE				
1	DEATHAGE	9.43349	13.17908	12.94996	
2	INITLYR	4.10684	3.88611	3.90212	
- 5	FINALTR	8.55 051	7.67790	7.74328	
4	TOTALYR	7.79186	7.12960	7.17841	
5	EXPOSURE	.00000	.00000	.00000	
6	CUMDOSE	491.47090	431.82021	436.30421	
7	CDOS 3+	444.26281	390.03605	394 11383	
ô	CDOS 5+	389.94979	344.84724	348.22697	
9	COOS 10.	244.83052	129.08900	194.10213	
10	CDOS 15+	117.93373	89.10683	91.44326	
11	CDOS 20+	34.23485	41.18084	40.72881	
12	CDOS 25+	15.46143	19.36115	19.11186	
13	YRDEATH	5.83136	6.31983	6.28655	
14	DT1	6.37690	6.84206	6.81022	
15	012	2.15003	8.24547	2.23876	
10	DT3	6.20271	6.69390	6.66037	
17	D050-3	63.54560	71.92290	71.36308	
18	DOS4-5	67.58867	69.79293	69.63940	
19	D056-10	163.99697	126.39070	184.89697	
20	D0511-15	148.52942	121.30639	123.42787	
21	-vosta=20	100.46173	00.58240		
22	D0521-25	29.73684	32.80420	32.59687	
23	D0525+	15.46143	19.36115	19.11166	
24	MAXDOS	177.85926	195.58838	194.38833	
25	TMAXDOS	7.29441	7.69571	7.66803	
26	AGE SQ	4.90601	9.34438	9.10203	
22	*****			0.000	

87

Table 10. Standard deviation of variables used in discriminant analysis of respiratory cancers; no cancer group includes all non-cancer deaths.

1393 135

-58-

INBLE	F TO FORCE	•	VA	RIABLE	FTO	FORCE	TOLERANCE
	REMOVE LEVEL				ENTER	LEVEL	7
	DF= 1 1911	•		DF=	1 191	0	
		•	1	DEATHAGE	.806	1	1.000000
			2	INITLIK	1.855		1.000000
•		•	3	FINALYR	6.942	1	1.000005
		•	4	TOTAL YR	4.387	1	1.000000
				EXPOSURE	.000		.000005
		•	6	CUMDOSE	1.257	1	1.000000
•			7	CDOS 3+	1.496	1	1.000000
			ő	CD05 5+	1.621		1.000000
		•	9	CDOS 10+	3.936	1	1.000000
The second second		•	10	CDOS 15+	3.357	1	1.000000
				CDOS 20+	.103		1.000000
			12	CDOS 25+	.005	1	1.000000
-		•	13	YRDEATH	5.589	1	1.000006
			14	DTI	1.965		1.000051
			15	DT2	.452	1	1.000000
-		•	16	DT3	.090	1	1.000GOú
			17	0050-3	.010		1.000000
- 10 M		•	18	DOS4-5	.309	1	1.000000
		•	19	D056-10	.100	1	1.000000
		-	20	00511-15	3.100		1.000000
		•	21	D0516-20	4.937	1	1.000000
1. 19 . 19		•	22	D0521-25	.195	1	1.000000
			- 23	00325+	.005		1.060000
			24	MAXDOS	.546	1	1.000000
			25	TMAXDOS	.242	1	1.000000
	the second s		20	AGE SG	17.245		

Table 11. F-ratios at initial step of discriminant analysis on exposed white males using two groups: death from respiratory cancer and death from non-cancer.

1393 136

	VAKI	ABLE	FTO	FORCE		
			RENOV	LEVEL-		
	• · · // / · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		DI= 1 19	10		
	20 4	GE SU				
		VAI	TABLE	110	FORCE	TULERANLE
				ENTER	LEVEL	
	*		DI	= 1 190	¥	013457
			DEATHAGE	.000		100014
		2	INITLYR	4.909		053050
		3	FINALTR	4.4//		
		-	TUTALTR	1.230		.000000
		2	EXPOSURE .	.000	:	
		0	CUMDOSE	.512		
			1005 54	- 097	1	.991117
		8	CDUS ST	2.531	; .	.991060
		Y	CDUS 104			
		10	1005 154	2.207		.998037
		11	CDOS 204	. 025	· ;	.999529
		12	2005 25.			.986519
Contraction of the		13	TRUCAIN	.247	1	.951442
		14	DTZ	.296	. i	.999073
			-012			.991196
		17	0050-3	.000	1	.999595
		19	0054-5	.100	1	.996717
					;	.993003
		20	DOS11-15	1.915	; 1	.991724
		21	DOS16-20	3.614	. 1	.994158
			D0521-25	.065	1	.998183
		23	D0525+	.025	5 1	.999529
		24	MAXDOS	-233	5 1	.996231
			TMAXDOS	.44	5	.99815

	P RES	PEANE	NUCANCE	R
VARIABLE 26 AGE SQ		4322	.08381	
CONSTANT .	77	053	98414	
	ATTON MAT	R1X .		CLASSIFIED INTO GROUP -
GROUP	PERCENT	NUMBER	OF CASES	
	LORRELI	RESPER	NC NOCANC	ER
RESPEANO	76.5	104	32	1395 157
NUCANCER	40.4	1058-	-712	
TOTAL	43.0	1162	750	
Table 12. F- at us fr	first ste ing two gr om non-can	Lassificat op of disc roups: de ncer.	cion functi criminant a eath from r	ons and classification matrix nalysis on exposed white males espiratory cancer and death

-

VARIABLE ENTERED	2 INITLYR
------------------	-----------

STEP NUMBER

1

A 16 .

2

a de la

		F 10-1	TIPLE	
	VARIABLE	DEPOVE	EVEL	
		r = 1 1000		
	ZINIILIK	20 714	:	
	26 AGE SQ	20.310		19. s. 19. s. s.
-	VARIABLE	F 10 F0	RCE	TULERANCE
		ENTER LE	VEL	
	D F =	1 .1908		
	1 DEATHAGE	.400	1	.840417
	3 FINALYR	1.627	1	.796828
	4 TOTALYR	1.576	1	.936767
	5 EXPOSURE	.000	1	.000000
	6 CUMPOSE	.202	1	.972815
	7 CDOS 3+	.321	1	.976362
	A COUS ST	.435	1	.980935
	9 CDOS 10+	2.536	1	.991062
	10 CDOS 15+	3.088	1	.981992
	11 COOS 20+	.308	1	.963800
٠	12 CDOS 25+	.014	1	.984102
	13 YRDEATH	2.168	1	.947557
		2.108	1	.807435
	15 DT2	.001	1	.933560
	16 DT3	.551	1	.867060
	17 0050-3	.150	1	.967433
	13 DOS4-5	.010	1	.961899
	19 0056-10	.197	1	.957014
	20 00511-15	1.469	1	.985035
*	21 DOS16-20	3.912	1	.992906
	22 DOS21-25	.386	1	.973108
	23 00525+		1	.984102
	24 MAXDOS	.008	1	.964233
	25 TMAXDOS	.012	1	.876700
			and the second second	

 CLASSIFICATION FUNCTIONS

 GROUP =
 RESPCANC
 NOCANCER

 VARIABLE
 3.18978
 3.13801

 26 AGE SQ
 -.22689
 -.18191

 CONSTANT
 -75.21168
 -73.02815

CLASSIFICATION MATRIX NUMBER OF CASES CLASSIFIED INTO GROUP -GROUP PERCENT. CURRELT RESPEANE NOCANCER RESPEANE 73.5 100 36 1393 138 949 827 NULANLER 46.0 1049 863 48.5 TOTAL

, W

Table 13. F-ratios, classification functions and classification matrix at second step of discriminant analysis on exposed white males using two groups: death from respiratory cancer and death from non-cancer.

	VAR	RIABL	E		F TO FORCE	-	
-				R	EMOVE LEVEL	_	
_	21	INIT DOST	6-20		5.206 1 3.912 1 5 .961 1	_	
	:	VAI	RIABLE		F TO ENTER	FORC	E TOLERANCE
	:	1	DEATH	AGE	- 1 1907 - 355	1	.838792
-	•	3	FINAL	YR	.766	1	.761025
	:	5 6	EXPOS	URE	.000	1	.000000
-	•	7	COOS	3+	1.458		.478205
	•	8	CDOS	10+	1.548	1	.429224
		10	CDOS	20+	- 609 - 609	1	.170724
	•	12	CDOS	25+	.002	1	.978012
	:	14	DT1 DT2		1.146	1	.770016
7		10	513	7	.311		.659359
	÷	18	DOS 4-	-5	.628		. 883384
		20	DOS6	-15	2.725	1	.718253
_	•	22	DOSZ	-25	.010	1	-846598
	:	24	MAXDO	s	2.110	1	.592837
CLASSIFI	CATIO		CTION		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	GROUP	=	RESPC	ANC	NOCANCE	R	
Z INIT	LYR		3.199	07	3.14564		
21 DOS1	6-20		.014	43	.0118	3	
CONSTANT		-75	.7114	5	-73.36654		
CLASSIFI	CATIO	N MAT	RIX				
GACUP .	PER	CENT	NUM	BER	OF CASES C	LASS	FIED INTO GROUP
	COR	RECT	RES	PCAN	C NOCANCER		
NOCANCE	c 58 R 56	•ð •5	80 773		1003		1393 139

1 1

200

9 8 8

an and the

.

.

185

т<u>а</u>.т

963

2

, ², 1

•


Figure 6 Percent of deaths from respiratory cancer for exposed white males as a function of age at death.

	20- 29.9	30- 34.9	35- 39.9	40- 44.9	45- 49.9	50- 54.9	55- 59.9	60- 64.9	65- 69.9	70+	Total
No. Cancers	0	0	4	5	8	13	24	32	28	22	136
Total	37	29	71	114	156	226	260	289	279	451	1912
% Cancer	0.0	0.0	5.6	4.4	5.1	5.8	9.2	11.1	10.0	4.9	7.1

Table 15 Numbers of and percent of Respiratory Cancers as a function of age for exposed white males.

The left portion of this graph for ages <u>less than</u> 50 departs from a parabolic shape, but this part involves only 407 cases out of a total of 1912 cases. Thus, nearly 80% of the cases are in the age group from 50-70 and the quadratic form which we used ought to provide a good fit. In fitting a logistic model one fits $\log [p/(1-p)]$ to the independent variables, where p is the probability of death from cancer. A plot of this expression vs. age is shown in Figure 7, where the percents in Figure 6 were used for p. Again the

-63-

parabolic shape stands out in the range 50-70 years where the largest portion of the data is located.



Figure 7 log [p/(1-p)] for exposed white males as a function of age at death, where p is the percent of deaths from respiratory cancer vs. non-cancer.

As seen in Table 11, other important variables at the initial step of the discriminant analysis are final year of employment (FINALYR), year of death (YRDEATH), total years of employment (TOTAL YR), dose received 16 to 20 years before death (DOS16-20) and dose received 11 to 15 years before death (DOS11-15).

After the variable AGESQ is entered in the first step of the discriminant analysis, a curious thing happens. The variable initial year of employment (INITLYR) becomes the next candidate to enter with an F-ratio of 4.9. Other variables that are close are FINALYR, YRDEATH, and DOS16-20. We are at a loss to explain the meaning of this. The coefficients on INITLYR in the classifications functions

-64-

are such that the larger the value of INITLYR, the greater the chance of death from respiratory cancer. One might argue that INITLYR is acting as a surrogate for dose, particularly in view of Figure 4 which shows that the average dose which Hanford workers have been receiving has been going up over the years. However, if this is the case, one would expect the dose variables to show up with F-ratios comparable to that of INITLYR, but aside from DOS16-20, they don't. Furthermore, after INITLYR is entered, the F-ratio for DOS16-20 increases a little. If INITLYR were acting as a surrogate for DOS16-20, this F-ratio should decrease considerably. Thus it seems that INITLYR is not acting as a surrogate for any of the dose variables. This question is considered later in more detail and this conclusion is contradicted. One might feel that INITLYR is acting as a surrogate for YRDEATH and that since the incidence of respiratory cancer has been increasing over the years, this produces a positive relation between death from respiratory cancer and INITLYR. Perhaps this is so, but then one would expect the F-ratio for YRDEATH at step 1 of the discriminant analysis to be somewhat higher than that of INITLYR, and this is not the case.

After AGESQ and INITLYR are entered in the stepwise discriminant procedure, DOS16-20 is chosen next with an F-ratio of 3.9 ($\alpha = .048$). The coefficients on DOS 16-20 in the classification functions are such that higher dose gives higher chance of cancer.

The stepwise discriminant analysis procedure was used to suggest a set of variables to be used in developing a model to give the probability of death from respiratory cancer. The variables chosen were:

AGESQ, INITLYR, YRDEATH, DOS6-10 and DOS16-20.

-65-

At all of the steps of the discriminant analysis, correct classification was not impressive, being typically around 50%. One interesting fact which stands out is that cumulative lifetime dose (CUMDOS) does <u>not</u> show up at all (F-ratios all less than 1.5). The stepwise discriminant analysis was also run on the above data set, leaving out accidental deaths, and the results were essentially the same. Finally, the analysis was done including cases with zero cumulative lifetime dose. The biggest difference here was that YRDEATH showed up quite a bit more significant than INITLYR.

A logistic regression model was developed for exposed white males. Two response categories were used: respiratory cancer death (136 cases) and non-cancer deaths (1776 cases). The form of the model is:

$$\log \left[\frac{P}{(1-p)} \right] = \alpha + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \beta_j x_j$$

where p is the probability of respiratory cancer being the cause of death, as opposed to a noncancer cause of death, x_{i} is the value of the j-th predictor variable in the model and α and $\beta_{\frac{1}{2}}$ are coefficients to be estimated from the data. Table 16 summarizes the results of 8 different logistic regression models which were fit to the data. First, based on the discriminant analysis results, we would certainly want to include AGESO in the model. Then discriminant analysis would suggest that INITLYR be included, while the fact that the incidence of respiratory cancer is increasing over time would say that YRDEATH should be in the model. Each of these variables was tried separately (with AGESQ, of course) and together. See models 3, 4 and 5 of Table 16. With both INITLYR and YRDEATH in the model the chi-square values for these variables are about 3.0 (α =.09),

-66-

1393 143

Model	Constant	AGESQ	INITLYR	YRDEATH	DOS16-20	-2.log L
1	-2.57					981.1
2	-2.21	291 (16.6)				956.4
3	-4.37	301 (18.0)	.047 (4.7)			952.1
4	-4.35	290 (16.2)		.033 (4.4)		951.7
5	-5.78	298 (17.3)	.038 (2.96)	.028 (3.02)		949.0
6	-4.51	296 (17.4)	.048 (4.99)		.0018 (3.5)	949.2
7	-4.13	286 (15.7)		.029 (3.3)	.0012 (1.6)	950.3
8	-5.64	294 (16.9)	.041 (3.4)	.023 (1.9)	.0014 (2.0)	947.2

÷.

Table 16. Results of fitting eight logistic regression models using respiratory cancer and no cancer as the two response categories. Only exposed white males are included in the model. Variables which have no entry for a particular model were not used in that model. For each model, the first value under the variable is the coefficient of that variable in the logistic regression model, while the second value (below in parentheses) is the chi-square value for a test of statistical significance of that variable. All chi-square values have one degree of freedom.

but either one alone has a chi-square of 4.7 or 4.4. This suggests that either one, but not both, of these variables belongs in the model. Since YRDEATH has an obvious interpretation while INITLYR does not, it would seem that a reasonable model at this point would consist of AGESQ and YRDEATH. Next, DOS16-20 was added to some of the above models. See models 6, 7 and 8 of Table 16 for the results. When DOS16-20 is added to the model consisting of AGESQ and INITLYR, it has a chi-square value of 3.497 with 1 degree of freedom (α =.06). When DOS16-20 is added to the model consisting of AGESQ and YRDEATH, it has a chi-square value of only 1.6. Also, the chi-square value of YRDEATH drops from 4.4 to 3.3. Finally, when DOS16-20 is added to the model consisting of AGESO, INITLYR and YRDEATH, both YRDEATH and DOS16-20 drop in significance. This suggests that YRDEATH and DOS16-20 are correlated. This is substantiated further on. This shows that YRDEATH contains information about DOS16-20 and vice-versa; and that we cannot separate the effects of each (except, for example, by having an independent estimate of the effect of YRDEATH on respiratory cancer deaths among Hanford workers). In any case, from the point of view of statistical significance, DOS16-20 is border line at best (α =.06 when we include in DOS16-20 any effect of YRDEATH). The coefficients on AGESQ in all of the models are nearly the same (all between -. 301 and -. 286) which is reassuring. The coefficients on DOS16-20, on the other hand, vary between .0012 and .0018; which is not a very large magnitude, but percentagewise the change is 33% or 50% depending on one's point of view. This is quite large and can have a considerable effect if one attempts to estimate the effect of dose on the probability of death from respiratory cancer. In view of the relation between YRDEATH and DOS16-20 in the data file, we are reluctant to attempt such an estimate.

