

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: INTERVIEW OF JUAN LAFAILLE

Docket Number: ---

Location: CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

Date: OCTOBER 23, 1995

Work Order No.: NRC- 370

Pages 27

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.
Court Reporters and Transcribers
1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 234-4433

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
+ + + + +
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
+ + + + +
INCIDENT INVESTIGATION TEAM
+ + + + +
INTERVIEW OF JUAN LAFAILLE

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

MONDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1995

3:30 P.M.

INTERVIEWERS:

JOHN GLENN, Team Leader
SAMI SHERBINI

ON BEHALF OF MIT:

RALPH D. GANTS, ESQ.
of: Palmer & Dodge
One Beacon Street
Boston, MA 02108
(617) 573-0100

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(3:37 p.m.)

MR. GLENN: Today is October 23, 1995. My name is John Glenn. I am here at MIT as the leader of an incident investigation team looking into an exposure of an individual at MIT to P-32. First I'd like to just introduce the people who are in the room. My name is John Glenn, as I said. I'm normally with the Office of Research of the NRC. I've been appointed to this task.

Mr. Sherbini from the NRC, if you'd introduce yourself?

MR. SHERBINI: Sami Sherbini of NRC from the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

MR. GANTS: And I'm Ralph Gants from the law firm of Palmer & Dodge. Palmer & Dodge is the attorney for MIT, and I am here on behalf of MIT as an institution and on behalf of Mr. Lafaille in his capacity as an employee of MIT.

MR. LAFAILLE: I am Juan Lafaille. I am a post doctorate and associate in the Susumu Tonegawa's laboratory.

MR. GLENN: Okay, for the record, I'd like to confirm with you, Juan, that you do not have a problem with counsel being here who represents MIT?

MR. LAFAILLE: No.

1 MR. GLENN: Okay. And for the record, the
2 interview is with you. You can consult with counsel, but
3 we would prefer that you answer the questions, not your
4 counsel answer the questions.

5 MR. LAFAILLE: Okay.

6 MR. GLENN: Okay, let me cover a few things
7 about why we're here and how we do the transcribing. The
8 IIT is a fact finding group to figure out what happened.
9 And as a result of collecting factual information, we're to
10 attempt to determine the probable cause of the incident,
11 and then to develop lessons learned that we could apply to
12 other licensed institutions such as MIT so that they could
13 avoid a similar incident, to provide information to MIT so
14 that they could avoid similar incidents in the future, and
15 also then to use that information and look at our own
16 regulatory program, or to see whether there are things that
17 need to be changed there to provide a higher assurance that
18 this kind of incident would not occur in all of the
19 institutions that we regulate.

20 We are not an inspection team. We will not be
21 making a finding as to whether MIT violated or didn't
22 violate the NRC's regulations. We will make any
23 information we develop available to our Region 1 in King of
24 Prussia, Pennsylvania who would have the responsibility for
25 making that kind of determination.

1 Likewise, is there is any wrongdoing, it's not
2 this group that would be doing the investigation and making
3 a determination on that. We would turn any information we
4 have like that over to our Office of Investigations.

5 The interviews are transcribed, and we do that
6 for two reasons. One is that it permits us to discuss with
7 you and do the interview without taking focused notes. So
8 we'll consider what we're hearing and what we're saying
9 rather than trying to record it. The other thing is though
10 that this is a relatively formal process for the NRC. We
11 want a clear record of the basis for any of the findings
12 and conclusions that come out of this investigation.

13 So the transcription provides us with a clear
14 record of what was said. If there's disagreements about
15 who said what, we can go back to the transcript. Since the
16 accuracy of the transcript is important, we will provide
17 you with an opportunity -- it should be sometime tomorrow
18 to review the transcript, see if you find any errors,
19 either in terms of something you said be misinterpreted,
20 maybe you said something differently than you wanted to say
21 it, or you've remembered additional information that you
22 would like to have noted for the record to correct any
23 misimpressions that the statement might have.

24 You would do that by filling out an errata
25 sheet noting the page and the line on which it occurred,

1 and then the transcript and the errata sheet would become a
2 part of the permanent record. We will make this available
3 to you to review, not to anyone else, and also to the team
4 at a later date after we have completed our investigation
5 and issued a report, which should be about 40 days from
6 now.

