

**Community Advisory Council**  
**January 10, 2002**  
**Action Items/Notes**

**FINAL**

These notes are in the following order:

1. Attendance
2. Correspondence and Handouts
3. Quorum
4. Administrative
5. Comments by Dr. Marburger
6. Peconic River Subcommittee Report
7. Electrochemical Screening Status, Skip Medeiros, Group Manager
8. Community Comment
9. Update on Grant from the Rauch Foundation, Dick Amper, CAC member
10. Cleanup-Budget Discussion, Les Hill, Director, Environmental Management
11. STAR letter
12. February Agenda

**1. Attendance:**

**Present:**

**Members-** R. Amper, M. Barrett, G. Campbell, A. Capozzi, R. Clipperton, B. Conklin, J. Corrarino, A. Esposito, M. Giacomaro, H. Guthy, J. Heil, A. Jones, J. Jordon-Sweet, E. Kaplan, J. Mannhaupt, G. Proios, M. Shea, D. Sprintzen, M. Walker.

**Alternates-** R. Biss, A. Graves, J. Grindrod, B. Henigin, J. McLoughlin, A. Martin, B. Martin, J. Minasi, K. Timmins

**Others-** M. Bebon, P. Bond, A. Carsten, J. Carter, J. Clodius, F. Crescenzo, L. Cunniff, J. D'Ascoli, R. Desmarais, A. Frain, K. Geiger, K. Grigoletto, L. Hill, R. Hodgins, M. Holland, B. Keeler, S. Kumar, M. Lynch, S. Medeiros, S. Musolino, L. Nelson, P. Paul, R. Paulsen, G. Penny, A. Rapiejko, S. Robbins, K. Shaw, T. Sheridan, K. White.

**Absent:**

**Members-** M. Cohn, S. Cullen, A. Drake, N. Essel, D. Fischler, J. Gibbons, J. Kassner, C. Kepert, P. Martino, C. Swenson, T. Talbot, F. Towle, J. Tripp.

**Alternates-** S. Bail, S. Carlin, A. Cooley, K. Crowley, W. Evanzia, T. Guglielmo, L. Jacobson, R. Johannesen, G. Miglino, J. Pannullo, P. Pizzo, W. Prospect, K. Skinner, L. Snead, P. Stephens

**2. Correspondence and Handouts**

(Items 1 – 3 were mailed with a cover letter dated December 7, 2001. Items 4 - 6 were available as handouts.)

1. Draft agenda for January.
2. Draft notes for December.
3. Final November notes.
4. Presentation on Peconic River Update, Skip Medeiros, Group Manager, Peconic River.
5. Statement on the Rauch Grant from the Pine Barrens Society.
6. Presentation on Cleanup Budget, Les Hill

### **3. Quorum**

The meeting began at approximately 6:41 p.m. A quorum was present.

### **4. Administrative**

Reed wished everyone a happy new year. He went over the ground rules and the agenda. Member Sprintzen asked to have some time to talk about the *Newsday* article and the desire to issue a statement collectively or not. Member Guthy expressed concern about issues raised in a letter she had received from the STAR Foundation. Reed agreed to place both items on the agenda.

The notes from the December meeting were approved with a correction to item No. 7. The sentence beginning with "The toxicity reported stated..." will be changed to "Member Conklin speculated..."

Jeanne D'Ascoli gave an update on training and issuing badges for CAC members. She stated that the issue was still being considered by management and that more information would be available for the February meeting.

### **5. Comments by Dr. John Marburger**

Dr. Marburger brought the CAC up-to-date on his appointment and its responsibilities. He thanked them for the contribution they had made in helping him understand how to make the Laboratory a good neighbor. He noted that, in his new position, there is difficulty in addressing issues specific to Brookhaven. He talked about the exciting science breakthroughs that he expects to see happen. The CAC presented him with a desk clock for his office in Washington.