-68-

Another curious point about the logistic modeling is the fact that when INITLYR is added to the model consisting of AGESQ, YRDEATH and DOS16-20, it is on the border line of testing significant (chi-square = 3.366 with 1 d.f., $\alpha = .07$). As stated before, we are unable to find an interpretation for this.

Based on the above discussion, it is difficult to recommend a single model. Our inability to find an interpretation for INITLYR makes us want to leave it out of the model. On the other hand, the statistical analysis is hinting (mildly, at least) that it belongs in the model. Also, the statistical analysis is hinting that YRDEATH and DOS16-20 belong in the model. However, these variables are correlated, so that when both are put in the model their significance drops, as do the values of their coefficients. Thus it is not possible to estimate the reffect of each variable separately on the response.

An attempt to get at the meaning of INITLYR in the model and to see the relation between YRDEATH and dose prompted a more detailed look at the data. Scatterplots were made of three dose variables, DOS6-10, DOS11-15 and DOS16-20 against both INITLYR and YRDEATH. In these plots the extremely low doses were omitted. The plots are shown in Figures 8 thru 13 on the following pages. A number, such as 3, indicates 3 or more points on top of one another on the graph while a plus sign indicates 10 or more points on top of one another. The scatterplots show little or no relationship between INITLYR and the dose variables. However, YRDEATH bears a definite positive relationship with each of the dose variables.

-69-



Figure 8.

Scatterplot of DOS6-10 vs. Initial Year of Employment for Exposed White Males With Respiratory Cancer or no Cancer as Cause of Death. Cases with DOS 6-10 Less or Equal to 15 have not been plotted.



Figure 9. Scatterplot of DOS11-15 vs. Initial Year of Employment for Exposed White Males With Respiratory Cancer or no Cancer as Cause of Death. Cases with Dose Less or Equal to 10 have not been plotted.



Figure 10. Scatterplot of DOS16-20 vs. Initial Years of Employment for Exposed White Males with Respiratory Cancer or no Cancer as Cause of Death. Cases with Dose Less or Equal to 25 have not been plotted.



Figure 11. Scatterplot of DOS6-10 vs. Year of Death for Exposed White Males with Respiratory Cancer or no Cancer as Cause of Death. Cases with DOS6-10 Less or Equal to 15 have not been plotted.



 \mathcal{G}

White Males with Respiratory Cancer or no Cancer as Cause of Death. Cases with Dose Less or Equal to 25 have not been plotted.

A close look at the scatterplot of DOS6-10 vs. YRDEATH in Figure 11 shows that the envelope of the dose levels is flat up to about '57 where it begins to rise linearly. The doses plotted for '57 were received 6-10 years earlier, i.e., in '47 to '51. This suggests that the doses (recorded in our file) which Hanford workers received began to rise sometime between 1947 and 1951. Similar considerations for DOS11-15 in Figure 12 would put the beginning of the rise between 1946 and 1950. while consideration of DOS16-20 in Figure 13 would put it between 1945 and 1949. These observations are consistant with Figure 4 which shows that the average dose which Hanford workers received increased over time and that the increase began around 1949. Furthermore, the flat parts of the envelopes of the dose levels in Figures 11, 12, and 13 suggest that the dose which Hanford workers received decrease linearly from 1944 to around 1948 or so; a look at the graph in Figure 4 shows that this is approximately true. Thus, we have established a very definite positive relationship between the dose variables and year of death in our data file.

Next, for each of the dose variables, the average dose was determined for each initial year and each year of death. Plots of these averages appear in Figures 14 thru 19. The plot of average DOS6-10 vs. INITLYR in Figure 14 shows a linear rise up to '55 after which the plot becomes erratic. We don't have an explanation for this erratic behavior. However, the vast majority of cases, 1857 out of 1910 (two cases with initial year of '72 are not included), are on or before '55, so this plot would suggest a positive relationship between DOS6-10 and INITLYR. Such a relationship didn't show up in Figure 8, but a look at the vertical scales of the two graphs shows that the rise detected in Figure 14 is

1393 150

-73-







Figure 15. Plot of average DOS11-15 for workers with the specified initial year of employment. Only exposed white males with respiratory cancer or no cancer as cause of death are used.

-



Figure 16. Plot of average DOS16-20 for workers with the specified initial year of employment. Only exposed white males with respiratory cancer or no cancer as cause of death are used.



.

Figure 17. Plot of average DOS6-10 for workers with the specified year of death. Only exposed white males with respiratory cancer or no cancer as cause of death are used.

0



Figure 18. Plot of average DOS11-15 for worker, with the specified year of death. Only exposed white male, with respiratory cancer or no cancer as cause of death are used.



Figure 19. Plot of average DOS16-20 for workers with the specified year of death. Only exposed white males with respiratory cancer or no cancer as cause of death are used. -

rather slight compared to the vertical scale of Figure 8 so one would not expect to see that rise in Figure 8. Similar comments apply to Figure 15. The doses from '63 up must be zero in this figure, since all of the cases are deathsthat occurred on or before '72. There is no relation between DOS16-20 and INITLYR other than the logical requirement that average DOS16-20 be zero from '57 up. Thus there is some indication of a positive relationship between dose and initial year of employment. With regard to year of death, Figures 17, 18, and 19 show a very definite positive relationship between the dose variables and year of death, reinforcing that observed in Ficures 11, 12, and 13. The implications of these relationships in the logistic modelling have been discussed above.

4.0 PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS

A number of conclusions have been reached pertaining to the quality of the data analyzed in this project and the results that can be obtained. These may be listed as follows:

- We are not convinced that the data is in fact the same data as that collected for Hanford workers and maintained by Battelle Pacific Northwest Laboratories. This concern is due in part to inconsistencies among various sources concerning the data and in part to lack of clear documentation of the chain of events leading to the preparation of the data.
- The data is not consistent with the purported data collection procedures as evidenced for example by the existence of reported doses after the final year of employment.
- The data does not correspond with that presented in the Mancuso paper.
- 4. The data contains a systematic trend of increasing average yearly dose over calendar years, which suggests a possible bias in the data collection procedure applicable to the file from which the current data was extracted.
- 5. We have not been able to receive or discover an authoritative definition of the meaning of the dose variables, including the units, types of radiation included, and guality factors.
- 6. The absence of data pertaining to other information that is available but which was not provided was a hindrance to a proper completion of analysis. This includes among other items, data on radiation 1393 155

- (Cont.)6. monitoring, secondary causes of death, internal exposures, accidental deposition, yearly dose records broken down by radiation sources, and inclusion of additional fatalities occurring after 1972.
 - 7. The lack of adequate documentation from NRC forced us to spend considerable time and effort identifying and researching the supporting material required for the preparation of a responsible analysis.
 - In view of the above conclusions concerning the data, it does not seem appropriate to attempt to draw conclusions from the statistical analysis.
 - 9. It is a useful corollary of the evidence presented in this paper that future efforts must carefully consider the reliability of the data studied. This would include careful documentation of the sources of the data and of the procedures used in compiling it.
 - 10. It is our recommendation that this contract should be modified in such a way that the work can be repeated with data which is adequate for the purpose intended.

REFERENCES

- Mancuso, T. F.; Stewart, A.; Kneale, G., "Radiation Exposures of Hanford Workers Dying From Cancer and Other Causes", HEALTH PHYSICS, Pergamon Press, 1977 Vol. 33, p. 369-385.
- Milham, S., Jr., 1975, "Occupational Mortality in Washington State, 1950-1971", Contract CDC-99-74-26.
- Marks, S.; Gilbert, E.S.; and Breitenstein, B.D., "Cancer Mortality in Hanford Workers", March 1978, Symposium on the Late Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation, IAEA, Vienna, Austria.
- Land, C. "Review of Mancuso, Stewart, and Kneale: Radiation Exposures of Hanford Workers Dying from Cancer and Other Causes", unpublished.
- Hearings held by the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment of the Committee of Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the U. S. House of Representatives, January-February, 1978.
- 6. Kneale, G.W.; Stewart, A.M.; Mancuso, T.F., "Re-analysis of Data Relating to The Hanford Study of the Cancer Risks of Radiation Workers", Symposium on Late Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation, Vol. 1, IAEA, Vienna 1978.
- 7. Kneale, G.W.; Stewart, A.M.; Mancuso, T.F., "A Study of the Carcinogenic Effects of Low-Level Ionizing Radiation in Hanford Workers by a Regression-Type Model Using Life Tables", Presentation to the American Association for the Advancement of Science, January 6, 1979.
- Progress Reports for Contracts AT(30-1)-3394, CHAT(11-1)-3428 and E(11-1)-3428 prepared by Mancuso, T. F.; Sanders, B. S.; and Brodsky, A., Department of Occupational Health, Graduate School of Public Health, University of Pittsburgh, 1964-1977.
- Kirklin, C. W.; Fritz, H. W., Heid, K. R., Preliminary report on Hanford Operations AEC feasibility Study, 1969.
- Sanders, B. S., "Low-Level Radiation and Cancer Deaths", unpublished.

-80-

- 11. Progress Report #9, Contract CHAT (11-1)-3428, 1973, "Study of the Lifetime Health and Mortality Experience of Employees of AEC Contractors".
- Input Data to the AEC Health and Mortality Study, Radiation Exposure Experience of Exployees 1977 through 1974, revised December 31, 1974.
- 13. Progress Report #4, Contract AT(30-1)-3394, Feasibility Study of the Correlation of Lifetime Health and Mortality Experiences of AEC and AEC Contractor Employees with Occupational Radiation Exposure, Mancuso, T. F.; Sanders B. S.; and Brodsky, A., 1968.
- Biomedical Computer Programs, Dixon, W. J., Editor, University of California Press, 1975.

APPENDIX A

Univariate Distributions of All Variables Except Race, Sex, and Exposed-Unexposed For All Cases and For Exposed White Males

21.5 10	22.5-	11000
22.5 TO	23.5-	54
23.5 10	24.5-	48
24.5 10	25.5-	10***
25.5 TO	26.5-	11***
26.5 10	27.5-	711
27.5 10	28.5-	16*****
28.5 10	29.5-	9112
29.5 10	30.5-	1144
30.5 10	12.5-	
32.5 TO	33.5-	201111111
33.5 TO	34.5-	1488888
34.5 TO	35.5-	198888888
35.5 TO	36.5-	23#########
36.5 TO	37.5-	31**********
37.5 TO	38.5-	37***************
38.5 TO	39.5-	46#####################################
39.5 10	40.5-	32***********
40.5 10	41.5-	40#####################################
42.5 10	42.5-	
43.5 TO	44.5-	
44.5 TO	45.5-	38************************************
45.5 TO	46.5-	63494444444444444444444444444444
46.5 TO	47.5-	71********************************
47.5 TO	48.5-	71
48.5 TO	49.5-	81**********************************
49.5 TO	50.5-	83*********************************
50.5 TO	51.5-	834************************************
51.5 10	52.5-	86
52.5 10	53.5-	
54.5 10	55.5-	874747477777777777777777777777777777777
55.5 TO	56.5-	112444444444444444444444444444444444444
56.5 TO	57.5-	117************************************
57.5 TO	58.5-	99 **** *******************************
58.5 TO	59.5-	103************************************
59.5 TO	60.5-	108************************************
60.5 TO	61.5-	106811111111111111111111111111111111111
61.5 10	62.5-	
47.5 10	44.5-	
64.5 TO	45.5-	126181888888888888888888888888888888888
65.5 TO	66.5-	115************************************
66.5 TO	67.5-	123************************************
67.5 TO	68.5-	??************************************
68.5 TO	69.5-	922222222222222222222222222222222222222
69.5 10	70.5-	977111111111111111111111111111111111111
71.5 10	72.5-	
77.5 TO	73.5-	AB************************************
73.5 TO	74.5-	93************************************
74.5 TO	75.5-	70*****************************
75.5 TO	76.5-	76*****************************
76.5 TO	77.5-	628888888888888888888888888888888888888
77.5 10	78.5-	48*************************************
78.5 10	79.5-	
PO. 5 TO	80.5-	
81.5 10	82.5-	2011111111
82.5 TO	83.5-	33*********
83.5 TO	84.5-	271111111111
84.5 TO	85.5-	21 *******
85.5 TO	86.5-	10###
86.5 TO	87.5-	611
87.5 TO	88.5-	5#
88.5 TO	89.5-	
00.5 10	91.5-	
91.5 10	92.5-	à
92.5 TO	93.5-	0
93.5 TO	94.5-	0
94.5 TO	95.5-	1
95.5 TO	96.5-	
96.5 TO-	97.5-	-0-
97.5 10	98.5-	
99.5 10	100 5-	
100.5 10	101.5	
		111 Green And at Death

I

I

2

1

1

I

All Cases Age at Death

42.5	TO	43.5-	•
43.5	TO	44.5-	18
44.5	TO	45.5-	574888888888888888888888888888888888888
45.5	TO	46.5-	107111
46.5	TO	47.5-	441848484888888888888888888888888888888
47.5	TO	48.5-	330####################################
48.5	TO	49.5-	581
49.5	TO	50.5-	A488
50.5	TO	51.5-	21 28 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4
51.5	TO	52.5-	75.84
52.5	TO	53.5-	418
53.5	TO	54.5-	410
54.5	TO	55.5-	4218
	TO	54.5-	14
54.5	TO	57.5-	2
57.5	TO	58.5-	
58.5	TO	59.5-	
	TO	40.5-	
40.5	TO	41 5-	
41.5	TO	42.5-	
42.5	TO	41.5-	10
41.5	TO	44.5-	1 [*]
64.5	TO	45.5-	
48.8	TO	44.5-	12
44.5	TO	47 8-	
47.5	TO	19.5-	
40 5	TO	40.5-	
40.5	TO	20 5	
THIC		100004	
1412	111	DUGRAM	DUES NUT INCLUDE 5.00 DBS .LT. 40.5 AND .000 DBS .GE. 79.5

All Cases Initial Year of Employment

1393 161

A-2

-

43.5 10 44.5-	364444444444444444444444444444444444444
44.5 TO 45.5-	790************************************
45.5 TO 46.5-	212************************************
46.5 TO 47.5-	116488888888888888
47.5 TO 48.5-	227444444444444444444444444444444444444
48.5 TO 49.5-	2504************************************
49.5 TO 50.5-	1364444444444444
50.5 TO 51.5-	195**********************
51.5 TO 52.5-	194888888888888888888888888888888888888
52.5 TO 53.5-	1368888888888888888
53.5 TO 54.5-	102**********
54.5 TO 55.5-	110**********
55.5 TO 56.5-	104############
56.5 TO 57.5-	120#############
57.5 TO 58.5-	102*********
58.5 TO 59.5-	107####################################
59.5 TO 60.5-	7488488888
60.5 TO 61.5-	928484484848
61.5 TO 62.5-	83#########
62.5 TO 63.5-	77333444444
63.5 TO 64.5-	75#######
64.5 TO 65.5-	98777777777777777
65.5 TO 66.5-	32***
66.5 TO 67.5-	25##
67.5 TO 68.5-	241
68 5 TO 69.5-	39****
69.5 TO 70.5-	41####
70.5 TO 71.5-	34888
71.5 70 72.5-	177700

A11	Cases	Final	Year	of	Emp	10	yment
-----	-------	-------	------	----	-----	----	-------

......