7 Then you would be able to request a copy of the
8 transcript for your own private possession, if you should
9 so desire. Also at that point, all of the documents that
10 form the basis for the IIT's report would be put into the
11 NRC's public document room. And therefore, anyone who had
12 an interest in the case and wanted to review the materials
13 on which the findings were based would have access to the
14 material.

15 So both you and the public would have that at
16 the same time. I want you to be aware that these
17 transcripts will be available to anyone who wants to listen
18 to them. Okay, any questions about that?

19 MR. LAFAILLE: No.

20 MR. GLENN: Okay, the first thing I'd like you
21 to do is ask you to just briefly tell us what you know
22 regarding the incident involving Dr. Li in the lab -- how
23 you first heard about it and anything else that you can
24 remember in terms of how the incident has evolved.

25 MR. LAFAILLE: My information is very limited

1 because I was -- since I'm setting up my laboratory in New
2 York University, I have been lately traveling quite a bit.
3 But I remember once coming back from New York to Boston and
4 I was informed why some member of the lab -- I don't
5 remember -- it could have been Eugene himself that told me
6 this problem happened.

7 At that moment, the dose he received was not
8 clear. And none of the circumstances was clear either, as
9 I think now.

10 MR. GLENN: So you can't put a time on when you
11 first heard about it?

12 MR. LAFAILLE: If I could have a calendar,
13 because I -- it could be on Monday or Tuesday after the --
14 if I could have a --

15 MR. GLENN: Okay, I don't believe we actually
16 have a calendar.

17 MR. LAFAILLE: If that's important, I could
18 look for it.

19 MR. GLENN: We like to relate things to
20 calendar dates as much as possible.

21 MR. LAFAILLE: All right.

22 MR. GLENN: We can then compare everybody's
23 facts and --

24 MR. LAFAILLE: Sure.

25 MR. GLENN: Perhaps we could just establish how

1 much interaction you actually have with the individual and
2 how much you know about the incident itself.

3 MR. LAFAILLE: I know Eugene for -- since he
4 came to the lab, because I presented him in the lab. And
5 the lab -- the Tonegawa lab works mainly to research fields
6 in immunology, which is the old Tonegawa field, which I
7 belong; and neurobiology is a field that started in the
8 laboratory about 1990, which is now growing in the
9 Tonegawa.

10 And Dr. Li works in neurobiology field, and I
11 work in immunology field. So we don't have a very strong
12 interactions scientifically, but I -- of course we all know
13 because we have common meetings every week. So I know -- I
14 could tell a third person what type of research he's doing.
15 That's the extent of my knowledge about him.

16 MR. GLENN: Did he relate to you in any detail
17 what happened? You said that you may have been --

18 MR. LAFAILLE: Yeah, of course I ask him, even
19 if it wasn't him the first person I told him, I met him
20 five minutes later, so I ask him. And no, at that moment,
21 I think he was very -- he was just trying to establish the
22 dosage, that I remember he was concerned was the first time
23 I met him was what the real dose -- I mean, was trying to
24 establish that. That's all.

25 MR. GLENN: Okay. Now I think I'd like to move

1 on more to how radioactive materials are handled in the
2 Tonegawa laboratory and then what the normal procedures
3 are. When the material is delivered by the radiation
4 protection office, what happens to it next?

5 MR. LAFAILLE: Are you talking about now or
6 before the incident?

7 MR. GLENN: Before the incident. Then you can
8 tell us about now.

9 MR. LAFAILLE: It goes to our storage freezer
10 where basically it becomes available to any lab members.

11 MR. GLENN: And if a lab member wanted to use
12 some of that material, what would they have to do?

13 MR. LAFAILLE: Then we go to the freezer and
14 take it and use it.

15 MR. GLENN: Do they have to have a key? Would
16 they have to --

17 MR. LAFAILLE: No, no.

18 MR. GLENN: Okay. Would they have to sign
19 anything?

20 MR. LAFAILLE: They sign in their own -- they
21 keep the record in their own notes.

22 MR. GLENN: In their own notes? So there was
23 not a common log, but each researcher was expected to note
24 in their own lab book how much -- that they took material
25 and how much they took?