### **6. Peconic River Subcommittee Report**

Member Kaplan reported that the subcommittee had been given material to review which covered the wetlands restoration project and the electrochemical pilot and that they heard a presentation on the planned health risk assessment. The subcommittee felt that more information was needed on the wetlands restoration project and made a recommendation that Chris Pickerell from the Cornell Cooperative Extension make a presentation to the full CAC. The subcommittee felt that the electrochemical pilot has been presented on too large a scale, that there is information missing, and the project will be conducted in an uncontrolled environment. They felt that if the project is to stay on the table at all, it should be scaled back, and conducted in a controlled manner so that solid, quantitative scientific information can be obtained to see if the technique is applicable here. The subcommittee also went through the proposed equations for the risk assessment. There is a lot of information required, but they would like to hear more, particularly on what data will be used, how the data will be grouped, and how it will be manipulated. They are concerned about the process. Member Esposito outlined the two recommendations of the subcommittee, the first being the presentation on wetlands remediation, and the second, that the electrochemical remediation be scaled back to the smallest pilot project possible. She said that the subcommittee had a very strong concern about using this technology in Area B, and felt the project was not what they thought it would be when they first started looking into it. Reed called for discussion on the comments from the subcommittee and asked that Skip's presentation be heard before the CAC acted on the electrochemical recommendation. Member Conklin addressed some issues that the subcommittee had concerning the risk assessment. CAC members asked about the actual parameters of the risk assessment, the different formulas for how much fish is consumed, how conservative the upper limit is, the input parameters, the range of values, and the differences in

the formulas among the regulating agencies. They decided to include the risk assessment on February's agenda, including the approach and inputs. The CAC also voted to place Chris Pickerell on the agenda for the February meeting.

**Action Item:** Chris Pickerell will be invited to the February meeting.

## **7. Electrochemical Screening Status, Skip Medeiros, Group Manager**

Skip Medeiros responded to CAC questions on electrochemical. He stated that he had asked the vendor how small a study could be done to answer the questions about radionuclides. Skip reported that the vendor felt that a benchtop study would be no-win. It would be impossible to simulate the same degree of resistance in the sediment, which the technology depends on. The vendor also felt nothing would be gained that could be directly applied to the Peconic River using the sand filter beds because the environment is dissimilar. Skip said that according to the vendor the technology is based on observation and experience as opposed to theory or systems analysis. He said that in essence it's trial and error. What the vendor did propose was to reduce the pilot study area by 75% and change the electrodes that they would use from iron to steel and graphite electrodes that would be placed in 8- inch diameter pipes. Skip reported that he still had reservations because of the uncertainties. He listed advantages, disadvantages, and discussed the overall protection of the environment, short and long-term effectiveness, implementability, and the reduction of toxicity, mobility, and volume. Member Esposito pointed out that some type of cleanup had to be done at this site and many of the impacts listed would also occur with dredging. CAC members asked questions about the electrodes, addressing the radioactive contaminants, the increase in size of the cleanup area, and the cost of the smaller pilot project compared to the original study. After much discussion about the pros and cons of using the electrochemical technology and about the possibility of conducting research on the technique, Member Proios made a motion to recommend that the "electrochemical pilot for remediation as it is currently designed not be carried forward." The recommendation was approved.

## **8. Community Comment**

There were no comments from the audience.

## **9. Update on Grant from the Rauch Foundation, Dick Amper, CAC Member**

Dick Amper addressed the CAC regarding the Pine Barrens Society's Grant from the Rauch Foundation. He handed out copies of a statement containing background information on why the grant application was made and for what purpose. Several CAC members made comments and asked additional questions.

## **10. Cleanup-Budget Discussion, Les Hill, Director, Environmental Management**

Les Hill gave an overview of the process that will be used to determine the priority for the projects within the cleanup program including the priorities within the major program elements. Hill said the groundwater cleanup program will be completed within the FY05 accelerated window and that the Peconic River cleanup is also a high priority. He said that there is a lower level of priority for those projects that are contained on-site such as the Graphite Reactor, some of the other reactor decommissioning projects, and stockpiled waste. He stated that the budget process is continuous and that cost and schedule status was constantly being reviewed. A detailed analysis is being completed to better understand the impacts of the FY03 numbers when they are released.

## **11. STAR letter**

Member Guthy questioned statements in a letter from STAR concerning the claim that a spent fuel fire could be more catastrophic than a reactor meltdown. Some discussion ensued.

## **12. February Agenda**

- Wetlands Remediation Presentation  
Chris Pickerell, Cornell Coop Ext
- Health Risk Assessment
  - Approach
  - Information/Inputs
- Phytoremediation Update
- g-2 Update
- Peconic River S. C. Report
- Proposal Re Quorum, Bruce Martin