5	TO	.5-	1012************						********		
	TO	1.5-	765************								
1.5	TO	2.5-	295888888888888888888888888888888888888								
2.5	TO	3.5-	172*************								
3.5	TO	4.5-	163************								
4.5	TO	5.5-	130*********								
5.5	TO	6.5-	140***********								
6.5	TO	7.5-	1168888888888								
7.5	TO	8.5-	1154*******								
8.5	TO	9.5-	110********								
9.5	TO	10.5-	9611111111								
10.5	TO	11.5-	9811111111								
11.5	TO	12.5-	821111111								
12.5	TO	13.5-									
13.5	TO	14.5-	9341441444								
14.5	TO	15.5-	771111111								
15.5	TO	16.5-	5911111								
16.5	TO	17.5-	80******								
17.5	TO	18.5-	564448							1 S 2 1	
18.5	TO	19.5-	528888							1. 1	112
19.5	TO	20.5-	521111							1204	104
20.5	TO	21.5-	39##							1375	10-
21.5	TO	22.5-	20								
22.5	TO	23.5-	12								
23.5	TO	24.5-	17								
24.5	TO	25.5-	26#								
25.5	TO	26.5-	13								
26.5	TO	27.5-	14								
27.5	TO	28.5-	14								
THIS	HIS	TOGRAM	DOES NOT INCLUDE	.000	OBS .LT	500	AND	5.00	OBS .GE.	29.5	
				A11	Cases	Total	Vear	e Emp	bevol		





All Cases Cause of Death





	5 TO 49 49.5 TO 99	.5-	2851 ####################################	
	99.5 TO 149	.5-	226*****	
	149.5 TO 199	.5-	120**	
	249.5 TO 299	.5-	45	
	299.5 TO 349	.5-	30	
	399.5 10 399	.5-	20	
	449.5 TO 499	.5-	13	
	499.5 TO 549 549.5 TO 599	.5-	10	
	599.5 TO 649	.5-	19	
	649.5 TO 699	7.5-	2	
	749.5 TO 799	7.5-	·	
6.00	799.5 TO 849	9.5-	5	
	899.5 TO 949	9.5-	8	
	949.5 TO 999	9.5-	3	
	1049.5 10 1049	9.5-		
	1097.5 TO 1145	9.5-	3	
	1142.5 10 1199	9.5-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	1249.5 10 1299	9.5-		
	1299.5 10 134	9.5-		
	1399.5 TO 144	9.3-	2	
1.	1449.5 TO 147	9.5-		
	1549.5 TO 159	9.5-	2	
	1599.5 TO 164	9.5-		
1	1699.5 TO 174	9.5-		
	1749.5 TO 179	9.5-		
	1799.5 TO 184 1849.5 TO 189	9.5-		
- 10 A	1899.5 TO 194	9.5-	0	
	1949.5 TO 199 1999.5 TO 204	9.5-		
20	2049.5 10 209	9.5-		
	2099.5 10 214	9.5-	1 2	
	2199.5 TO 224	19.5-	0	
	2249.5 10 229	9.5-	0	
	2349.5 TO 239	9.5-	1	
1.000	2399.5 10 244	19.5-	0	
	2499.5 TO 254	19.5-	1	
	2549.5 10 259	19.5-	5	
	2649.5 TO 269	7.5-	1	
	2699.5 TO 274	49.5-	2	
	2799.5 TO 284	49.5-	0	
~ · ·	2849.5 10 289	99.5-	2	
1	2949.5 TO 299	99.5-	0	
	2999.5 10 304	49.5-	0	
	3049.5 TO 309	49.5-	3	
	3149.5 10 319	99.5-	1	
	3199.5 TO 324 3249.5 TO 329	49.5-	0	
	3299.5 -10 -334	49.5-	-0	
	3349.5 10 339	99.5-	0	
	3449.5 TO 349	99.5-	0	
1	3499.5 10 354	49.5-	0	
	3599.5 10 364	49.5-	1	
	3649.5 10 365	99.5-	0	
10.10	3749.5 10 379	99.5-	0	
	3799.5 TO 384	49.5-	1	
1	3899.5 10 39	49.5-	0	
	3949.5 TO 39	99.5-	•	1395
	4049.5 10 40	99.5-	0	13/5
	4099.5 TO 41	49.5-	0	
11.	4149.5 TO 41	49.5-	0	
	4249.5 TO 42	99.5-	0	
	4299.5 10 43	49.5-	1	
	4399.5 TO 44	49.5-	1 NIL Canada Cumulation Tilesting	Dees
			All Cases Cumulative Lifetime	Dose

.

ø

A-8

167

-

	49.5-	
40.5 10	05.5-	
47.5 10	149 5-	170++++
140 5 10	100 5-	
100.5 10	749.5-	59
249.5 10	229.5-	36
299.5 10	349.5-	29
349.5 TO	399.5-	10
399.5 TO	449.5-	21
449.5 TO	499.5-	11
499.5 TO	549.5-	0
549.5 TO	599.5-	20
599.5 10	649.5-	
499 5 10	749 5-	
749.5 10	799.5-	
799.5 TO	849.5-	
849.5 10	899.5-	1
899.5 TO	949.5-	2
949.5 TO	999.5-	
999.5 10	1049.5-	
1047.5 10	1149.5-	
1149.5 10	1199.5-	
1199.5 TO	1249.3-	
1249.5 TU	1299.5-	
1299.5 TO	1349.5-	2
1349.5 TO	1399.5-	
1399.5 TO	1449.5-	2
1449.5 10	1499.5-	
1499.5 10	1500.5-	
1599.5 10	1649.5-	
1649.5 TO	1699.5-	· 3
1699.5 TO	1749.5-	3
1749.5 TO	1799.5-	•
1799.5 10	1849.5-	•
1849.5 10	1899.5-	
1899.5 10	1949.5-	
1949.5 10	2049.5-	
2049.5 10	2099.5-	0
2099.5 10	2149.5-	
2149.5 TC	2199.5-	1
2199.5 10	2249.5-	0
2249.5 TO	2299.5-	
2299.5 10	2347.5-	
2349.5 10	2399.5-	
2449.5 TO	2499.5-	
2499.5 TO	2549.5-	0
2549.5 TO	2599.5-	3
2599.5 TO	2649.5-	• 1
2649.5 TO	2699.5-	
2699.5 1	2749.0	
2749.5 H	2040 5.	
2849.5 T	2899.5	
2899.5 TH	2949.5	• 1
2949.5 TI	2999.5	· 0
2999.5 T	0 3049.5	• 0
3049.5 T	0 3099.5	
3099.5 T	0 3149.5	
3149.5	0 3199.5	
3144.5 T	1 100.5	
3299.5 T	0 3349.5	
3349.5 T	0 3399.5	- 0
3399.5 T	0 3449.5	• 3 (a 1734) a 174
3449.5 T	0 3499.5	- 0
3499.5 1	0 3549.5	
3549.5 1	0 3599.5	1707 168
3549.5 1	0 1499	1373 100
1400 5 1	0 3749.5	- 0
3749.5 1	0 3799.5	- 0
3799.5 1	0 3849.5	- 0
3849.5 1	0 3899.5	- 0
3899.5 1	0 3949.5	
3949.5	0 3999.5	
3444.5 1	0 4049.5	

.....

10

All Cases Cumulative Dose 3 Years Before Death

5 TO 49.5-	3005***********************************
99.5 TO 149.5-	188****
149.5 TO 199.5-	871
199.5 10 249.5-	58
249.5 TO 299.5-	32
299.5 10 349.5-	21
349.5 10 399.5-	13
449.5 TO 499.5-	16
499.5 TO 549.5-	9
549.5 TO 599.5-	14
599.5 TO 649.5-	2
A99.5 TO 749.5-	7
749.5 TO 799.5-	8
799.5 TO 849.5-	2
849.5 TO 899.5-	
949.5 TO 999.5-	
999.5 TO 1049.5-	4
1049.5 TO 1099.5-	
1099.5 10 1149.5-	
1149.5 10 1199.5-	•
1249.5 TO 1299.5-	
1299.5 TO 1349.5-	
1349.5 TO 1399.5-	
1399.5 10 1449.5-	
1499.5 TO 1549.5-	
1549.5 10 1599.5-	1
1579.5 TO 1649.5-	2
1649.5 10 1699.5-	: 특히 - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1749.5 10 1799.5-	
1799.5 TO 1849.5-	
1849.5 TO 1899.5-	2
1899.5 TO 1949.5-	
1999.5 10 2049.5-	
2049.5 70 2099.5-	0
2099.5 TO 2149.5-	0
2149.5 10 2199.5-	
2249.5 10 2299.5	
2299.5 10 2349.5-	· i
2349.5 TO 2399.5-	
2399.5 10 2449.5-	
2444.5 10 2444.5	
2549.5 10 2599.5	
2599.5 TO 2649.5	• •
24:9.5 TO 2699.5	- 2
2699.5 10 2749.5	
2799.5 10 2849.5	- o
2849.5 TO 2899.5	- 0
2899.5 10 2949.5	
2949.5 10 2999.5	
3049.5 10 3099.5	ò
3099.5 TO 3149.5	• • •
3149.5 10 3199.5	- 0
3199.5 10 3249.5	- 0
1299.5 10 1149.5	- 0
3349.5 TO 3399.5	- 0
3399.5 10 3449.5	- 2
3449.5 10 3499.5	
3499.5 10 3549.5	1707 169
3599.5 TO 3449.5	1373 107
3649.5 10 3699.5	- 0
3699.5 10 3749.5	- 0
3749.5 10 3799.5	
3777.5 10 3849.5	

All Cases Cumulative 55 5 Years Before Dea

A-10

•

5 T0 49.5- 326444444 49.5 T0 149.5- 1264 149.5 T0 149.5- 1264 149.5 T0 249.5- 44 240.5 T0 249.5- 24 - 299.5 T0 349.5- 21 349.5 T0 399.5- 6 399.5 T0 447.5- 13 449.5 T0 499.5- 10 499.5 T0 549.5- 4 639.5 T0 549.5- 4 649.5 T0 599.5- 10 599.5 T0 749.5- 3 749.5 T0 749.5- 3 849.5 T0 899.5- 2 899.5 T0 749.5- 1 1049.5 T0 1049.5- 3 1099.5 T0 1049.5- 3 1099.5 T0 1049.5- 3 1099.5 T0 1049.5- 3 1299.5 T0 1299.5- 2 1299.5 T0 1299.5- 2 1299.5 T0 1299.5- 2 1299.5 T0 1399.5- 2 1399.5 T0 149.5- 1 149.5 T0 1399.5- 3 1399.5 T0 1449.5- 1 149.5 T0 1399.5- 2 149.5 T0 1399.5- 2 149.5 T0 1399.5- 2 149.5 T0 1399.5- 2 1699.5 T0 149.5- 1 1599.5 T0 1449.5- 1 1699.5 T0 1499.5- 2 1699.5 T0 1499.5- 2 1699.5 T0 1699.5- 0 1799.5 T0 1699.5- 0 1799.5 T0 1699.5- 0 1799.5 T0 1699.5- 0 199.5 T0 199.5- 0 199.5 T0 2099.5- 0 2099.5 T0 2399.5- 0 2249.5 T0 2399.5- 0 2349.5 T0 2399.5- 0 2349.5 T0 2399.5- 0 2349.5 T0 2399.5- 0 2349.5 T0 2349.5- 1 2349.5 T0 2349			
	10 Years	Before Death	
5 TO 49.5- 3506444444444 49.5 TO 99.5- 24244444444 99.5 TO 149.5- 994 149.5 TO 199.5- 42 199.5 TO 249.5- 35 249.5 TO 349.5- 16 349.5 TO 399.5- 2 399.5 TO 449.5- 7 449.5 TO 599.5- 4 549.5 TO 549.5- 3 549.5 TO 549.5- 4 599.5 TO 649.5- 4 699.5 TO 649.5- 1 749.5 TO 849.5- 1 749.5 TO 849.5- 1 749.5 TO 849.5- 1 899.5 TO 949.5- 1 899.5 TO 949.5- 1 899.5 TO 949.5- 2 949.5 TO 949.5- 1 999.5 TO 949.5- 1 999.5 TO 949.5- 1 999.5 TO 1049.5- 0 1049.5 TO 1049.5- 0 1049.5 TO 1149.5- 1 1149.5 TO 1199.5- 0 1199.5 TO 1249.5- 1			
	All Cases 15 Years	Cumulative Dose Before Death	1393 170



21.5	10	22.5-	4414
	10	27 5-	
****	10	23.3-	
23.5	10	24.5-	
24.5	TO	25.5-	6*****
25.5	TO	26.5-	4111
74.8	10	37 5-	
-0.5			
27.5	10	28.5-	Activity
28.5	TO	29.5-	0
29.5	TO	30.5-	A
10.5	TO	71 5-	
30.0	10	31.3-	0
31.5	10	32.5-	BEETELEE
32.5	TO	33.5-	11*********
33.5	TO	34.5-	611110
34.5	TO	35.5-	1100000000
78 8	TO	74 8-	
33.3	10	30.0-	1144444444
36.5	TO	37.5-	13********
37.5	TO	38.5-	198818888888888888888888888888888888888
10.5	TO	10 5-	22****************
30.5	10	37.3-	
39.5	10	40.5-	14#############
40.5	TO	41.5-	22***************
41.5	TO	42.5-	774844444444444444444444444444444444444
4213	10	43.3-	2/1111011111111111111111111111111111111
43.5	TO	44.5-	30*************************************
44.5	TO	45.5-	36*************************************
45.5	TO	46.5-	362333555553355555555555555555555555555
	10	47 5	
40.0	10	47.3-	
47.5	TO	48.5-	34#####################################
48.5	TO	49.5-	42*************************************
49.8	TO	50.5-	
20.2	10	21.2-	121111111111111111111111111111111111111
51.5	TO	52.5-	49*************************************
52.5	TO	53.5-	55*************************************
	TO		
33.5	10	34.3-	00
34.3	10	22.2-	241111111111111111111111111111111111111
55.5	TO	56.5-	55************************************
54.5	TO	57.5-	74*************************************
	TO	50 5-	***************************************
3/13	10	30.3-	
28.2	TO	59.3-	2911111.1111111111111111111111111111111
59.5	TO	60.5-	59*************************************
40.5	TO	41.5-	ARTY ************************************
	10	17 .	
0113	10	0410	/3
62.5	TO	63.5-	
63.5	TO	64.5-	65####################################
44.5	TO	45.5-	79*************************************
		44.5	
03.3	10	00.3-	021111111111111111111111111111111111111
66.5	TO	67.5-	72*************************************
67.5	TO	68.5-	70*************************************
40.5	TO	49.5-	
40.0	10	20 5	
07.3	10	10.5-	24444444
70.5	TO	71.5-	39*************************************
71.5	TO	72.5-	70*************************************
72.*	TO	23.5-	51 ************************************
		74 5-	
13.3	10	/4.5-	101111111111111111111111111111111111111
74.5	TO	75.5-	37*************************************
75.5	TO	76.5-	45**********************************
74.5	TO	77.5-	17**********************************
77 .	10	70 -	······
11.5	10	10.3-	
78.5	TO	79.5-	27**********************
77.5	TO	80.5-	13*********
80.5	TO		
00.5	10	01.5-	
81.5	10	82.5-	1111111111111
82.5	TO	83.5-	18**************
83.5	TO	84.5-	1444444444444
	-	ar .	
84.5	10	9312-	1.2.1.1.1.1.1.1
82.5	10	86.5-	Statt
86.5	TO	87.5-	51111
87.5	TO	88.5-	54444
00 5	TO		
00.0	10	07.3-	
89.5	TO	90.5-	
90.5	TO	71.5-	
91 .	TO	22.5-	
02.0	10		
74.3	10	43.5-	
93.5	TO	94.5-	0
94.5	TO	95.5-	0
	TO	94.5-	•
01 0	TO		
70.5	10	11.3-	3 You New You N
97.5	TO	98.5-	0
98.5	10	99.5-	0
	TO	100.5-	0
100 -	TO	101 .	

75 350

35

۲. ۲

Exposed White Males Age At Death 1393 172

8

* × ?

1. S. S.

see = 8

* ²⁰⁰²

1

1

į.

· .