1 MR. LAFAILLE: Yes, yes.

2 MR. GLENN: Since the material is frozen, how
3 quickly can you take a little bit of it? Do you have to
4 let it thaw out?

5 MR. LAFAILLE: You have to let it thaw out for
6 15 minutes or so. Because it's also very protected in
7 these thick -- so it takes a while. Although the volume is
8 very small, takes a while to defrost.

9 MR. SHERBINI: Is that 15 minutes at room
10 temperature?

11 MR. LAFAILLE: At room temperature.

12 MR. SHERBINI: Or in a --

13 MR. LAFAILLE: Well, you take it and you --
14 normally what people would do when they know they are ready
15 to do a procedure -- a labeling procedure, they take it ten
16 or 15 minutes in advance from the freezer. They let it
17 defrost in the bench in a shielded part of the bench.

18 MR. GLENN: Okay, how has that changed since
19 the incident?

20 MR. LAFAILLE: How has that changed? The
21 isotopes are locked now, and two people have the key.
22 Also, in a way, they now everybody -- if someone needs to
23 do a procedure, they would have to in advance make sure
24 that one of the two people that Dr. Tonegawa felt they
25 could handle the responsibility of knowing what anybody --

1 everybody else is doing.

2 So in other words, you have to plan your
3 experiments a little bit better, not ten minutes in
4 advance. But you have to make sure that a person who has
5 the key is going to be around. And so you now communicate
6 with this person I'm going to do a labeling in the next
7 while, so are you going to be here or not.

8 And then they have to go get the key and record
9 every volume that is taken.

10 MR. GLENN: So the person who has the key
11 actually records the volumes?

12 MR. LAFAILLE: Yes.

13 MR. GLENN: Has that turned out to be very
14 burdensome or just a little bit burdensome?

15 MR. LAFAILLE: It is -- it is burdensome, but --
16 - yeah, it is a burden. Because you know, I don't think
17 many labs can afford to have like a permanent person that
18 is there. We work very long hours. If you come at 3:00 in
19 the morning, there are people working there. And so to
20 find the person that will have the key at 3:00 in the
21 morning, sometimes -- you know, it's -- that's why the
22 planning has to change a little bit so there is not that
23 okay, you have brilliant idea at 2:30 in the morning; at
24 3:00 in the morning you start experiment.

25 It doesn't work like that now. It has to maybe

1 wait until next day.

2 MR. GLENN: Right. These procedures were set
3 up I guess by the radiation protection office?

4 MR. LAFAILLE: Yes.

5 MR. GLENN: And had they done something before
6 that to -- in terms of controlling the material?

7 MR. LAFAILLE: Well, I think the material is
8 always controlled in a sense that the amount that we -- the
9 amount that we have at any given time in the lab is rather
10 low. I would say we never have more than two millicuries
11 of P-32 at any given moment in the lab as a source.

12 MR. GLENN: Okay, was there a period of time
13 when the radiation protection office was restricting the
14 use of isotopes other than through this lock and check out
15 procedure?

16 MR. LAFAILLE: No, but the reason -- supply.
17 In other words, we just found out we cannot order 20
18 millicuries randomly. We have to show that we run out of
19 what we have, and we get in vials of one millicuries.

20 MR. GLENN: Okay, I guess what I'm asking is
21 was there a period of time when they actually suspended --

22 MR. LAFAILLE: Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah. It's
23 right near after the accident, yes, yes, yes.

24 MR. GLENN: Okay. So they suspended activity,
25 and then when work was allowed to begin, it was with the

1 condition that --

2 MR. LAFAILLE: The condition, and this is the
3 conditions it's in.

4 MR. GLENN: Lock and sign procedure?

5 MR. LAFAILLE: Exactly.

6 MR. GLENN: Okay. In terms of the security of
7 the laboratory or the security of the building and the
8 security of the material itself against unauthorized
9 removal, with people coming and going all hours of the
10 night, the weekends and so forth, what are your
11 observations about whether people could get into the lab or
12 not?

