

**From:** Paul Lorenzini [<mailto:rodin2@aol.com>]

**Sent:** Thursday, October 25, 2018 9:44 AM

**To:** Alan Waltar <[alan.waltar@gmail.com](mailto:alan.waltar@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** RE: Path Forward Meeting in Richland -- Friday afternoon, Nov. 2

Alan – a few thoughts:

If I summarize – at least as I interpret these two positions, I see them as two proposals with different goals, both legitimate, but different. The one (which I understand to be yours) focuses on how to bring the community together to work constructively toward a resolution of/ or a more aligned view of, the LNT-Hormesis controversy. The second focuses on a regulatory fix. My first suggestion would be to separate them and realize we are trying to work this on two parallel paths – I think what you've outlined is a reasonable start at working the first path – professional alignment. My angst, if you will, focuses on the second -- a regulatory fix which can't wait and which can be worked within the framework of our current technical disagreements -- if, that is, we can agree on some common principles.

As to the regulatory fix – I would add a fourth voice to your opening paragraph:

Voice 4: find a common ground and seek a revised regulatory fix that reflects a common view shared by voices #1-3 of the actual risks of low level radiation – even if there is an LNT< the risks below some de minimus level are too low to worry about.

If we think in those terms and consider Tony's paper, I would propose the following as a process:

Step 1: Agree on the need for change.

This is an essential first step – I sense we're there intuitively, but there's a lot of space between intuition and articulating this view in specific terms. Is there really alignment on the need for change – that the system is broken as many of us think it is? We need to get all (the other) three voices to agree that the regulatory process is broken - that it is costing unnecessary \$\$billions and is resulting in public consequences that in some cases are compromising public safety and in others are not returning a reasonable cost benefit safety advantage. E.g., does it make sense to screw down on 0.5% of the public exposures from nuclear at a cost of \$\$billions while largely ignoring other areas of exposure that are much (orders of magnitude?) higher? Can the \$\$billions being spent to meet the EPA standards for a repository be reconciled in any way with a common understanding of radiation risks that is shared by every one of the voices above? If not, that defines broken.

An essential aspect of step 1 is formulating the “group” that will work this problem. We need respected individuals that will have influence over others within their particular “voice” and whose views will carry weight in a final report with recommendations. This may be the most important (and most difficult) step in the process.

Step 2. Develop some articulated statements that both sides can agree on which define what “broken” means.

This will be the conversation that motivates an agreement that it is broken, but any proposal for change that is to be compelling must articulate in specific ways just how the system is broken. That never

happened in the last (failed) attempt at achieving a de minimus standard. Whatever justification statements were made, they were - based on the results - -weak and unconvincing. (Plus the actual proposal was feeble). We need to do better- and it needs to come out as a consensus view from all three of these groups combined. (Maybe the individuals working the problem have an assignment to work their "group" and get some internal alignment. The HPS proposal should be tabled in order to pursue a consensus from others that would get behind the HPS proposal before it is pushed.

Step 3. Articulate a proposed new approach to regulation that *is grounded* in a consensus on steps 1 and 2.

I read Tony's proposal as a good attempt at step 3 – but I believe as a preliminary to step we need a process aimed at steps 1 and 2.

That's my initial thoughts, FWIW.

Paul

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

**From:** [Alan Waltar](#)

**Sent:** Thursday, October 25, 2018 7:10 AM

**To:** '[Paul Lorenzini](#)'

**Subject:** RE: Path Forward Meeting in Richland -- Friday afternoon, Nov. 2

Paul,

Sorry you are tied up—and it sounds like for a very good cause!

I have attached a couple "trial balloons" one from Tony and one from me (based on Ludwig's suggestion).

Both Steve Baker and Wayne Glines have other thoughts (that I have not yet digested).

Any thoughts?

Alan

**From:** Paul Lorenzini [<mailto:rodin2@aol.com>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 24, 2018 10:25 PM

**To:** Alan Waltar <[alan.waltar@gmail.com](mailto:alan.waltar@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: Path Forward Meeting in Richland -- Friday afternoon, Nov. 2

Alan — thx for thinking of me — would love to join you but I'm in Cal at a Kairos prison ministry Nov 1-4 — basically taking Walk to Emmaus/Cursillo inside prisons - I am anxious to stay involved as I believe getting people reoriented in their thinking to work toward a de minimus concept is the key and is doable — but it must be a level that is rationalized to other exposure levels such as natural background or its not worth the effort. We must find a common ground and get the system changed while we work

through our LNT disagreements on a parallel track. And it must integrate respected regulatory authorities — having interesting conversations with an OSU prof reinforcing this whole thing — some players are not helping our cause by being too polarizing - nuff said — pls keep me in the loop if you can.

Best,

Paul

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 24, 2018, at 8:37 PM, Alan Waltar <[alan.waltar@gmail.com](mailto:alan.waltar@gmail.com)> wrote:

Dear Paul,

Any chance you could make one more trip to Richland in association with the Low Dose Conference?

A few of us plan to get together at the Richland Community Center on Friday, November 2 from 5:00 pm to 7:00 pm to brainstorm some key items for a Path Forward.

Many things went very well with the conference (including your talk), but no tangible Path Forward was agreed upon in the conference itself. But a key goal of the organizing committee has been to build upon the success of this conference move the needle forward. We have several ideas, but I'm sure you could contribute many more!

By the way, if you can come, the whole planning group is getting together the next night (Saturday, Nov. 3) at the Red Lion for a Celebration Party. You would be more than welcome to join us (and bring your wife).

So.....any chance?

Alan

Alan E. Waltar

Email: [Alan.Waltar@gmail.com](mailto:Alan.Waltar@gmail.com)

Home phone: 509-548-5272

Cell phone: 509-881-1641