1. 20.1

A-13

42.5 10 43.5-	
41.5 TO 44.5-	1008***********************************
AA . TO AT	
43.5 10 40.5-	
46.5 10 47.5-	242488888888888888888888888888888888888
47.5 TO 48.5-	132********
48.5 TO 49.5-	33**
49.5 TO 50.5-	33**
50.5 TO 51.5-	132********
51.5 TO 52.5-	45###
52.5 TO 53.5-	30*
53.5 TO 54.5-	35**
54.5 TO 55.5-	41###
55.5 TO 56.5-	7
56.5 TO 57.5-	
57.5 TO 58.5-	이야 한 것 같은 것이 집에 집에 있는 것 같은 것이 같이 많이 가지? 것 같은 것 같은 것 같은 것 같은 것이 같은 것이 같은 것이 같은 것이 같은 것이 없다.
58.5 TO 59.5-	사람이 집에서는 사람이 해야 한 것이 같아요. 그는 것을 위한 것을 가지 않는 것이 같아요. 가지 않는 것을 가지 않는 것을 하는 것을 하는 것을 가지 않는 것을 하는 것을 수 있다. 것을 하는 것을 수 있는 것을 수 있는 것을 수 있는 것을 하는 것을 하는 것을 하는 것을 수 있다. 것을 하는 것을 수 있는 것을 수 있다. 것을 수 있는 것을 수 있다. 것을 수 있는 것을 수 있다. 것을 수 있는 것을 수 있다. 것을 수 있는 것을 수 있다. 것을 것을 것을 것을 것을 것을 것을 수 있는 것을 수 있는 것을 수 있는 것을 수 있는 것을 수 있다. 것을
59.5 TO 60.5-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
40.5 TO 41.5-	2 · . 2 · . 이 이 가지 않아? 이 이 가지 않는 것 이 가지 않는 것 같아. 것 같아. 가지 않는 것 같아. 이 가지 않는 것 이 가지 않는 것 같아. 이 가지 않는 것 이 가지 않는 것 같아. 이 가지 않는 것 않는 것 같아. 이 가지 않는 것 같아. 이 가지 않는 것 않는 것 않는 것 않는 것 않는 이 가 것 않는 것 같아. 이 가 있는 것 같아. 이 이 것 같아. 이 이 이 이 것 않는 것 같아. 이 이 이 이 이 이 있는 것 같아. 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이
AL.5 TO 42.5-	2
42.5 TO 41.5-	. 그는 것 같아요. 그는 것 같아요. 그는 것 같아요. 이 것 같아요.
43.5 TO 44.5-	
44 E TO 45 E-	
04.5 10 05.5-	이 같은 것 같은
00.0 10 00.0-	
66.5 TO 67.5-	
67.5 TO 68.5-	0
58.5 TO 69.5-	0
10 5 10 70 5-	

Exposed White Males Initial Year of Employment

A-14

43.5 10 44.5-	18****
44.5 TO 45.5-	340************************************
45.5 TO 46.5-	119445555555555555555555555555555555555
46.5 10 47.5-	46433333333333
47.5 TO 48.5-	69444444444444444444
48.5 TO 49.5-	112444444444444444444444444444444444444
49.5 TO 50.5-	78*************************************
50.5 TO 51.5-	1238888844888888888888888888888888888888
51.5 TO 52.5-	98*****
52.5 TO 53.5-	914444444444444444444444444444444444444
53.5 TO 54.5-	67888888888888888888888
54.5 TO 55.5-	38***********************
55.5 TO 56.5-	75#####################################
56.5 TO 57.5-	948888888888888888888888888888888888888
57.5 TO 58.5-	88#####################################
58.5 TO 59.5-	84****************
59.5 TO 60.5-	664444444444444444444444444444444444444
20.5 10 61.5-	744444444444444444444444444444444444444
51.5 TO 62.5-	764444444444444444444444444444444444444
62.5 TO 63.5-	67188538888978888888
63.5 TO 64.5-	648888888888888888888888888888888888888
54.5 TO 65.5-	774****************
65.5 TO 66.5-	3148888888
66.5 TO 67.5-	198888
57.5 TO 68.5-	24888888
58.5 TO 69.5-	3488888888
69.5 TO 70.5-	38*********
70.5 TO 71.5-	304144448
71.5 TO 72.5-	36******
	MMM MMMMMMM MATERIAL CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR AND A C

-

Exposed White Males Final Year of Employment

5	TO	.5-	177************************************
.5	TO	1.5-	362************************************
1.5	TO	2.5-	159************************************
2.5	TO	3.5-	119************************************
3.5	TO	4.5-	105*********************
4.5	TO	5.5-	92*****************
5.5	TO	6.5-	93***************
6.5	TO	7.5-	90***************
7.5	TO	8.5-	92111111111111111111111111
8.5	TO	9.5-	92**************
9.5	TO	10.5-	79*************
10.5	TO	11.5-	9344444444444444444
11.5	TO	12.5-	71 *************
12.5	TO	13.5-	61 *********
13.5	TO	14.5-	791111111111111111111111111111111111111
14.5	TO	15.5-	674444444444444444444444444444444444444
15.5	TO	16.5-	5188885888888
16.5	TO	17.5-	68111111111111
17.5	TO	18.5-	5011111111
18.5	TO	19.5-	498888888888
19.5	TO	20.5-	471111111111
20.5	TO	21.5-	36******
21.5	TO	22.5-	19112
22.5	TO	23.5-	124 1295 11
23.5	TO	24.5-	1611
24.5	TO	25.5-	241818
25.5	TO	26.5-	13*
20.5	TO	27.5-	148
27.5	10	28.5-	148

0

Exposed White Male Total Years Employed A-15



A-16

1393 175
1	. 이는 것은 것 같아요. 영상 이는 것은 것은 것은 것은 것을 가지 않는 것 같아요. 이는 것은 것은 것이 있는 것이 같아요. 이는 것은 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있다. 이는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있다. 이는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있다. 것이 있는 것이 있다. 것이 있는 것이 없다. 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 없는 것이 있는 것이 없는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 없다. 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 없는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 없는 것이 있는 것이 없다. 것이 있는 것이 없는 것이 없다. 것이 없는 것이 없다. 것이 없는 것이 없 않는 것이 없는 한 것이 없는 것 이 없는 것이 없 한 것이 없는 것 않는 것이 없는 것이 것이 없는 것이 않는 것이 않이
1	
1	
1	
1	
1	
	6
	3
	3 A STATE OF A STATE
	5
	• 양 방법 전 경험은 것 같은 전 비가 많은 것 같아요. 것 같아요. 그는 것 것 것 같아요. 한 것 것 같아요. 한 것 같아요. 돈을 했는 것 같아.
	3
	/0.3
	1804******************
	18*
	3
	14
	35****
	35####
	35#### 1 36#### 15
	35**** 1 36**** 15 2
	35**** 1 36**** 15 2 13
	33**** 1 36**** 15 2 13 33***
	33**** 1 36**** 15 2 13 33*** 2 1
	33**** 1 36**** 15 2 13 33*** 2 1 2
	35**** 1 36**** 15 2 13 33*** 2 2 2
	35**** 1 36**** 15 2 13 33*** 2 1 2 2 2 4
	35**** 1 36**** 15 2 13 33*** 2 2 2 4 1
	35#### 1 36#### 15 2 13 33### 2 1 1 2 4 1 1 1
	35#### 1 36#### 15 2 13 33### 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
	35#### 1 36#### 15 2 13 33### 2 1 2 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 2
	35#### 1 36#### 15 2 13 33### 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 4 4 1 1 1 2 2 3 4 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
	35#### 1 36#### 15 2 13 33### 2 1 2 2 4 1 1 1 1 2 2 4 4 1 1 2 2 4 4 1 1 2 2 4 4 1 1 2 2 2 4 4 1 2 2 2 2 4 4 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
	35#### 1 36#### 15 2 13 33### 2 1 2 2 4 4 1 1 1 1 2 2 4 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
	35#### 1 36#### 2 2 3 3 3 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
	35#### 36#### 36#### 36#### 2 2 3 3 3 4 4 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 3 4 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

Exposed White Males Cause of Death (ICD codes)

A-17



5 TO	49.5-	1141 **********************************		
49.5 10	99.5-	404141444444444444444444444444444444444		
99.5 TO	149.5-			
199.5 10	249.5-	50111		
249.5 10	299.5-	4478		
349.5 10	399.5-	19		
399.5 TO	449.5-	20		
499.5 TO	549.5-	9		
549.5 TO	599.5-	14		
649.5 TO	599.5-	÷		
699.5 TO	749.5-	5		
799.5 TO	849.5-	s		
849.5 10	899.5-	0		
949.5 TO	999.5-	3		
999.5 TO 1	049.5-	5		
1099.5 TO 1	149.5-	i de la companya de l		
1149.5 TO 1	199.5-			
1249.5 TO 1	299.5-	2		
1299.5 TO 1 1349.5 TO 1	349.5-			
1399.5 TO 1	449.5-			
1449.5 TO 1 1499.5 TO 1	1499.5-			
1549.5 TO	1599.5-	2 1945 - 1955 - 1957 - 1957 - 1957 - 1957 - 1957 - 1957 - 1957 - 1957 - 1957 - 1957 - 1957 - 1957 - 1957 - 195		
1549.5 TO 1	1649.5-	6		
1699.5 TO 1	1749.5-			
1799.5 10 1	1849.5-			
1849.5 TO	899.5-	0		
1949.5 TO	1999.5-	2		
1999.5 TO 3	2049.5-	3. A second se second second sec second second sec second second sec		
2099.5 TO	2149.5-			
2149.5 10 2	2199.5-	2		
2249.5 10	2299.5-	0		
2299.5 10	2349.5-			
2399.5 TO	2449.5-	ò		
2449.5 TO 2499.5 TO 2	2499.5-	0		
2549.5 TO	2599.5-			
2599.5 TO 2649.5 TO 2	2649.5-	0		
2699.5 TO	2749.5-	2		
2749.5 10	2799.5-	1		
2849.5 10	2899.5-			
2949.5 TO	2999.5-	0		
2999.5 TO	3049.5-	0		
3099.5 TO-	3149.5-	-3-		
3149.5 TO	3199.5-	1		
3249.5 10	3299.5-	1		
3299.5 10	3349.5-	0		
3399.5 10	3449.5-			
3449.5 TO	3499.5-	0		
3549.5 TO	3599.5-	0		
3599.5 10	3649.5-	1		
3699.5 TO	3749.5-	0		
3749.5 10	3799.5-	2		
3849.5 TO	3899.5-	0		
3949.5 10	3949.5-	0		
3999.5 TO	4049.5-			
4049.5 10	4149.5-	0		
4149.5 10	4199.5-	0	1 7 0 7	170
4249.5 10	4299.5-	0	1395	1/8
4299.5 10	4349.5-			
4399.5 10	4449.5-			
		Exposed White Males Cumulative Lifetime D	OSP	

A-19

5 TO 49.5-	1206	****************
49.5 10 99.5-	421************************************	
140 5 TO 149.5-	1/7	
199.5 TO 249.5-	54##	
249.5 10 299.5-	35.	
299.5 TO 349.5-	29*	
349.5 TO 399.5-	16	
399.5 10 449.5-	21	
499.5 TO 549.5-	2	
549.5 TO 599.5-	18	
599.5 TO 649.5-	11	
649.5 TO 699.5-		
749.5 TO 799.5-		
799.5 TO 849.5-		
849.5 TO 899.5-		
899.5 10 949.5-		
999.5 TO 1049.5-		
1049.5 TO 1099.5-	3	
1099.5 TO 1149.5-		
1149.5 10 1199.5-		
1249.5 10 1299.5-	· 글 이 것 같아요. 이 안전 방송은 빈 것 같아. 이 것	
1299.5 TO 1349.5-		
1349.5 10 1399.5-		
1399.5 TO 1449.5-		
1499.5 TO 1549.5-		
1549.5 TO 1599.5-	I R. 성화 2007년 전문 전문 것은 것이 가지 않는 것 같은 감정 이 가격적 것이 같다.	
1599.5 10 1649.5-		
1849.5 TO 1899.5-		
1749.5 TO 1799.5-	o de la construcción de la constru	
1799.5 TO 1849.5-	0	
1349.5 TO 1899.5-	0	
1049.5 10 1949.5-		
1999.5 TO 2049.5-	3	
2049.5 TO 2099.5-	0	
2099.5 TO 2149.5-	이 같은 사람들은 가장 아들 수 있다. 영화 가장 이 것이 가지 않는 것이 같은 것이 가지 않는 것이 같이 있다.	
2199.5 TO 2249.5-		
2249.5 TO 2299.5-		
2299.5 TO 2349.5-	 Instruction of the second secon	
2349.5 10 2399.5-	•	
2449.5 TO 2499.5-		
2499.5 TO 2549.5-	0	
2549.5 TO 2599.5-	3	
2649.5 10 2699.5-	12	
2699.5 TO 2749.5-	2	
2749.5 TO 2799.5-	0	
2799.5 TO 2849.5-	3	
2899.5 10 2949.5-		
2949.5 TO 2999.5-	0	
2999.5 TO 3049.5-	0	
3049.5 TO 3099.5-		
3149.5 10 3199.5-		
3199.5 TO 3249.5-	0	
3249.5 TO 3299.5-	•	
3299.5 10 3349.5-	0	
3399.5 TO 3449.5-	3	
3449.5 TO 3499.5-	0	
3499.5 TO 3549.5-		
3549.5 10 3599.5-		
3649.5 10 3699.5-	0	
3699.5 TO 3749.5-	0	
3749.5 TO 3799.5-		and the state of the
3849.5 10 3849.5-		
3899.5 TO 3949.5-		
3949.5 TO 3999.5-	•	07 170
3999.5 10 4049.5-		75 119
	Exposed White Males	

Cumulative Dose 3 Years Before Death

5 TO 49.5-	1281 ***********************************
49.5 TO 99.5-	407*********************
99.5 TO 149.5-	182******
149.5 TO 199.5-	8644444
199.5 10 249.5-	55484
249 5 10 299 5-	12.
100 5 TO 149.5-	21
740 5 10 100 5-	13
100 S TO 449 5-	10
AAO 5 TO 499.5	
447.5 10 477.5 400 5 TO 540 /-	
E 40 E TO FOC E-	
547.5 TO 57.5-	
110 E TO 100 E	: " 이 방법에서 정말 이 있는 것이 같은 것이다. 이렇게 가지 않는 것이 가지 않는 것이 가지 않는 것이 있는 것이 가지 않는 것이 가지 않는 것이 있다. 이 가지 않는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이
100 5 70 740 F	
740 € TO 700 €-	
747.5 10 777.5	
040 5 10 000 5-	
047,5 10 077,5-	
877.5 TO 747.5-	
949.5 10 999.5-	
999.5 10 1049.5-	이 이에 NH NA NY TERMETER NY TRANSPORTER NY TRANSPORTER NY TRANSPORTER NY TRANSPORTER NY TRANSPORTER NY TRANSPORT
1049.5 10 1099.5-	
1099.5 10 1149.5-	
1149.5 10 1199.5-	
1199.5 10 1249.5-	3
1249.5 10 1299.5-	
1299.5 10 1349.5-	3
1349.5 10 1399.5-	
1399.5 10 1449.5-	
1449.5 10 1499.5-	
1499.5 10 1549.5-	
1549.5 10 1599.5-	
1599.5 10 1649.5-	
1549.5 10 1899.5	
1899.5 10 1/49.5-	
1749.5 10 1799.5-	
1/99.5 10 1849.5-	
1849.5 10 1899.5-	
1899.5 10 1949.5-	
1949.5 10 1999.5-	가슴 가지 않는 것 같은 것 같
1999.5 10 2049.5-	
2049.5 10 2099.5-	
2099.5 TO 2149.5-	· •
2149.5 TO 2199.5	
2199.5 TO 2249.5-	2
2249.5 TO 2299.5-	
2299.5 TO 2349.5-	
2349.5 10 2399.5	
2399.5 10 2449.5	
2449.5 10 2499.5	
2499.5 10 2549.5	
2549.5 0 2599.5	
2599.5 10 2049.5	
2047.5 10 2077.5	
2077.0 10 2747.0	
2747.5 10 2777.5	
2799.5 10 2849.5	
2047.5 10 2017.5	
2877.5 10 2747.5	
2949.5 10 2999.5	
2444.5 10 3044.5	
3049.5 10 3099.5	
3044.5 10 3144.5	
3147.5 10 3177.5	
1740 E TO 1700 E	
100 € TO 1740 5.	
1149 5 10 1109 5	
1790 5 10 7440 5	
1440 6 10 1449.5	
3447.5 10 3499.5	
3499.5 10 3549.5	
3549.5 10 3599.5	
3599.5 10 3649.5	
3649.5 10 3699.5	
3699.5 10 3749.5	
3749.5 10 3799.5	
3799.5 10 3849.5	

I

Exposed White Males Cumulative _)se 5 Years Before Death

1393 180

5 TO	49.5-	1526************************************
49.5 10	99.5-	345444444444444444444
44.5 10	149.5-	
147.5 10	199.5-	30**
749 5 10	100 5-	128
199.5 10	749.5-	
349.5 TO	399.5-	
399.5 TO	449.5-	12
449.5 TO	499.5-	10
499.5 TO	549.5-	6
549.5 10	599.5-	10
599.5 TO	649.5-	5
649.5 TO	599.5-	
699.5 TO	749.5-	3
749.5 10	799.5-	
799.5 10	849.5-	
849.5 10	899.5-	2
879.5 10	949.5-	
999.5 10	444.5-	·
1019 5 10	1047.5-	
1099.5 TO	1149.5-	
1149.5 TO	1199.5-	0
1199.5 TO	1249.5-	
1249.5 TO	1299.5-	
1299.5 TO	1349.5-	3
1349.5 10	1399.5-	3
1399.5 10	1449.5-	1
1449.5 10	1499.5-	2
1499.5 10	1549.5-	
1549.5 TO	1599.5-	2
1599.5 10	1649.5-	
1649.5 10	1099.5-	
1749 5 10	1700 5-	
1799.5 10	1949.5-	
1849.5 TO	1899.5-	0
1899.5 TO	1949.5-	0
1949.5 TO	1999.5-	0
1999.5 TO	2047.5-	0
2049.5 10	2099.5-	0
2099.5 10	2149.5-	0
2149.5 10	2199.5-	0
2199.5 10	2249.5-	
2247.5 10	2277.5-	
7149 5 10	2347.5-	
2399.5 10	2449.5-	
2449.5 10	2499.5-	0
2499.5 TO	2549.5-	1 Empand White Malas
		Lxposed White Males
		Cumulative Dose 10 Years Before Death