13 MR. LAFAILLE: Well, the doors are locked after
14 6:00 or 7:00. The freezer -- I would say if you go into
15 the lab, that freezer that contains the radioactive
16 material doesn't look any different from 50 other freezers
17 that we have in there. So unless someone has a specific
18 knowledge that that freezer contains radioactive material --
19 - of course it's labeled, but so are all the others.

20 So I wouldn't imagine how that a random person
21 can get into the lab and -- even if he found some unlocked
22 door could have access to -- you know, free access to that
23 supply unless he has some previous knowledge that in this
24 freezer the material is stored.

25 MR. GLENN: I understand your point about being

1 able to know where the material is. Do you think someone
2 could actually though get into the lab?

3 MR. LAFAILLE: Well, it could happen. I mean,
4 it's not impossible. The doors -- you know, during the
5 day, there are a lot of people around. The doors were open
6 until 6:00, sometimes until 7:00. And then everything was
7 locked. All of us had a key. It works like a key. Not a
8 card, just a regular key. All of us had a key, and we are
9 supposed to.

10 MR. GLENN: When people are in the lab, do
11 they -- and after hours, do they lock the door for security
12 reasons?

13 MR. LAFAILLE: Yeah, like 6:00 or 7:00, the
14 doors are locked. You know, even the building also is
15 locked.

16 MR. GLENN: Okay, the building and the
17 laboratories?

18 MR. LAFAILLE: And the labs, yes.

19 MR. GLENN: That's what I wanted to confirm.
20 Okay, and if someone, a stranger, were coming in, do you
21 think people would notice that and respond to it?

22 MR. LAFAILLE: Yeah, people would notice,
23 especially at night. I mean, during the day, sales person
24 come to, you know, sell the laboratory and they enter the
25 lab. And normally you see someone needs help, so you

1 immediately help. Otherwise, after 5:00, everybody that is
2 in the lab is known person for sure. And if someone -- I
3 mean, I haven't seen -- I have been more seven years, I
4 have not seen people inside the lab wandering around.

5 It would be really merely tell them what are
6 they doing.

7 MR. GLENN: In terms of the laboratory and how
8 it's laid out, where is the supply area with respect to
9 where -- the freezer where the stock material is kept --
10 where is that with respect to where --

11 MR. LAFAILLE: It's kind of in the middle.
12 It's kind of in the middle. It's a very -- and so the plan
13 of our lab is very complicated because some pieces were
14 added as the years went by. But it happens to be almost in
15 the middle.

16 MR. GLENN: Is it located such that if someone
17 were in one of the other laboratories in one where the
18 freezer is located -- would they be likely to be able to
19 see somebody going to the freezer, or would it be hidden
20 from most people?

21 MR. LAFAILLE: Well, the people who would --
22 this was located in the room where three people currently
23 work. One is Dr. Li, the other is Dr. Chen, and the other
24 is Joe Delaney, which is a PhD student. The room is 347 --
25 E17-347. And that room has a corridor that goes through a

1 locked door to the outside.

2 So if someone would now the freezer -- where
3 the freezer with the radioactive material is and would come
4 in the absence of all the three people, there is some
5 chance that, you know, no one will be walking around at
6 that moment. Although people do circulate quite a bit,
7 there is a possibility.

8 MR. GLENN: What about researchers from other
9 laboratories? Do they have pretty free access? And is
10 there any exchange of material between laboratories?

11 MR. LAFAILLE: Tonegawa is possible he --
12 because of his philosophy, he's quite a sharing in terms of
13 reagents. And also, because our lab is more funded than
14 other labs, I think he feels some responsibility to share
15 more unidirectional. So we give more reagents to other
16 people than we borrow from other people.

