

These notes are in the following order:

1. Attendance
2. Correspondence and handouts
3. Quorum
4. Administrative including approving draft notes from November
5. Presentation on Education Programs, Brian Murfin, Manager, Office of Educational Programs
6. Accelerated Cleanup Update, Les Hill, Director, Environmental Management
7. Community Comment
8. Discussion on forming a Governing Committee, requested by Bob Conklin
9. Agenda Setting

1. Attendance

See Attached Sheet

Others Present:

P. Bond, J. Carter, J. Clodius, J. D'Ascoli, K. Geiger, K. Grigoletto, L. Hill, M. Holland, S. Layendecker, M. Lynch, B. Murfin, Dr. Paul, T. Sheridan, K. White

2. Correspondence and Handouts

Items 1 - 3 were mailed with a cover letter dated January 3, 2003. Items 4 and 5 were included in the folders and item 6 was available at the meeting as a handout.

1. Draft agenda for January.
2. Draft notes for December.
3. Final notes from November.
4. Memo from Bob Conklin requesting time on the agenda to discuss governing committee.
5. EPA Announcement of Regional Workshop Series on Pollution Prevention.
6. Copy of presentation on BNL's Education Programs, Brian Murfin

3. Quorum

The meeting began at 6:35 p.m. A quorum was established when 55% of the 27 member organizations (15) were in attendance.

4. Administrative

Reed wished the CAC members a Happy New Year and welcomed them to the first meeting of 2003. He went over the ground rules and agenda. The EM update presentation was moved so that it followed the Education presentation.

Dr. Peter Paul stated that the New Director Search Committee made a recommendation to the Brookhaven Science Associates Board of Directors. He expects an announcement on the selection in the near future. He also noted that Congressman elect Tim Bishop had visited the Laboratory on December 30. Mr. Bishop toured the Lab and spoke with DOE and Lab management officials.

Jeanne D'Ascoli and Marge Lynch reported that due to budget constraints the Lab would not be able to put together a Pollution Prevention Conference this year. Lynch said that expertise could be provided by the Lab for a forum put together by another organization, but that would be the limit of the Lab's involvement. George Goode gave his commitment to be available. It was suggested by CAC members that LIU, Cornell Cooperative Extension, the Water Authority, and the Long Island Association might be able to play some type of role in supporting a conference. Small businesses, the public, municipalities, and government were all identified as target audiences.

The CAC voted unanimously to work through their organizations and other organizations to hold a P2 Conference and that Brookhaven's participation would be to provide subject matter expertise and showcase the P2 Program as it's been developed and implemented at Brookhaven. Jim Heil, David Sprintzen, George Proios, Mary Joan Shea, and Adrienne Esposito agreed to serve on the P2 Conference subcommittee.

The December notes were approved with the following corrections: include the cost of the phyto remediation study in the section on Skip Medeiros' presentation and the spelling of Giacomaro on page 4 should be corrected.

5. Education Programs at the Laboratory, Brian Murfin, Manager, Office of Educational Programs

Brian Murfin discussed the education programs at the Laboratory. He explained why DOE Laboratories are involved in education, talked about the state of science in education, and his program's vision for science education. He described the elementary school programs at the Lab's Science Museum, the Science Fair, and the Maglev and Bridge Building contests. Murfin talked about the high school and college programs and said that the Undergraduate Laboratory Internship Program is BNL's flagship program. Lab scientists compete for students from that program. There are also programs for in-service teachers. Quarknet is for high school physics teachers.

Murfin said that there are plans to expand the existing programs in 2003 and he talked about the online classroom initiative that is a joint project with scientists from Russia that uses technology to bring the science of the lab to teachers and students in the schools. Next year there will be a middle school solar car competition sponsored by DOE. The Lab will be holding a Science Bowl in February. Murfin also noted that this year the Lab was submitting a grant proposal in partnership with Southampton College and another in partnership with SUNY and Hofstra. He wants to increase programs for middle school students as well as increase diversity overall in the programs.

CAC members asked about the number of participants in the programs. Murfin reported that participation was down from the peak year of 1995. Ed Kaplan, representative for the Friends of Brookhaven discussed the value of the Essay contest that is supported by his organization. Members also queried why more students aren't interested in science and engineering, if there is any way to determine if science education really works, and if the Lab's scientists have ever been polled to see how they became interested/involved in science.

6. Accelerated Cleanup Update and EM Year in Review, Les Hill, Director, Environmental Management

Les Hill gave an update on the accelerated cleanup. He reported that the EM program would be funded somewhere in the area of \$34 - \$35 million. The funding profile for completion of cleanup in FY05 was for \$35.6 million. He reminded the CAC that DOE had undertaken a comprehensive review of cleanup programs to improve program performance. DOE looked at the progress made each fiscal year and concluded the human risk was not being reduced. Some key observations were that there were some great opportunities to accelerate risk reduction by spending the dollars in the right places and that the small sites should get done first. Hill said there is a renewed emphasis on the effectiveness of the clean up program. DOE is looking at risk reduction at sites like Brookhaven that have a continuing mission.