ş

	TO	49.5-	1750####################################
49.5	TO	99.5-	22844444444
99.5	TO	149.5-	07****
149.5	TO	199.5-	418
199.5	TO	249.5-	34
249.5	TO	299.5-	12
299.5	TO	349.5-	16
349.5	TO	399.5-	2
399.5	TO	449.5-	7
449.5	TO	499.5-	5
499.5	TO	549.5-	3
549.5	TO	599.5-	
599.5	TO	649.5-	
649.5	TO	699.5-	2
699.5	TO	749.5-	1
749.5	TO	799.5-	1
799.5	TO	849.5-	0
849.5	TO	899.5-	1
899.5	TO	949.5-	2
949.5	TO	999.5-	1
999.5	TO	1049.5-	0
1049.5	TO	1099.5-	0
1099.5	TO	1149.5-	1
1149.5	10	1199.5-	0
199.5	TO	1249.5-	1
			Exposed White Males

Cumulative Dose 15 Years Before Death 1393 181 A-22

49.5 T 99.5 T 149.5 T 249.5 T 249.5 T 349.5 T 349.5 T 399.5 T 449.5 T	0 99.5- 0 149.3- 0 199.5- 0 249.5- 0 249.5- 0 349.5- 0 349.5- 0 399.5- 0 449.5- 0 499.5-	2004 1314*** 45 26 9 5 3 1 0 2	
		Exposed White Males Cumulative Dose 20 Years Before Death	
5 49.5 149.5 149.5 199.5 249.5	0 49.5- 0 99.5- 0 149.5- 0 199.5- 0 249.5- 0 299.5-	2159************************************	
		Exposed White Males Cumulative Dose 25 Years Before Death	
13.5 TO 44.5- 14.5 TO 45.5- 15.5 TO 45.5- 15.5 TO 47.5- 17.5 TO 49.5- 19.5 TO 50.5- 10.5 TO 51.5- 11.5 TO 52.5- 12.5 TO 53.5- 13.5 TO 54.5- 15.5 TO 56.5- 15.5 TO 60.5- 15.5 TO 60.5- 15.5 TO 62.5- 15.5 TO 65.5- 10.5 TO 65.5- 65.5 TO 65.5- 65.5 TO 65.5- 67.5 TO 68.5- 67.5 TO 68.5- 67.5 TO 68.5- <t< th=""><th>1 5 7 2 8 8 8 2 3 3 3 3 4 3 3 4 7 3 5 4 7 4 4 7 4 7 4 4 7 4 4 7 4 4 4 7 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4</th><th>Exposed White Males Year of Death</th><th></th></t<>	1 5 7 2 8 8 8 2 3 3 3 3 4 3 3 4 7 3 5 4 7 4 4 7 4 7 4 4 7 4 4 7 4 4 4 7 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	Exposed White Males Year of Death	
		A-23 1393 182	

<u>.</u>

1.1

APPENDIX B

1

.

1

I

I

I

I

CAUSE OF DEATH DISTRIBUTION

O. OF	CODE	DESCRIPTION
1	8	Enteritis due to other specified organism
4	9	Diarrhoeal disease
13	11	Pulmonary tuberculosis
1	23	Brucellosis
2	38	Septicaemia
1	39	Other bacterial diseases
2	40	Acute paralytic poliomyelitis specified as bulbar
1	41	Acute poliomyelitis with other paralysis
2	43	Acute poliomyelitis, unspecified
1	46	Other enterovirus diseases of central nervous system
1	52	Chickenpox
2	70	Infectious hepatitis
1	93	Cardiovascular syphilis
1	95	Other forms of late syphilis, with symptoms
1	112	Moniliasis
1	136	Other and unspecified infective and parasitic diseases
1	140	Malignant neoplasm of lip
6	141	Malignant neoplasm of tongue
3	142	Malignant neoplasm of salivary gland
2	144	Malignant neoplasm of floor of mouth
3	145	Malignant neoplasm of other and unspecified parts of mouth
3	146	Malignant neoplasm of oropharynx
1	147	Malignant neoplasm of nasopharynx

B-1

NO. OF CASES	CODE	DESCRIPTION
2	148	Malignant neoplasm of hypopharynx
2	149	Malignant neoplasm of pharynx, unspecified
18	150	Malignant neoplasm of oesophagus
39	151	Malignant neoplasm of stomach
2	152	Malignant neoplasm of small intestine, including duodenum
79	153	Malignant neoplasm of large intestine, except rectum
23*	154	Malignant neoplasm of rectum and rectosigmoid junction
9	155	Malignant neoplasm of liver and intrahepatic bile ducts, specified as primary
11	156	Malignant neoplasm of gallbladder and bile ducts
53	157	Malignant neoplasm of pancreas
3	158	Malignant neoplasm of peritoneum and retroperitoneal tissue
1	159	Malignant neoplasm of unspecified digestive organs
2	160	Malignant neoplasm of nose, nasal cavities, middle ear and accessory sinuses
10	161	Malignant neoplasm of larynx
202	162	Malignant neoplasm of trachea, bronchus and lung
1	163	Malignant neoplasm of other and unspecified respiratory organs
1	170	Malignant neoplasm of bone
6	171	Malignant neoplasm of connective and other soft tissue
13	172	Malignant melanoma of skin
3	173	Other malignant neoplasm of skin

395 18:

NO. OF CASES	CODE	DESCRIPTION
31	174	Malignant neoplasm of breast
7	180	Malignant neoplasm of cervix uteri
6	182	Other malignant neoplasm of uterus
13	183	Malignant neoplasm of ovary, fallopian tube and broad ligament
43	185	Malignant neoplasm of prostate
4	186	Malignant neoplasm of testis
11	188	Malignant neoplasm of bladder
25	189	Malignant neoplasm of other and unspecified urinary organs
1	190	Malignant neoplasm of eye
23	191	Malignant neoplasm of brain
5	192	Malignant neoplasm of other parts of nervous system
2	193	Malignant neoplasm of thyroid gland
1	194	Malignant neoplasm of other endocrine glands
5	195	Malignant neoplasm of ill-defined sites
1	196	Secondary and unspecified malignant neoplasm of lymph nodes
18	197	Secondary malignant neoplasm of respiratory and digestive systems
2	198	Other secondary malignant neoplasm
30	199	Malignant neoplasm without specification of site
22	200	Lymphosarcoma and reticulum-cell sarccoma
14	201	Hodgkin's disease
3	202	Other neoplasms of lymphoid tissue
11	203	Multiple myeloma
5	204	Lymphatic leukaemia 1395 180

6.

B-3

-3

.

NO. OF CASES	CODE	DESCRIPTION
13	205	Myeloid leukaemia
1	206	Monocytic leukaemia
5	207	Other and unspecified leukaemia
1	208	Polycythaemia vera
1	209	Myelofibrosis
2	211	Benign neoplasm of other parts of digestive system
2	218	Uterine fibroma
1	225	Benign neoplasm of brain and other parts of nervous system
1	228	Benign neoplasm of other and unspecified organs and tissues
1	231	Neoplasm of unspecified nature of respiratory organs
5	238	Neoplasm of unspecified nature of eye, brain and other parts of nervous system
1	244	Myxoedema
48	250	Diabetes mellitus
1	253	Diseases of pituitary gland
4	255	Diseases of adrenal glands
1	258	Polyglandular dysfunction and other diseases of endocrine glands
3	269	Other nutritional deficiency
4	272	Congenital disorders of lipid metabolism
1	276	Amyloidosis
3	277	Obesity not specified as of endocrine origin
3	279	Other and unspecified metabolic diseases
4	284	Aplastic anaemia
2	289	Other diseases of blood and blood-forming organs

B-4



ø

NO. OF CASES	CODE	DESCRIPTION
2	291	Alcoholic psychosis
1	299	Unspecified psychosis
11	303	Alcoholism
3	309	Mental disorders not specified as psychotic associated with physical conditions
2	320	Meningitis
1	322	Intracranial and intraspinal abscess
2	323	Encephalitis, myelitis, and encephalomyelitis
1	330	Hereditary neuromuscular disorders
1	331	Hereditary diseases of the striato-pallidal system
2	340	Multiple sclerosis
7	342	Paralysis agitans
2	345	Epilepsy
3	347	Other diseases of brain
6	348	Motor neurone disease
l	355	Other and unspecified forms of neuralgia and neuritis
1	393	Disease of pericardium
14	394	Disease of mitral valve
15	395	Diseases of aortic valve
5	396	Diseases of mitral and aortic valves
0	397	Diseases of other endocardial structures
11	398	Other heart disease, specified as rheumatic
8	400	Malignant hypertension
4	401	Essential benign hypertension
15	402	Hypertensive heart disease

B-5

1393 188

NO. OF CASES	CODE	DESCRIPTION							
7	403	Hypertensive renal disease							
8	404	Hypertensive heart and renal disease							
1109	410	Acute myocardial infarction							
19	411	Other acute and subacute forms of ischaemic heart disease							
348	412	Chronic ischaemic heart disease							
1	413	Angina pectoris							
2	421	Acute and sub-acute endocarditis							
3	422	Acute myocarditis							
1	423	Chronic disease of pericardium, non-rheumatic							
1	424	Chronic disease of endocardium							
2	425	Cardiomyopathy							
3	426	Pulmonary heart disease							
29	427	Symptomatic heart disease							
15	428	Other myocardial insufficiency							
20	429	Ill-defined heart disease							
31	430	Subarachnoid haemorrhage							
75	431	Cerebral haemorrhage							
8	432	Occlusion of pre-cerebral arteries							
58	433	Cerebral thrombosis							
1	434	Cerebral embolism							
61	436	Acute but ill-defined cerebrovascular disease							
19	437	Generalized ischaemic cerebrovascular disease							
6	438	Other and ill-defined cerebrovascular disease							

B-6

1393 189

NO. OF CASES	CODE	DESCRIPTION						
23	440	Arteriosclerosis						
55	441	Aortic aneurysm (non-syphilitic)						
3	442	ner aneurysm						
4	444	Arterial embolism and thrombosis						
4	445	Gangrene						
3	446	Polyarteritis nodosa and allied conditions						
2	447	Other diseases of arteries and arterioles						
13	450	Pulmonary embolism and infarction						
2	451	Phlebitis and thrombophlebitis						
· 1	452	Portal vein thrombosis						
2	453	Other venous embolism and thrombosis						
2	458	Other diseases of circulatory system						
1	463	Acute tonsillitis						
1	466	Acute bronchitis and bronchiolitis						
5	470	Influenza unqualified						
3	480	Viral pneumonia						
16	481	Pneumococcal pneumonia						
2	482	Other bacterial pneumonia						
26	485	Bronchopneumonia, unspecified						
19	486	Pneumonia, unspecified						
1	490	Bronchitis, unqualified						
16	491	Chronic bronchitis						
81	492	Emphysema						
9	493	Asthma						
1	513	Abscess of lung						
2	514	Pulmonary congestion and hypostasis						

R

B-7

NO. OF CASES	CODE	DESCRIPTION
1	515	Pneumoconiosis due to silica and silicates
9	517	Other chronic interstritial pneumonia
5	518	Bronchiectasis
9	519	Other diseases of respiratory system
2	530	Diseases of oesophagus
7	531	Ulcer of stomach
18	532	Ulcer of duodenum
8	533	Peptic ulcer, site unspecified
1	534	Gastrojejunal ulcer
1	535	Gastritis and duodenitis
1	537	Other diseases of stomach and duodenum
4	540	Acute appendicitis
2	551	Other hernia of abdominal cavity without mention of obstruction
1	552	Inguinal hernia with obstruction
2	553	Other hernia of abdominal cavity with obstruction
3	560	Intestinal obstruction without mention of hernia
1	561	Gastro-enteritis and colitis, except ulcerative, of non-infectious origin
5	562	Diverticula of intestine
4	563	Chronic enteritis and ulcerative colitis
1	565	Anal fissure and fistula
5	569	Other diseases of intestines and peritoneum
1	570	Acute and subacute necrosis of liver
75	571	Cirrhosis of liver

NO. OF CASES	CODE	DESCRIPTION
5	573	Other diseases of liver
3	574	Choletithiasis
1	575	Cholecystitis and cholangitis, without mention of calculus
3	576	Other diseases of gallbladder and biliary ducts
10	577	Diseases of pancreas
4	581	Nephrotic syndrome
16	582	Chronic nephritis
1	583	Nephritis unqualified
1	584	Renal sclerosis unqualified
12	590	Infections of kidney
2	592	Calculus of kidney and ureter
4	593	Other diseases of kidney and ureter
1	596	Other diseases of bladder
3	599	Other diseases of urinary tract
1	600	Hyperplasia of prostate
1	601	Prostatitis
3	602	Other diseases of prostate
1	694	Pemphigus
1	695	Erythematous conditions
1	712	Rheumatoid arthritis and allied conditions
1	716	Polymyositis and dermatomyositis
1	717	Other non-articular rheumatism
1	720	Osteomyelitis and periostitis

B-9

1393 192

NO. OF CASES	CODE	DESCRIPTION
1	729	Other diseases of joint
2	733	Other diseases of muscle, tendon, and fascia
4	734	Diffuse diseases of connective tissue
1	746	Congenital anomalies of heart
5	747	Other congenital anomalies of circulatory system
1	748	Congenital anomalies of respiratory system
1	751	Other congenital anomalies of digestive system
2	753	Congenital anomalies of urinary system
1	780	Certain symptoms referable to nervous system and special senses
9	782	Symptoms referable to cardiovascular and lymphatic system
1	786	Symptoms referable to genito-urinary system
1	792	Uraemia
2	794	Senility without mention of psychosis
1	795	Sudden death (cause unknown)
25	796	Other ill-defined and unknown causes of morbidity and mortality
2	E805	Hit by rolling stock
1	E807	Railway accident of unspecified nature
9	E810	Motor vehicle traffic accident involving collision with train
44	E812	Motor vehicle traffic accident involving collision with another motor vehicle
3	E813	Motor vehicle traffic accident involving collision with other vehicle
15	E814	Motor vehicle traffic accident involving collision with pedestrian

and the second

B-10

NO. OF CASES	CODE	DESCRIPTION
1	E815	Other motor vehicle traffic accident involving collision
36	E816	Non-collision motor vehicle traffic accident due to loss of control
6	E818	Other non-collision motor vehicle traffic accident
57	E819	Motor vehicle traffic accident of unspecified nature
1	E821	Motor vehicle non-traffic accident involving collision with stationary object
11	E830	Accident to watercraft causing submersion
4	E832	Other accidental submersion or drowning in water transport
3	E840	Accident to powered aircraft take-off or landing
17	E841	Accident to powered aircraft, other and unspecified
1	E853	Accidental poisoning by analgesics and antipyretics
4	E854	Accidental poisoning by other sedatives and hypnotics
1	E873	Accidental poisoning by motor vehicle exhaust gas
2	E874	Accidental poisoning by carbon monoxide from incomplete combustion of domestic fuels
5	E880	Fall on or from stairs or steps
3	E881	Fall on or from ladders or scaffolding
, 2	E882	Fall from or out of building or other structure
1	E883	Fall into hole or other opening in surface
3	E884	Other fall from one level to another
2	E885	Fall on same level from slipping, tripping

B-11

CASES	CODE	DESCRIPTION
13	E887	Other and unspecified fall
10	E890	Accident caused by conflagration in private dwelling
3	E891	Accident caused by conflagration in other building or structure
1	E894	Accident caused by ignition of highly inflammable material
1	E895	Accident caused by controlled fire in private dwelling
3	E898	Accident caused by other specified fires or flames
2	E899	Accident caused by unspecified fire
16	E910	Accidental drowning and submersion
7	_ E911	Inhalation and ingestion of food causing obstruction or suffocation
2	E913	Accidental mechanical suffocation
7	E916	Struck accidentally by falling object
1	E918	Caught accidentally in or between objects
1	E921	Accident caused by explosion of pressure vessel
11	E922	Accident caused by firearm missiles
3	E923	Accident caused by explosive material
3	E924	Accident caused by hot substance, corrosive liquid, and steam
6	E925	Accident caused by electric current
1	E926	Accident caused by radiation
3	E927	Vehicle accidents not elsewhere classifiable
3	E928	Machinery accidents not elsewhere classifiable
4	E929	Other and unspecified accidents
6	E930	Complications and misadventures in operative therapeutic procedures

B-12

NO. OF CASES	CODE	DESCRIPTION
l	E940	Late effect of motor vehicle accident
1	E942	Late effect of accidental poisoning
1	E943	Late effect of accidental fall
17	E950	Suicide and self-inflicted poisoning by solid or liquid substances
24	E952	Suicide and self-inflicted poisoning by other gases
11	E953	Suicide and self-inflicted injury by hanging, strangulation and suffocation
4	E954	Suicide and self-inflicted injury by submersion (drowning)
80	E955	Suicide and self-inflicted injury by firearms and explosives
2	E958	Suicide and self-inflicted injury by other and unspecified means
1	E963	Assault by hanging and strangulation
8	E965	Assault by firearms and explosives
3	E968	Assault by other and unspecified means
3	E980	Poisoning by solid or liquid substances, undetermined whether accidentally or purposely inflicted
1	E981	Poisoning by gases in domestic use, undetermined whether accidentally or purposely inflicted
1	E982	Poisoning by other gases, undetermined whether accidentally or purposely inflicted
3	E984	Submersion (drowning), undetermined whether accidentally or purposely inflicted
4	E985	Injury by firearms and explosives, undetermined whether accidentally or purposely inflicted
2	E986	Injury by cutting and piercing instruments, undstermined whether accidentally or purposely inflicted
2	E988	Injury by other and unspecified means, undetermined whether accidentally or purposely inflicted
		в-13 1393 196

.