17 And so, it's not surprising other people will
18 borrow any material from us, including radioactive material
19 if there is a need. It's more rare event, but if someone
20 needs --

21 MR. GLENN: But that could go uninterrupted, I
22 guess, if someone that you recognize from another lab were
23 in at the freezer --

24 MR. LAFAILLE: Exactly.

25 MR. GLENN: No one would --

1 MR. LAFAILLE: No, no, they would have to ask.

2 MR. GLENN: Oh?

3 MR. LAFAILLE: They would have to ask because
4 they don't know whether someone is planning to do a big
5 experiment that is going to need that material that is
6 there, so they would not just help themselves, I would say.
7 I would expect someone --

8 MR. GLENN: Okay, now what is the normal
9 activity that's used in a labeling?

10 MR. LAFAILLE: About 50 microcuries.

11 MR. GLENN: So something on the order of 500
12 microcuries would almost have to come from a stock vial?

13 MR. LAFAILLE: Yes.

14 MR. GLENN: Not from a single lab experiment?

15 MR. LAFAILLE: No, no.

16 MR. GLENN: Now when people withdraw from the
17 stock vials, where do they do that? Do they take the stock
18 vial to their work area?

19 MR. LAFAILLE: They stick to their work areas,
20 and I think the philosophy that has our lab, because it's
21 so big, I think the way it's set is that everybody has like
22 a little corner with a shield in each own bench from which
23 you are responsible to keep it clean and neat, rather than
24 having a common radioactive dirty area, since we have 30
25 people and it's messy, you never -- it will be more harder

1 to track and it's probably going to be dirty all the time.

2 So that's the way it works. Each one has its
3 own corner and a bench, and each one is responsible to keep
4 that area clean. Now, some people that share the bay, they
5 have an arrangement that is just a few feet away, so I have
6 the -- and you have the shield for the P-32, whatever
7 that's in the middle arrangement can be made like that.

8 But most likely, it's shield -- individual. So
9 each person would take their source and bring it to their
10 own bench and move on from there.

11 MR. SHERBINI: And when you take a source --
12 let's say you take a vial that has 500 microcuries and you
13 want 50. Do you refreeze the rest or --

14 MR. LAFAILLE: Yes.

15 MR. SHERBINI: You can?

16 MR. LAFAILLE: Yes.

17 MR. SHERBINI: Okay.

18 MR. GLENN: And the accounting for this would
19 be -- mainly you'd have to -- well, to the lab books in
20 order to figure out how much -- how do people know that
21 you're going to run out? I guess that would be the
22 question.

23 MR. LAFAILLE: Well, we -- I mean, basically
24 you -- when you are planning the experiment, you would have
25 to check how much you have and then -- you know, it's a

1 strange way, but you almost know, because in the way it's
2 done in our experiments, you work sort of labeling probes
3 sort of heavily for a while, and then you don't do it for
4 seven months.

5 So during this given period, maybe two or three
6 or four people are doing heavy labeling. And so you
7 basically know or you should ask -- I don't know, I should
8 ask someone else, are they going to label probes this week
9 or so -- in case we need to order more. That's basically
10 the way it operates.

11 MR. GLENN: Do you know during the week of
12 August 13th I guess through 19th, was anyone upset that
13 there seemed to be less material available than they
14 expected?

15 MR. LAFAILLE: No. I was told that week was a
16 heavy -- heavily -- there were a lot of users, maybe even
17 an abnormally high number of users as compared to other
18 weeks. But I --

19 MR. GLENN: But you didn't hear anybody say --

20 MR. LAFAILLE: I didn't hear, no.

21 MR. GLENN: -- I went to get some material and
22 there wasn't as much there as I expected?

23 MR. LAFAILLE: No, the biggest fight I found is
24 someone goes to the freezer and because it's at that very
25 moment being used by somebody else, that they don't find

1 the -- and so they have to look around who has it. That
2 was the biggest complaint. But not that people has run out
3 of material.

4 MR. GLENN: Okay, in terms of -- when you're
5 doing your own experiments and accounting for the material,
6 how do you, in your lab book, you know, say -- you do
7 certain amount of material, then you do some disposal. I
8 guess some of it would be solid waste, some of it would be
9 liquid waste. Is there any sort of accounting that's done
10 in terms of --

11 MR. LAFAILLE: Yes, we do.

12 MR. GLENN: Okay.

13 MR. LAFAILLE: But it's estimate, of course.
14 So we do our best effort to estimate how much is liquid
15 waste, how much is solid. That is carefully recorded.
16 Otherwise, they don't pick up the trash basically.