•

NO. OF CASES	CODE	DESCRIPTION
2	E994	Injury due to war operations by destruction of aircraft
3	E995	Injury due to war operations by other and unspecified forms of conventional warfare

* **

1393 197

and the

APPENDIX C

Program and Output Which Reviews Dose Time Histories and Generates Average Yearly Dose of Workers

1393 198

```
FURFUR-MACC 4.14 RLIB36 12/17-09:52:03
2873600908#REGRESS(1).1RUN(3)
                     PRUN K.13015.2873600908.*50.00,1000

PASCAX OUTFILE.

PRAT.S REGRESS.1RUN

PRT.S REGRESS.1
          3
          5
                      PASG.AX DATA.
                      PUSE 20. . DATA.
PASC.T TEMP2.
          7
          .....
                      QUSE 21. . TEMP2.
                      @FOR.IXC
        10
        11
                       PADD REGRESS.1
        12
                      REOF
                       exor
         13
                       COST .A
         14
                       BRKPT PRINTS
         15
                       PFIN
         14
 PPRT.S REGRESS.1
 2873600908#REGRESS(1).1(1)
                          DIMENSION A(15). YC(100). Y1(100). Y1C(100). [TABLE(100). UGS(7)
           11
                          DATA TTABLE/4#1,2#2,5#3,5#4,5#5,5#6,74#7/
           21
                           LCOUNT
                           LINII
           14.1
                                         1
                          READ(20,100,END=300) (A(110),110-1,16)
           5:10
                           ICNT1 = ICNT1 + 1
           61
                          II = A(16) = A(3) + 1
I2 = A(16) = A(2) + 1
ITOP = ITABLE(I1)
IBOT = ITABLE(I2)
           71
           8:
           91
         10:
                           IFLAG = 0
D0 700 I = 1,7
D0S(I) = A(8+I)
         :1:
                          D0 700 [ = 1,7

D0S(I) = A(8+I) - A(9+I)

IF(I.EQ.7) D0S(I) = A(15)

IF((I.LT.ITOP).OR.(I.GT.IBO1)) GO TO 701

GO TO 700

IF((D0S(I).GT.O.).AND.(IFLAG.EQ.O))WR(TE(-,-) (A(I7),I7=1,15)

IF(D0S(I).EQ.O.) GO TO 700

IF(IFLAG.EQ.O) ICOUNT = ICOUNT + 1

IFLAG = 1
          121
          13:
          14:
          15:
         15: 17:701
          19:
          19:
                           IFLAG = 1
          20:
          21:700
                           CONTINUE
                           FORMAT(F4.0.2F2.0.2F3.0.3F1.0.7F6.0.F2.0)
                         IX = A(15)
DO 200 I = 1.35
IX1 = IX - I + 1
          231 241
          25:
          261
                           IF=4(3)
                           IF(1x1.GT.IF) GO TO 200
          28:
                           IN = A(2)
                           IF(IX1.LT.IN) GO TO 200
          29:
          30:
                            IF (1.GT.3) GO TO 190
                            [F[N = A(3)] \\ [N[T = A(2)] \\ [U = A(1a) - 1. + 1. \\ [L = A(1a) - 3. + 1. ] 
          31:
          32:
          33:
          34:
                            IF(IFIN.LT.IU) IU = IFIN
IF(INIT.GT.IL) IL = INIT
          35:
          30:
                           37:
          38:
          39:
           40:
                           GO TO 200
IF(I.GT.5) GO TO 192
           411
           42:190
                           IF(I,GT,S) GG TO 192 

IFIN = A(3) 

INIT = A(2) 

IU = A(16) = 4. + 1. 

IL = A(16) = 5. + 1. 

IF(IFIN.LT.IU) IU = IFIN 

IF(INIT.GT.IL) IL = INIT 

XINT = IU = IL + 1. 

Y1(IX1) = (A(10) = A(11))/XINT 

          43:
           441
           45:
          40:
           48:
           49:
           50:
```

0

1

1393 199

÷.,

10 A

1 12

C

а 1911

× %

C.

5

i.

 Γ

100 SK

511	VICTIALL - VICTIALL - VICTIAL
8.31	VELTER - FRUITASE F FILLASE
	TUTALI - TETALI + T.
	-00 10 -00
41.5	Reclaration and his 194
55:	IFIN = A(3)
561	INIT = A(2)
57:	THE ACTAL A A A
601	10 - H1107 - 01 T 11
501	1L = A(15) = 10. + 1.
241	IF(IFIN.LT.IU) IU = IFIN
50:	IF(INIT.GT.IL) IL = INIT
61:	XINT # TU - TL + 1.
621	VILLENIA & CALLER & ACCOUNTER
.7.	
	fic(IXI) = fic(IXI) + fi(IXI)
041	YC(IX1) = YC(IX1) + 1.
65;	GO TO 200
55:194	IF(1.GT.15) GO TO 194
57:	IFTN = A(T)
601	1411 - 41-1
041	10 = A(16) = 11. + 1.
701	IL = A(15) - 15. + 1.
71:	IF(IFIN, LT. 10) IU = IFIN
721	IFIINIT OT TIN TI . THIT
73:	XINT - TH - TH - I
741	
	f(1X1) = (A(12) - A(13))/XINT
/2:	Y1C(IX1) = Y1C(IX1) + Y1(IX1)
76:	YC(IX1) = YC(IX1) + 1.
77:	GO TO 200
78:196	IF(1.01.20) 00 10 100
791	1514 - 4/2
201	1 C LA = A(3)
301	1011 * A(2)
811	IU = A(15) - 16. + 1.
821	(L = A(15) 20. + 1.
81:	IF(IFIN.LT.IU) IU = IFIN
84:	IF(INIT.GT.IL) IL . INTT
85:	TINT a THE TILL I
841	
07.	(1(1A1) = (A(13) - A(14))/XINT
0/1	fic(IXI) = fic(IXI) + fi(IXI)
88:	YC(IXI) = YC(IXI) + 1.
89:	GO TO 200
90:198	IF(1.GT.25) GO TO 199
91:	IFIN = A(T)
97:	THIT - ACON
07.	LITEL - ACZI
73.	10 = A(15) - 21. + 1.
74:	IL = A(15) - 25 + 1.
95:	IF(IFIN.LT.IU) IU = IFIN
961	IF(INIT.GT.IL) IL . INTT
97:	YINT - TH - TH - T
991	
201	TI(IAI) = (A(14) - A(15))/XINT
	VIC(IX1) * VIC(IX1) + VI(IX1)
100:	TC(IX1) = YC(IX1) + 1.
1011	60 TU 200
1071199	CONTINUE
1071	T ON T LINUE
1041	0 = A(15) = A(2)
104:	IF(D.LE. 25.) GO TO 200
105:	IFIN = A(3)
106:	INIT = A(2)
107:	IU = A(16) - 26 - 1 -
1081	
1001	12 - 4(10) - 30. + 1.
1091	IF (IF IN.LT.IU) IU = IFIN
110:	IF(INIT.GT.IL) IL = INIT
1111:	XINT = IU - IL + 1.
112:	Y1(IX1) = (A(15))/YINT

113:	YIC(IX1) = YIC(IX	1) + Y1([X1)				
1141	YC(IX1) = YC(IX1)	+ 1.				
115:200	CONTINUE					
110:	GO TO 10 .					
1177300	CONTINUE					
118:	WAITE() ICNT1					
119:	WRITE(- +-) ICOUNT					
120:	WRITE(-,201)					
121:201	FORMAT(10X. YR'.1	OF TOTAL DOSE .	10X. COUNTS	. LOY . AVERAGE DOSE		A
122:	01.1 = NL1 006 00	0	Levi coonis	TIVAT AVERAGE DOSE	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
123:	A5 = 0.					
1241	IF (YC(LUN).EQ.O.	60 TO 17				
125:	A5 = 710(1JN)/YC(LIK)				
124:37	CONTINUE					
1271	WRITE(500) 1.0.	YIC(TH) YC(TH)	. 45			
128:	WRITE(21.500) TUR	.YIC(LIK) .YC(LIK	1.4"			
129:000	CONTINUE					
130:500	FORMAT(10X.13.10%	F7.1.10X.F7.1.1	48.67.11			
131:	STOP					
1321	END					
ASG.AY DATA.						
USE 20 DATA	나는 것이 좋아? 나는 것이 같아?					
ASG.T TEMPT.						
HISE 21 TENP			· · · · · ·			
FORITYC						
OSTEAN-HACT	1.178-17/10/70-001	*****				
END OF	COMPTIATION:	52.07	NARES			
YOT CHU UF	COMPTENTION.	NO DIAGNOST	ics.			
AP70-7 PI 191	. 12/18-00-53115					
ADDECC I THIT						
ADDRESS FILTI				PDI		
	001000 012822	SUIT IPAN	WORDS DEC	IMAL 000004		
	040000 045207	26YO UBAN	WORDS DEC	IMAL 000005		
STAKTING ADOR	55 011452			and a second second		
-	SEGRENT SMAINS	001000 012	622 040	0000 045207		
TARA (FORTO						
ETCUA (EOPIO			.(2)	040000 040044		
CONTON DI CONTO	••••	001000 001300	.(2)	040045 040102		
CRICE 2/FORIO	••••	001301 003830	•(2)	040103 042573		
CONTRACT (CONTO	•••••	003831 004874	.(2)	042574 043011		
OKIUSJ/FORIO	•(1)	0048/5 005282	.(2)	043012 043020		
SETON (FORIO	•(1)	005283 005372	\$(2)	043021 043024		
APPTOS/FURIU	•(1)	005373 005763	•(2)	043025 043066		
OKIUSA/FURIU	•(1)	005764 006257	\$(2)	043067 043111		
FORIOS1/FORIO	•(1)	006260 011451	\$(2)	043112 044206		
NAMES	\$(1)	011452 012622	\$(0)	044207 045207		
SYSSERLIES. L	EVEL 41					
END MAP		in the first of the				
480.0000	53.0000	55.0000	14.0000	284.0000	1.0000	0.0
17.0000	17.0000	17.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
615.0000	44.0000	54.0000	100.0000	162.0000	1.0000	1.0000
222.0000	213.0000	126.0000	88.0000	56.0000	17.0000	0.0
418.0000	63.0000	66.0000	31.0000	162.0000 '	1.0000	1.0000
97.0000	71.0000	63.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0000
513.0000	48.0000	49.0000	2.0000	250.0000	1.0000	1.0000
74.0000	29.0000	9.0000	4.0000	0.0	0.0	1.0000
\$93.0000	44.0000	62.0000	181.0000	185,0000	1 0000	0.0
253.0000	253.0000	233.0000	117.0000	100.0000	1.0000	1.0000
637.0000	45.0000	56.0000	115.0000	197.0000	1.0000	33.0000
228.0000	210.0000	162.0000	117.0000	111.0000	1.0000	1.0000
631.0000	48,0000	51.0000	34.0000	410 0000	49.0000	0.0
224.0000	183.0000	100.0000	23.0000	14 0000	1.0000	1.0000
514.0000	55.0000	57.0000	43.0000	910 0000	0.0000	0.0
147.0000	14.0000	0.0	0.0		1.0000	1.0000
647.0000	48.0000	48.0000	1.0000	412 0000	0.0	0.0
9.0000	9.0000	9.0000	6.0000	12.0000	1.0000	1.0000
	** ^^^^	** ****	10 0000	0.0	0.0	0.0

C-3

1393 201

1.0000 70.0000 1.0000 66.0000 72.0000 1.0000 66.0000 1.0000 69.0000 1.0000 69.0000 1.0000 65.0000 1.0000 55.0000 1.0000

2562.0000	2562.0000	2542.0000	1149.0000	170			
645.0000	48.0000	49.0000	4.0000	338.0000	0.0	0.0	72.0000
348.0000	148.0000	154.0000	278 0000	-10.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
545.0000	45.0000	54.0000	117 0000	105.0000	39.0000	0.0	72.0000
353.0000	115.0000	202 0000	117.0000	·10.0000	1.0000	1,0000	1.0000
419.0000	335.0000	282.0000	171.0000	103.0000	21.0000	0.0	68.0000
47.0000	14.0000	52.0000	56.0000	153.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
454.0000	18.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	67.0000
393 0000		54.0000	100.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
272.0000	292.0000	299.0000	170.0000	145.0000	91.0000	44.0000	71.0000
010.0000	48.0000	48.0000	2.0000	202.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
7.0000	7.0000	7.0000	7.0000	7.0000	4.0000	0.0	68.0000
584.0000	47.0000	53.0000	58.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
3113.0000	3113.0000	2729.0000	1393.0000	444.0000	22.0000	0.0	72.0000
810.0000	**.0000	46.0000	16.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
646.0000	644.0000	485.0000	321.0000	217.0000	146.0000	28.0000	69.0000
501.0000	47.0000	49.0000	15.0000	562.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
201.0000	201.0000	133.0000	13.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	70.0000
537.0000	44.0000	57.0000	129.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
3447.0000	3104.0000	2727.0000	1570.0000	621.0000	100.0000	0.0	70.0000
567.0000	44.0000	45.0000	6.0000	95.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1 0000
173.0000	173.0000	154.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0000	1.0000
633.0000	49.0000	\$1.0000	15,0000	497.0000	1.0000		50.0000
156.0000	154.0000	134.0000	59.0000	47 0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
598.0000	44.0000	51,0000	48.0000	43.0000	11.0000	0.0	72.0000
758.0000	773.0000	451 0000	142.0000	-27.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
380.0000	44.0000	651.0000	182.0000	88.0000	69.0000	0.0	69.0000
207.0000	180.0000	83.0000	13.0000	965.0000	0.0	1.0000	1.0000
495.0000	51.0000	144.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	71.0000
134.0000	51.0000	51.0000	1.0000	812.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
415.0000	37.0000	47.0000	47.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	65.0000
199.0000	45.0000	58.0000	134.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
198.0000	198.0000	198.0000	42.0000	14,0000	14.0000	14.0000	71.0000
387.0000	49.0000	65.0000	159.0000	1321 0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
111.0000	12.0000	29.0000	15.0000	910000	0.0	0.0	68.0000
555.0000	44.0000	44.0000	1.0000	532.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
24.0000	24.0000	24.0000	24.0000	23.0000	0.0	0.0	60.0000
624.0000	59.0000	63.0000	38.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1,0000
58.0000	28.0000	48.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	49.0000
635.0000	45.0000	51.0000	68.0000	571.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
132.0000	113.0000	83.0000	61.0000	50.0000	29.0000	0.0	49 0000
636.0000	44.0000	50.0000	58.0000	162.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
17.0000	17.0000	14.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	55.0000
666.0000	44.0000	55.0000	108.0000	412.0000	1.0000	1.0000	33.0000
313.0000	313.0000	295.0000	196.0000	176.0000	101.0000	44.0000	1.0000
493.0000	48.0000	55.0000	70.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1.0000	12.0000
161.0000	134.0000	130.0000	12.0000	0.0	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
586.0000	44.0000	47.0000	24.0000	410.0000	1.0000		12.0000
3183.0000	3066.0000	2913.0000	1747.0000	199.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
448.0000	48.0000	51,0000	23.0000	187.0000	23.0000	0.0	69.0000
96.0000	45.0000	18.0000	18.0000	183.0000	1.0000	0.0	1.0000
547.0000	45.0000	48.0000	30.0000	10.0000	0.0	0.0	65.0000
1449.0000	1778 0000	11. 00000	34.0000	912.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
\$10.0000	13/7.0000	1151.0000	382.0000	215.0000	68.0000	0.0	70.0000
148 0000	51.0000	85.0000	135.0000	832.0000	1.0000	0.0	1.0000
164.0000	153.0000	123.0000	34.0000	39.0000	0.0	0.0	70.0000
301.0000	58.0000	56.0000	4.0000	238.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
101.0000	64.0000	53.0000	5.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.0000
387.0000	52.0000	54.0000	17.0000	433.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
384.0000	103.0000	78.0000	24.0000	0'-0	0.0	0.0	63.0000
572.0000	48.0000	56.0000	83.0000	188.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
210.0000	194.0000	164.0000	50.0000	354 0000	20.0000	0.0	72.0000
459.0000	44.0000	48.0000	43.0000	428.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
324.0000	324.0000	324.0000	314.0000	291.0000	0.0	0.0	61.0000
656.0000	51.0000	59.0000	81.0000	532,0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
54.0000	54.0000	54.0000	48.0000	3610000	0.0	0.0	48 0000
578.0000	44.0000	61.0000	169.0000	174,0000	1,0000	0.0	1 0000
1439.0000	1439.0000	1316.0000	441.0000	218.0000	170.0000	152.0000	71 0000
177 0000			70 0000				1.0000

1781.0000	1544.0000	1253.0000	400 0000				
577.0000	54.0000	44.0000	78.0000	148.0000	0.0	0.0	71.0000
115.0000	115.0000	97.0000	13.0000	348.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
409.0000	54.0000	57.0000	13.0000	441 0000	0.0	0.0	7:.0000
2875.0000	2454.0000	2000.0000	591.0000	14.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
689.0000	48.0000	48.0000	8.0000	179.0000	1.0000		67.0000
24.0000	24.0000	24.0000	3.0000	0.0	0.0	1.0000	1.0000
384.0000	51.0000	57.0000	58.0000	255.0000	. 1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
385.0000	330.0000	194.0000	45.0000	0.0	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
552.0000	45.0000	55.0000	104.0000	195.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
1491.0000	1152.0000	770.0000	407.0000	71.0000	27.0000	0.0	47.0000
625.0000	45.0000	48.0000	14.0000	444.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
201.0000	192.0000	175.0000	120.0000	117.0000		72.0000	71.0000
570.0000	51.0000	58.0000	45.0000	885 0000	1 0000	1.0000	/1.0000
1479.0000	1578.0000	1111.0000	1425 0000	447 0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
591.0000	45.0000	50.0000	55.0000	410.0000	8.0000	1.0000	/2.0000
328.0000	274.0000	271.0000	348.0000	254.0000	199 0000	0.0	11.0000
431.0000	44.0000	45.0000	204.0000	441 0000	177.0000	1.0000	
185.0000	144.0000	145.0000	78.0000	77.0000	1.0000	7.0000	1.0000
455.0000	45.0000	145.0000	7 0000	157 0000	34.0000	3.0000	10.0000
149.0000	141.0000	84.0000	58.0000	55.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
470.0000	141.0000	54.0000	37.0000	55.0000	37.0000	0.0	69.0000
44.0000	44.0000	58.0000	120.0000	12.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
\$12.0000	48.0000	82.0000	51.0000	32.0000	0.0	0.0	62.0000
198 0000	172 0000	44.0000	10.0000	10.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
148.0000	172.0000	141.5000	52.0000	32.0000	3.0000	0.0	/1.0000
482.0000	54.0000	84.0000	48.0000	-10.0000	1.0000	0.0	1.0000
471.0000	44.0000	82.0000	8.0000	221.0000	0.0	0.0	69.0000
1443.0000	1447 0000	1015 0000	30.0000	2/8.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
3443.0000	343.0000	3015.0000	1882.0000	/13.0000	154.0000	0.0	/1.0000
138 0000	55.0000	58.0000	28.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
829.0000	17.0000	338.0000	54.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	65.0000
300.0000		53.0000	54.0000	182.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
2/5.0000	275.0000	2/5.0000	2/5.0000	247.0000	133.0000	0.0	71.0000
341.0000	52.0000	54.0000	19.0000	412.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
128.0000	228.0000	228.0000	185.0000	144.0000	30.0000	0.0	72.0000
001.0000		48.0000	28.0000	151.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
23.0000	20.0000		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	49.0000
341.0000	214 0000	199.0000	74.0000	412.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
518.0000	48.0000	53.0000	120.0000	29.0000	24.0000	8.0000	12.0000
104.0000	14.0000	8.0000	-1.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
104.0000	15.0000	6.0000	8.0000	8.0000	0.0	0.0	67.0000
338.0000	240.0000	187.0000	148.0000	191.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
171 0000		183.0000	87.0000	80.0000	28.0000	0.0	10.0000
831.0000	14.0000	30.0000	120.0000	•10.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
188.0000	188.0000	131.0000	/1.0000	44.0000	30.0000	10.0000	72.0006
536.0000		80.0000	154.0000	342.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
348.0000	351.0000	320.0000	238.0000	219.0000	150.0000	117.0000	72.0000
504.0000	47.0000	61.0000	138.0000	571.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
62.0000	25.0000	5.0000	4.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	65.0000
721.0000	47.0000	44.0000	15.0000	182.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
754.0000	754.0000	754.0000	664.0000	008.0000	30.0000	0.0	69.0000
491.0000	50.0000	82.0000	118.0000	412.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
180.0000	187.0000	139.0000	80.0000	68.0000	10.0000	0.0	71.0000
619.0000	44.0000	53.0000	80.0000	185.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
128.0000	110.0000	70.0000	29.0000	25.0000	19.0000	0.0	69.0000
615.0000	44.0000	52.0000	74.0000	410.0000	1.0000	0.0	1.0000
47.0000	67.0000	67.0000	20.0000	19.0000	0.0	0.0	71.0000
648.0000	52.0000	52.0000	3.0000	792.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
110.0000	110.0000	48.0000	10.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	68.0000
652.0000	51.0000	59.0000	76.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
116.0000	98.0000	72.0000	26.0000	20.0000	0.0	0.0	69.0000
651.0000	55.0000	65.0000	100.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
1626.0000	1544.0000	1365.0000	420.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	70.0000
666.0000	45.0000	58.0000	130.0000	162.0000	1.0000 -	1.0000	1.0000
696.0000	696.0000	675.0000	477.0000	207.0000	142.0000	122.0000	71.0000

C-5

74.0000	69.0000	40.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	48.0000
\$10.0000	44.0000	46.0000	20.0000	412.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
3.0000	3.0000	3.0000	3.0000	3.0000	0.0	0.0	70.0000
424.0000	50.0000	52.0000	18.0000	812.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
2176.0000	2113.0000	1955.0000	1398.0000	447.0000	9.0000	0.0	70.0000
681.0000	51.0000	59.0000	76.0000	153.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
235.0000	235.0000	202.0000	80.0000	55.0000	0.0	0.0	71.0000
410.0000	54.0000	38.0000	33.0000	531.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
1375.0000	1039.0000	907.0000	243.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	67.0000
613.0000	45.0000	48.0000	34.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
177.0000	169.0000	143.0000	75.0000	70.0000	11.0000	3.0000	70.0000
535.0000	44.0000	55.0000	104.0000	410.0000	1.0000		1.0000
173.0000	157.0000	123.0000	103.0000	89.0000	32.0000	0.0	69.0000
537.0000	44.0000	56.0000	124.0000	157.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
168.0000	168.0000	124.0000	52.0000	49.0000	45.0000	7.0000	70.0000
535.0000	45.0000	62.0000	171.0000	•10.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
2882.0000	2326.0000	1861.0000	752.0000	175.0000	9.0000	0.0	66.0000
545.0000	44.0000	48.0000	38.0000	154.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
142.0000	96.0000	77.0000	53.0000	17.0000	6.0000	0.0	67.0000
572.0000	47.0000	55.0000	78.0000	157.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
2198.0000	1485.0000	1170.0000	282.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.0000
785.0000	44.0000	46.0000	20.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
67.0000	52.0000	52.0000	52.0000	52.0000	52.0000	52.0000	71.0000
483.0000	45.0000	49.0000	39.0000	173.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
1542.0000	1517.0000	1349.0000	722.0000	273.0000	92.0000	2.0000	70.0000
541.0000	51.0000	24.0000	29.0000	348.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
141.0000	135.0000	120.0000	23.0000	9.0000	4.0000	2.0	72.0000
\$52.0000	44.0000	51.0000	54.0000	162.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
100.0000	87.0000	44.0000	10.0000	7.0000	0.0	0.0	19.0000
495.0000	54.0000	54.0000	2.0000	190.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
75.0000	75.0000	75.0000	20.0000	0.0	e.e	0.0	72.0000
476.0000	51.0000	54.0000	23.0000	433.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
1746.0000	1225.0000	781.0000	272.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.0000
436.0000	50.0000	63.0000	127.0000	810.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
186.0000	139.0000	90.0000	15.0000	15.0000	0.0	0.0	71.0000
599.0000	45.0000	53.0000	83.0000	431.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
1102.0000	1062.0000	977.0000	577.0000	247.0000	88.0000	43.0000	72.0000
557.0000	54.0000	56.0000	21.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
2374.0000	2122.0000	1659.0000	473.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	68.0000
538.0000	44.0000	56.0000	120.0000	922.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
166.0000	166.0000	159.0000	68.0000	57.0000	39.0000	0.0	70.0000
550.0000	46.0000	53.0000	42.0000	432.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
68.0000	66.0000	23.0000	4.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	69.0000
511.0000	51,0000	56.0000	55.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
154.0000	154.0000	114.0000	52.0000	37.0000	18.0000	0.0	72.0000
656.0000	53.0000	58.0000	34.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
143.0000	104.0000	79.0000	55.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	67.0000
384.0000	80.0000	61.0000	2.0000	400.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
168.0000	154.0000	119.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	70.0000
296.0000	60.0000	65.0000	43.0000	450.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
834.0000	611.0000	368.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	68.0000
532.0000	45.0000	46.0000	11.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
222.0000	222.0000	196.0000	143.0000	118.0000	0.0	0.0	67.0000
516.0000	48.0000	49.0000	4.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
46.0000	30.0000	15.0000	7.0000	3.0000	3.0000	0.0	69.0000
639.0000	48.0000	49.0000	7.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
298.0000	96.0000	65.0000	49.0000	18.0000	0.0	0.0	66.0000
322,0000	63.0000	63.0000	16.0000	812.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
325.0000	302.0000	81.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	69.0000
560.0000	51.0000	52.0000	12.0000	425.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
614.0000	523.0000	448.0000	290.0000	160.0000	3.0000	0.0	71.0000
555.0000	47.0000	59.0000	119.0000	199.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
218.0000	151.0000	120.0000	99.0000	11.0000	0.0	0.0	67.0000
373.0000	55.0000	55.0000	5.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
59.0000	11.0000	11.0000	11.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	68.0000
101 0000	** ****	** ****	10 0000			1 0000	\$ 0000

е . Эр Н д

.

1

ă,

1393 204

. .

.

9,

237.0000	237.0000	775 000					
401.0000		225.000	138.0000	127.0000	82.0000	0.0	72.0000
110 0000	51.0000	58.000	0 38.0000	205.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1 0000
114.0000	104.0000	72.000	43.0000	34.0000	0.0		1.0000
565.0000	45.0000	60.000	0 149.0000	200.0000	1 0000	0.0	69.0000
50.0000	50.0000	38.000	0 38.0000	18 0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
447.0000	51.0000	57.000	0 41 0000	38.0000	38.0000	0.0	67.0000
520.0000	158.0000	1 200 000	0 01.0000	953.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
778.0000	338.0000	290.000	0 179.0000	99.0000	0.0	0.0	47.0000
//8.0000	47.0000	49.000	0 13.0000	552.0000	1.0000	1.0000	07.0000
28.0000	26.0000	26.000	0 26.0000	10.0000		2.0000	1.0000
467.0000	54.0000	65.000	0 104.0000	142.0000	0.0	0.0	69.0000
142.0000	133.0000	117.000	24 0000	182.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
580.0000	47 0000	.13.000	20.0000	8.0000	0.0	0.0	72.0000
1247.0000	47.0000	52.000	47.0000	412.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
	2817.0000	2297.000	0 1077.0000	260.0000	30.0000	0.0	48.0000
537.0000	54.0000	58.000	39.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1.0000	00.0000
78.0000	62.0000	18.000	0.0	0.0		1.0000	1,0000
543.0000	46.0000	54.000	74.0000	157.0000	0.0	0.0	69.0000
177.0000	145.0000	154 000	74.0000	137.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
191.0000		150.000	/8.0000	\$3.0000	40.0000	2.0000	71.0000
	53.0000	83.0000	104.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
++.0000	60.0000	27.0000	15.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	48.0000
387.0000	51.0000	55.0000	31.0000	812.0000	1 0000		00.0000
112.0000	82.0000	30.0000	14.0000	4 0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
526.0000	51.0000	44 0000	132.0000	8.0000	0.0	0.0	68.0000
199 0000	51.0000	84.0000	132.0000	540.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
178.0000	181.0000	164.0000	89.0000	79.0000	31.0000	0.0	72.0000
243.0000	44.0000	63.0000	183.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1 0000	1 0000
224.0300	208.0000	176.0000	77.0000	45.0000	17 0000	1.0000	1.0000
509.0000	62.0000	45.0000	15.0000	410 0000	33.0000	0.0	70.0000
636.0000	594.0000	574 0000	33.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
192.0000	47.0000	524.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	71.0000
100 0000	47.0000	50.0000	29.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
107.0000	74.0000	27.0000	20.0000	2 0000	0.0	0.0	45.0000
515.0000	44.0000	45.0000	13.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1 0000	00.0000
35.0000	35.0000	35.0000	32.0000	8.0000		1.0000	1.0000
595.0000	55.0000	58.0000	24.0000	410 0000	0.0	0.0	59.0000
788.0000	949.0000	771 0000	177 0000	-10.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
525.0000	\$1.0000	//3.0000	377.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	69.0000
525.0000	31.0000	52.0000	8.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
18.0000	16.0000	16.0000	16.0000	16.0000	0.0	0.0	77.0000
592.0000	53.0000	54.0000	15.0000	441.0000	1 0000		12.0000
12.0000	7.0000	0.0	0.0		1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
619.0000	53.0000	58.0000		0.0	0.0	0.0	70.0000
437.0000	505.0000	177 0000	-8.0000	830.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
137.0000	375.0000	4/3.0000	227.0000	10.0000	0.0	0.0	71.0000
427.0000	48.0000	58.0000	101.0000	157.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
458.0000	332.0000	233.0000	205.0000	58.0000	0.0		1.0000
462.0000	47.0000	48.0000	10.0000	601.0000	1 0000	0.0	05.0000
149.0000	149.0000	30.0000	0.0		1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
383.0000	47.0000	T1 0000	10 0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	69.0000
848 0000	47.0000	51.0000	40.0000	753.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
748.0000	948.0000	711,0000	324.0000	21.0000	0.0	0.0	44.0000
519.0000	44.0000	56.0000	118.0000	410.0000	1.0000	1 0000	00.0000
273.0000	100.0000	76.0000	52.0000	20.0000	7 0000	1.0000	1.0000
603.0000	44.0000	45.0000	204.0000	174 0000	3.0000	0.0	66.0000
555.0000	503,0000	150 0000	142 0000	-38.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
810.0000	11 0000	338.0000	142.0000	115.0000	44.0000	0.0	69.0000
010.0000	0000	49.0000	53.0000	412.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
33.0000	33.0000	33.0000	33.0000	33.0000	25.0000	12.0000	77 0000
592.0000	47.0000	58.0000	104.0000	162.0000	1 0000	11.0000	12.0000
4421.0000	4036.0000	3472.0000	2251.0000	970 0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
696.0000	47.0000	54 0000		770.0000	194.0000	3.0000	72.0000)
248.0000	749.0000	38.0000	87.0000	151.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1,0000
410 0000	240.0000	248.0000	85.0000	3.0000	0.0	0.0	71.0000
0000	45.0000	54.0000	95.0000	450.0000	1,0000	0.0	1 0000
146.0000	60.0000	28.0000	12.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0000
644.0000	55.0000	58.0000	22.0000	410 0000	0.0	0.0	67.0000
2568.0000	2173,0000	1774.0000	491 0000	-10.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
1003		1778.0000	491.0000	0.0	0.0	0.0	68.0000
139							
TR	TOTAL	DOSE	COUNTS	AVERAGE DOSE			
1		.0	.0				
2		.0					
				.0			
-			.0	.0			
		2		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

1

l

5	.0	.0
6	.0	.0
7	.0	.0
8	.0	.0
	.0	.0
10		
11		
12		
		1.0
		1.0
13		3.0
10	.0	3.0
17	.0	3.0
18	.0	3.0
17	.0	4.0
20	.0	4.0
21	.0	4.0
22	.0	4.0
23	.0	4.0
24	.0	4.0
25	.0	4.0
26	.0	4.0
27	.0	4.0
28	.0	4.0
29	.0	4.0
30	.0	4.0
31	.0	5.0
32	.0	5.0
33	.0	5.0
34	.0	5.0
35	.0	5.0
36	.0	5.0
37	.0	5.0
38	.0	5.0
19		5.0
40		5.0
		5.0
		5.0
	0.8	1774 0
	10865.4	1774.0
45	14107.4	2044.0
40	11408.0	1399.0
	8435.3	1547.0
48	9030.2	1850.0
49	8814.0	1081.0
50	8647.8	1497.0
51	10568.3	15/8.0
52	12972.0	1458.0
53	14945.0	1308.0
54	14428.7	1215.0
55	16010.0	1175.0
56	16225.0	1081.0
57	16607.3	984.0
58	19187.3	868.0
59	15085.0	773.0
60	14913.2	674.0
61	17473.8	606.0
62	18290.2	522.0
63	16424.5	449.0
64	15515.7	375.0
65	14353.9	302.0
66	9359.6	226.0
47	8079.9	201.0
48	4229.5	174.0
49	1270.8	153.0
70	1007 1	

C-8

 71
 632.8
 77.0
 8.2

 72
 432.3
 43.0
 10.1

 73
 .0
 .0
 .0

 74
 .0
 .0
 .0

 75
 .0
 .0
 .0

 76
 .0
 .0
 .0

 77
 .0
 .0
 .0

 78
 .0
 .0
 .0

 79
 .0
 .0
 .0

 80
 .0
 .0
 .0

 81
 .0
 .0
 .0

 82
 .0
 .0
 .0

 83
 .0
 .0
 .0

 84
 .0
 .0
 .0

 85
 .0
 .0
 .0

 86
 .0
 .0
 .0

 97
 .0
 .0
 .0

 97
 .0
 .0
 .0

 97
 .0
 .0
 .0

 97
 .0
 .0
 .0

 97
 .0

APPENDIX D

DEFINITION OF VARIABLE NAMES

1393 208

R.S.