17 MR. GLENN: Okay.

18 MR. LAFAILLE: But we are forced to act that
19 way or we don't get the trash picked up. So everything we
20 have to estimate.

21 MR. GLENN: Okay, has the laboratory had any
22 other contamination problems in the past?

23 MR. LAFAILLE: No, not that I know of.

24 MR. GLENN: And has the laboratory ever been on
25 probation or anything like that for any kinds of

1 violations?

2 MR. LAFAILLE: No. I have been there seven
3 years. I heard that -- this was before I came.

4 MR. GLENN: Before you --

5 MR. LAFAILLE: There was an Iodine-125 problem.
6 That may be ten years ago. I don't know. Very, very long
7 time ago.

8 MR. GLENN: Okay.

9 MR. LAFAILLE: Iodine-125. Since I'm there, it
10 was never a problem.

11 MR. GLENN: Is there any kind of routine
12 bioassay in the lab or is it only if there's a suspicion of
13 a problem -- urinalysis?

14 MR. LAFAILLE: I'm sorry?

15 MR. GLENN: Urine specimens -- is that
16 something that's done routinely?

17 MR. LAFAILLE: Urine specimens?

18 MR. GLENN: Yes.

19 MR. LAFAILLE: No.

20 MR. GLENN: Okay. After this incident, it was
21 done?

22 MR. LAFAILLE: Yeah, yeah.

23 MR. GLENN: Okay.

24 MR. LAFAILLE: But the routine procedure that
25 we were obliged to follow, anybody involved with Iodine-125

1 needs to be -- check the thyroid before and after the --
2 within one week at the most. Again, otherwise the new
3 material is not delivered. So that's the way that they
4 have to control -- that we actually comply with that.
5 Nothing else.

6 MR. GLENN: Now, in this case, I guess the
7 contamination was discovered by Dr. Li, you know, surveying
8 himself. Are people pretty careful about surveying
9 themselves after they --

10 MR. LAFAILLE: After and before, too, I think,
11 yeah. Some people do it.

12 MR. GLENN: So it's something you can count on
13 being done rather than being missed for a few days then
14 somebody --

15 MR. LAFAILLE: No, it's being done. However,
16 it's being done as a result of a procedure that Juan
17 executed. So if I didn't do a labeling, I don't
18 necessarily go to the geiger to check if I'm hot or not.

19 MR. GLENN: But if you do a procedure, you'll
20 check yourself?

21 MR. LAFAILLE: Exactly.

22 MR. GLENN: Okay. And then --

23 MR. LAFAILLE: You check the gloves and you
24 check that the -- it's normal.

25 MR. GLENN: And your sense is that other people

1 --

2 MR. LAFAILLE: Oh, yeah, everybody does it.

3 MR. GLENN: How often do the people from the
4 radiation protection office come through? Do you have a
5 sense of that?

6 MR. LAFAILLE: Well, I see the person -- I
7 don't know his name. I think it's old guy, older, maybe
8 50 or so. He comes and takes the -- does these swipe tests
9 --

10 MR. GLENN: Yeah.

11 MR. LAFAILLE: -- in the sinks and the floor
12 quite often. Maybe once every month maybe. I don't know.

13 MR. GLENN: Okay. Fairly frequently?

14 MR. LAFAILLE: Yeah.

15 MR. GLENN: They do have a presence?

16 MR. LAFAILLE: They do have a presence. And
17 they're also there probably -- as I said, there are other
18 ways they use to control is the waste pick up, and when we
19 purchase, we also meet them. So that's the way we are
20 controlled.

21 MR. GLENN: In terms of training, what kinds of
22 training have you been provided here at MIT in terms of
23 safe use of radioisotopes?

24 MR. LAFAILLE: Well, I had been trained
25 before -- before I came here. When I go to PhD, I work

1 with radioactive materials. However, I had to pass an
2 exam. They give us a little lecture, and just -- when I
3 did it seven years ago, it was just a talk. And I think
4 now they complement with a movie or something, I don't
5 know. But it was a talk.