-

VARIABLE NAME	DEFINITION
DEATHAGE	Age at death to nearest tenth.
INITLYR	Initial year of employment.
FINALYR	Final year of employment
TOTALYR	Total years of employment to nearest tenth.
EXPOSURE	0=zero lifetime dose recorded.
	l=positive lifetime dose recorded.
CUMDOSE	Cumulative lifetime dose.
CDOS 3+	Cumulative lifetime dose 3 years before death.
CDOS 5+	Cumulative lifetime dose 5 years before death.
CDOS 10+	Cumulative lifetime dose 10 years before death.
CDOS 15+	Cumulative lifetime dose 15 years before death.
CDOS 20+	Cumulative lifetime dose 20 years before death.
CDOS 25+	Cumulative lifetime dose 25 years before death.
YRDEATH	Year of death.
DT1	Represents the difference between year of death and the initial year of employment.
DT2	Represents the difference between the year of death and the final year of employment.
DT3	Represents the differences between the year of death and the year at the middle of employment.
DOS0-3	Represents the differences between cumulative dose and cumulative dose three years before death.

1393 209

di

VARIABLE NAME	DEFINITION
DOS4-5	Represents the difference between cumulative dose 3 years before death and cumulative dose 5 years before death.
DOS6-10	Represents the difference between cumulative dose 5 years before death and 10 years before death.
DOS11-15	Represents the difference between cumulative dose 10 years before death and 15 years before death.
DOS16-20	Represents the difference between cumulative dose 15 years before death and cumulative dose 20 years lefore death.
DOS21-25	Represents the difference between cumulative dose 20 years prior to death and cumulative dose 25 years prior to death.
D0S25+	Represents the cumulative dose 25 years prior to death.
MAXDOS	Represents the maximum value of DOS0-3, DOS4-5, DOS6-10, DOS11-15, DOS16-30, DOS21-25, and DOS25+
TMAXDOS	Represents the time from the center of the interval in which the maximum dose is found.
AGESQ	Represents the age at death minus 60 all divided by 5 and then squared.

s

	F (0).	NEWVARFOR/FINAL(0)
1		DIMENSION XID(100), XTAB(999), DOS(10), DT(10), XDATE(10), XWIDTH(10),
2		1XINT(50), XREC(10)
3		DATA XWIDTH/3.,2.,5.,5.,5.,5.,4.,3+0.,
4		DATA XTAB/137*1.,17*13.,5.,3*13.,3*6.,6*13.,7.,
5		\$3*13.,8.,18*13.,9.,6*13.,3*10.,12.,10.,11.,11.,
6		13#13.,30#14.,170#2.,2#3.,388#2.,200#4./
7		DATA XD-TE. 1.5.4.0,7.5,13.0,18.5,24.0,27.75,3*0./
3	1	READ(2:,50,END=300) (XID(J),J=1,16)
9	50	FORM((F4.1.F2.0.F2.0.F3.1.F3.0.3F1.0.7F4.0.F2.0)
10	r	FIL 28 FOR EXPOSED WHITE MALES WITH KNOWN CAUSE OF DEATH
11	с	IF XID(8).EQ.0.) GO TO 998
12		(XID(7), ED.O.) GD TO 997
13		F(XID(6), EQ.0.) GO TO 996
14		IF(XID(5), ED.0.) GO TO 995
15	C	IF(XID(4), FR.O.) GD TD 994
16	ē	RECODE CAUSE OF DEATH INTO 14 CATEGORIES
17	- 2	1 . ICD4 FEOH 1 TO 135
18	C	2 - ICDA FROM 240 TO 409 AND 412 TO 799
19	č	TEICDA 410 AND 411
20	č	
31	× č	S = ICDA 1157 FANTPEAR CANCED
22	č	A = TOTA 141 TO 147 BEED CYCT CANFED
23	č	
24	č	P = 1000 174 DEFACT CANCER
-	č	
	ž	10 - TOPH 173 IPTRUED CHILLA I VACUATE CAUCEE
	ž	11 - TCDA SOU TO 202 AND LOVEL OT FUT CHACEN
20	č	
	č	12 - TOPA 100 TO ADD CYCLINTHIA TURCE CODED 5 TURCHAU 13 ABAUE
30	č	14 - ICA 21/ TO 207 EXCLUDING INCE COLED 5 THOUGH IS POVE
71	~	K + VIDEST DIST DIREK CARCEN TIFES (DENION ON DISFECTIED)
32		YEFC(1) = YTAB(K)
77	~	DECADE OF DEATH THAT THEE BOARD
74	č	BLOOD CAUSE OF DEATH INTO TAKE OKOOPS
7.	č	NON CAPER
1	2	
37	-	
78		TELVENTENT TAAN OF VERSEN OF DAD IN VERSION
10		TECHNIC CELLAR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR
40		TELEVITES OF 200 AND AVERAGES FOR A VECTOR - A
41	r	SET THE DELTA T COM HARDAGE POTUTE TH CHER AND DELTH
	2	DET THE DELTH I FROM VARIOUS FORMES IN ENFLORMENT AND DEATH
43	č	ST(2) TO THE FOOD FUT OF CHELOWED TO DEATH
44	č	DT(1) TO THE FIGH END OF ENDINE AT THE PERIOD
45	-	DT(1) = VID(1) = VID(2)
46		DT(2) = XID(14) = XID(3)
47		DT(3) = YID(1A) = (((YID(3)-YID(2))/2))+YID(2))
48	c .	DOSES RECEIVED IN UNFIDUE DELTA T INTERVALE
49	č	DETERMINE THE DOSES AT VARIOUS TIMES TH DEATH
50	č	VARIABLE TIME INTERVAL
51	č	005(1) 0 10 3
52	č	DDS(2) 4 TO 5
53	č	DOS(3) 0 TO 10
54	č	DOS(4) 11 TO 15
20	č	DOS(5) 14 TO 20
56	č	DOS(A) 21 TO 25
57	č	DOS(7) HOSE THAN 25
	c	
59		DOS(2) = YID(10) = YID(11)
60		
61		DOS(4) = XID(12) - XID(13)
62		DOS(5) = XID(13) - XID(14)
63		DOS(6) . XID(14) - XID(15)
64		DOS(7) = XID(15)

Program used to generate variables DT1, DT2, DT3, DOS0-3, DOS4-5, DOS6-10, DOS11-15, DOS16-20, DOS21-25, DOS25+, MAXDOS and TMAXDOS. (Continued on next page)

D-3

1393 211
FIND THE MAXIMUM DOCC RECIEVED IN ANY GIVEN TIME INTERVAL NOTE THAT THE TIME INTERVALS ARE OF DIFFERENT LENGTH AND THAT THIS PUTS SOME TIME INTERVALS AT A DISADWANTAGE SINCE THEY HAVE FEWER YEARS TO ACCUMULATE DOSE...HOWEVER AT THIS POINT WE'LL SEE WHAT THIS DOES AND IF IF LCOKS AT ALL FROMISING WE CAN TAKE THIS EFFECT INTO ACCOUNT XMAXD = AMAX1(DOS(1),DOS(2),DOS(3),DOS(4),DOS(5),DOS(5),DOS(7)) 45 C 66 000 33 69 70 71 C C 72 DO 125 I = 1,7 IF(XMAXD.E0.DOS(I)) K = I IF(XMAXD.E0.DOS(I)) GO TO 126 74 75 76 77 125 CONTINUE IF(K.E0.0) WRITE(-,-) K.K.K.K. (XID(LS).LS=1.16) 785 126 CONTINUE 20 C 81 FIND THE FINE FIDE THE FROM THE HAVINGH DOSE
DT(4) = XDATE(K)
XINT(2) = XID(1)**2.
URITE(21,70) (XID(L6),L6=1,16),
IXREC(1),XREC(2),DT(1),DT(2),DT(3),(DOS(I),I=1,7),XHAXD,DT(4), 82 83 84 05 IXINT(2) FORMAT(16F8.1.15F8.1) GO TO 1 ICNT = ICNT + 1 0005 70 978 GG TG 1 ICNT1 = ICNT1 + 1 90 91 93 997 GO TO 1 996 ICNT2 = ICNTE + 1 94 GO TO 1 ICNT3 = ICNT3 + 1 995 96 GO TO 97 994 CONTINUE ICNT4 = ICNT4 + 1 GO TO 1 78 99 100 300 CONTINUE WRITE(-,-) ICNT, ICNT1, ICNT2, ICNT3, ICNT4 101 102 103 STOP END

Program used to generate variables DT1, DT2, DT3, DOS0-3, DOS4-5, DOS6-10, DOS11-15, DOS16-20, DOS21-25, DOS25+, MAXDOS and TMAXDOS. (Continued from previous page)

APPENDIX E

1

1

1

I

SUMMARY OF LOGISTIC MODELING

APPENDIX E

KEY

EUWM-ALL	Exposed and Unexposed White Males - All cases included.
EUWM-NA	Exposed and Unexposed White Males - No accident cases included.
EWM-ALL	Exposed White Males - All cases included.
EWM-NA	Exposed White Males - No accident cases included.
-2LOG(L)	Log of the likelihood ratio

Decrease in -2LOG(L) from the constant model to the specific model.

The tables below contain models which specify

Δ

log /P/(1-P)7

where P is the probability that death was due to the specific cancer.

n.b. Definitions of variables are contained in Appendix D. In particular, note the specific form of AGESQ.

RESPIRATORY MODELS*	RESP-ALL EUWM-ALL	
Model	-2LOG(L)	≙
-2.6625 -2.24843440 (AGESQ) 30.1	1493.4 1445.9	47.7
-5.05393470 (AGESQ) +.0439 (YRDEATH) 29.8 13.0	1431.9	61.5
-4.90763438 (AGESQ)+.0412 (YRDEATH)+.0012 (DOS16-20) 29.3 11.1 1.5	1430.6	62.8
	-2LOG(L)	≙
-6.18346 (AGESQ) +.037 (YRDEATH) +.033 (INITYR) + 30.2 8.6 2.9 .0013 (DOS16-20) 1.8	1427.9	65.5
-6.43353 (AGESQ) +.041 (YRDEATH) +.0337 (INITYR) 30.9 10.9 2.92 0003 (DOS6-10) .44	1428.9	64.5
-6.49356 (AGESQ)+.0375 (YRDEATH)+.0397 (INITYR) 31.1 8.7 4.0 +.0026 (DOS16-20)001 (DOS6-10) 4.7 2.6	1424.8	68.6
	RESP ALL-A EUWM-NA	ACC
	-2LOG(L)	≙
-2.4939	1427.9	
-2.14173139 (AGESQ) 23.7	1394.6	33.2
-4.68683240 (AGESQ)+.0399 (YRDEATH) 24.9 10.4	1383.5	44.3
-4.10353017 (AGESQ) +.0464 (YRDEATH)0167 (AGE) 22.0 13.3 4.0	1379.6	48.2
*NOTE: Numbers below the variable names represe chi square values for the variable after all other terms are entered.	ent	

4

.

E-2

-				-	-	-
10	LAJ	м	-	- 24		т.
-		1.1	-	5		~

100

8

Model	Constant	AGESQ	INITLYR	YRDEATH	DOS16-20	-2 log·L
1	-2.57					981.1
2	-2.21	291 (16.6)				956.4
3	-4.37	301 (18.0)	.047 (4.7)			952.1
4	-4.35	290 (16.2)		.033 (4.4)		951.7
5	-5.78	298 (17.3)	.038 (2.96)	.028 (3.02)		949.0
6	-4.51	296 (17.4)	.048 (4.99)		.0018 (3.5)	949.2
7	-4.13	286 (15.7)		.029 (3.3)	.0012 (1.6)	950.3
8	-5.64	294 (16.9)	.041 (3.4)	.023 (1.9)	.0014 (2.0)	947.2

Results of fitting eight logistic regression models using respiratory cancer and no cancer as the two response categories. Only exposed white males are included in the model. Variables which have no entry for a particular model were not used in that model. For each model, the first value under the variable is the coefficient of that variable in the logistic regression model, while the second value (below in parentheses) is the chi-square value for a test of statistical significance of that variable. All chi-square values have one degree of freedom.

	EWM-NA	
	-2LOG(L)	₫
-2.406	938.3	
-2.109259 (AGESQ) 12.4	921.9	16.4
-5.07702563 (AGESQ) +.0626 (INITYR) +.0017 (DOS16-20) 12.3 7.9 3.3	912.5	25.8
-5.45712718 (AGESQ)+.0715 (INITYR)0010 (DOS6-10) 13.2 9.9 2.5 +.0030 (DOS16-20) 6.3	909.6	28.7
PANCREAS MODELS	PANCREAS	
	EUWM-ALL	
-4.0389	514.9	
-3.75192093 (AGESQ)	508.5	6.4
-3.84321951 (AGASQ) +.0033 (DOS4-5) 4.1 7.3	503.5	11.4
	EUWM-NA	
-3.8704	497.8	<i>c</i> 1
9.1	491.7	6.1
-3.65341708 (AGESQ) 2.8	494.4	3.4
	EWM-ALL	
-4.0164	321.6	
-4.1436+.0036 (DOS4-5)	315.9	5.7
-3.977+.0035(DOS4-5)1107(AGESQ) 7.7 1.2	314.5	7.1

 \sim

1393 217

E-4

	EWM-NA	
	-2LOG(L)	≙
-3.8528	311.3	
-3.9827+.0038 (DOS4-5)	305.1	6.2
-3.9051+.0037 (DOS4-5)0550 (AGESQ) 8.4 .25	304.8	6.5
BRAIN MODELS	BRAIN	
	EUWM-ALL	
-4.6749	306.7	
-4.7401+.0121(DOS25+)	303.2	3.5
-3.2417+.0132 (DOS25+)0260 (AGE)	299.9	6.8
-3.2660+.0085(DOS25+)0541(AGE)+.0937(DT1)	292.7	14.0
-3.3680+.1054(DT1)0551(AGE) 8.7 9.1	294.4	12.3
	EUWM-NA	
-4.506	297.6	
-2.00580424 (AGE)	290.1	7.5
-1.90590453 (AGE) +.0125 (DOS25+)	286.3	11.3
-2.11030713 (AGE) +.0993 (DT1)	281.5	16.1
-1.99850704 (AGE) +.0877 (DT1) +.0080 (DOS25+) 13.4 5.8 2.1	279.97	17.63
	EWM-ALL	
-4.5917	201.5	
-4.6909+.0118 (DOS25+)	198.2	3.3
-3.47250907 (AGE) +.2089 (D'F1)	181.1	19.4
-2.9896+.0130 (DOS25+)0296 (AGE)	195.5	6.0
-3.3311+.0047 (DOS25+)0896 (AGE)+.1965 (DT1) .6 11.1 12.0	180.5	21.0

Π

I

	EWM-NA	
	-2LOG(L)	Δ
-4.4282	195.6	
-1.81450444 (AGE)	190.3	5.3
-2.33461041 (AGE) +.2005 (DT1) 14.4 13.2	173.4	22.2
-1.65470490 (AGE) +.0124 (DOS25+)	186.6	9.0
-2.19281031(AGE)+.1887(DT1)+.0042(DOS25+) 14.0 10.8 .46	173.0	22.6