6 And after that, we have to answer questions,
7 which I think they probably have there for the record.

8 MR. GLENN: But are there any -- do they come
9 around every year or every two years and do anything
10 additional?

11 MR. LAFAILLE: To retrain?

12 MR. GLENN: Yes, to retrain.

13 MR. LAFAILLE: No, only if there is a problem.
14 Like for instance, there was a problem that they -- the
15 person who removed the waste gets a little bit upset
16 because they were solids and liquids mixed up, so then they
17 come -- one of these people here, they come and they
18 lecture. But you know, the trash is not going to be picked
19 up unless the liquid is liquid and the solid is solid.

20 And sometimes when a new person comes from
21 other place, they don't -- I know MIT has 20 kinds of
22 trash. You almost need a course of trash handling at MIT.
23 And therefore, they get confused and it's not very -- maybe
24 that had happened once or so I remember. But besides that,
25 --

1 MR. GLENN: Okay, my understanding is that Dr.
2 Tonegawa is the principal investigator. He's the person
3 who's named on the permit at the radiation safety --

4 MR. LAFAILLE: Exactly, sure.

5 MR. GLENN: Who -- does he in fact take a
6 personal interest in the day to day radiation safety, or
7 does someone else do that in the laboratory?

8 MR. LAFAILLE: No, Dr. Tonegawa, he just wants
9 the lab to be running according to the procedures. And he
10 would not be an every day basis checking if researcher A, B
11 or C is following procedure. He sets the procedure -- I
12 mean, the procedures are basically set by RPO. But he
13 makes sure he adapts -- adjust the procedure of RPO to our
14 way of working.

15 And once the procedure is set -- let's say
16 every day policemenhip is done by Dennis King.

17 MR. GLENN: Dennis King would be the person who
18 actually checks that people are following those procedures?

19 MR. LAFAILLE: Precisely, yes, yes. So
20 Tonegawa is involved in establishment of the procedures,
21 but not in the every day execution.

22 MR. GLENN: And if you were going to order
23 material, who would you talk to?

24 MR. LAFAILLE: Dennis King. We need to talk
25 with Dennis King.

1 MR. GLENN: Sami, do you have any --

2 MR. SHERBINI: No, just maybe one question. Do
3 your keys open other labs or just yours?

4 MR. LAFAILLE: Yes.

5 MR. SHERBINI: They open --

6 MR. LAFAILLE: Whole building.

7 MR. SHERBINI: Okay, so one key would open all
8 the labs in the building?

9 MR. LAFAILLE: Yes. The labs. Not the
10 offices, but the labs, yes, yes.

11 MR. SHERBINI: Okay.

12 MR. GLENN: Okay, is there anything we haven't
13 questioned you about that you think we should know about?

14 MR. LAFAILLE: No.

15 MR. GLENN: Okay. Do you have any suggestions
16 as to other people who might have knowledge of the incident
17 or have knowledge of the radiation protection program that
18 we should talk to?

19 MR. LAFAILLE: I guess you'd have to talk with
20 most of them.

21 MR. GLENN: We talked to several people from
22 the laboratory.

23 MR. LAFAILLE: And of course Dr. Li too.

24 MR. GLENN: Yeah, Dr. Li and radiation
25 protection office and the radiation safety committee.

1 MR. LAFAILLE: Yeah.

2 MR. GLENN: Okay, I'd like to give you here a
3 document entitled Review and Available Transcripts. This
4 is a written description of what I went over with you in
5 the front, that the transcript will be available for you to
6 review and to mark errors. That at the end of the -- IIT's
7 report, that it would be made available to you if you
8 request i .

9 We don't automatically send you a copy, but if
10 you request it, good. But if you call over here tomorrow
11 at the number that's on the top there, you should be able
12 to make arrangements to view the transcript and read it and
13 make the corrections. I think that probably concludes it.
14 The time is 4:10 p.m. and we're concluding the interview.

15 (Whereupon, the proceedings were adjourned at
16 4:10 p.m.)

17

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission in the matter of:

Name of Proceeding: INTERVIEW WITH JUAN LAFAILLE

Docket Number: --

Place of Proceeding: Cambridge, Massachusetts

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the file of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission taken by me and, thereafter reduced to typewriting by me or under the direction of the court reporting company, and that the transcript is a true and accurate record of the foregoing proceedings.

S. Dildine
Official Reporter
Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.