Hill said that he recognizes the protracted schedule for getting the Peconic River Risk Assessment out and that he knows it has been a source of disappointment to stakeholders. He explained the delay was a result of responding to comments from the regulators and from looking to complete the Risk Assessment at a time when there's a renewed DOE focus on cost effectiveness, risk reduction, and on acceleration.

Hill said the regulator comments resulted in additional work and that they've spent the past several months addressing comments that were related to the uncertainties in the report. There was concern that if the Risk Assessment were not written properly, it would bias the reader. Hill said they expect the Senior DOE official in Chicago to sign off on the Risk Assessment next week. Then it will go to the regulators and shortly after that, it will be given to the community. He said he was committed to get it to the Working Group a week before their January 28 meeting.

CAC members questioned the length of the document and how long they would have to review it before they were expected to comment. Les said all of the feedback wouldn't be expected at the Working Group's meeting.

Hill was asked to talk about how the changes in the DOE cleanup programs are affecting the views of the cleanup of the Peconic. He said that all cleanup activities are undergoing a consistent review; the Risk Assessment and proposed remedy are being extensively reviewed in CH and HQ. Members also asked about the funding, noting that there was a shortfall. Hill said that the \$1 million shortfall would not have an impact, he pointed to savings in other areas as a way to offset the difference. It was asked if parts of the report could be made available to the committee earlier and if the changes in the Risk Assessment have affected the original scope and cost of the cleanup. Hill believes the scope and cost are the same. Member Conklin asked about the change from risk to wildlife to the human health risk. Ken White said that at first there was a human health risk assumed to be present if the fish were of a sufficient population and size to be consumed. The fish onsite were considered small and not prevalent enough. It was believed that no one trespassed and ate the fish, therefore, the risk was deemed not to exist. The new Risk Assessment changes the fish consumption rate and also assumes trespassing. Additional fish data from offsite was added. It is a new document because a lot of the data is new.

Reed asked the subcommittee if they thought they would have a report for the CAC at the next meeting. It was recommended by Member Esposito that the subcommittee meet after the Working Group meets and that a small presentation be prepared for the CAC. Member Kaplan asked what the projected timeline was for comments. Ken White noted the document being released was still going to be a Draft Risk Assessment. He said the regulators have 30 days to review and comment on the document from the time they receive it. The Working Group should be briefed by the Lab and that other data will be shared as it starts to come forth. Then discussions can begin on the alternatives and the roundtables will take place. He encouraged

the Working Group to maintain their schedule, take the document and learn what they can from it. White said that somewhere in that timeframe, when the DOE, the regulatory agencies, and the Lab are comfortable, the Proposed Plan will be released and the public comment period will come into play.

The Laboratory will provide the timeline/process to the CAC and subcommittee at the February meeting. The CAC will decide how their input will fit into the process.

Action Item: Laboratory to provide an outline of the steps/path forward to the Working Group and to the CAC.

7. Community Comment

There were no comments from the audience.

8. Request from Bob Conklin to discuss formation of a Governing Committee

Bob Conklin questioned whether or not the CAC is taking an active enough role in getting to all levels of issues. He asked if the CAC should be more proactive, have more control over the agenda, and the direction it takes. He asked if the CAC should take on new members and how that could be done. Conklin proposed that a steering committee be formed and asked for the opinions of the other CAC members on the matters he raised.

Member Guthy said members should take responsibility for the items they bring up and that if they are not addressed, they should be reintroduced. She also said that she didn't see any reason why anyone who expresses interest can't be asked to come to the CAC meetings as a guest. They can address the CAC during the comment period if they want to. She said the more people the better.

A discussion on how the CAC was originally formed took place with many members expressing approval of the concept of adding additional members as long as it was done keeping balance and size in mind and whether they represent themselves or an organization. Member Kaplan posed the question of whether or not the CAC does enough in its current role; he thinks that the members are not asked to give enough and suggested that a steering committee could put together an agenda of issues that would be important for the Director to have diverse input on. Dr. Paul said that as far as the community is concerned, the CAC was the most important committee to the Laboratory. He compared CAC meetings to reverse Town Meetings where instead of the Director going out to the various community organizations, the CAC members graciously give their time and come to the Lab. He said that the CAC was the Lab's connection to the various parts of the community and that he couldn't over emphasize how important the committee, and its diverse interests and opinions, are. Dr. Paul said that if a steering committee were to serve the purpose of unifying the CAC's opinions - filtering them before passing them on - that the CAC's purpose would be lost. It is important that the Lab hears the diverse opinions. As for the items placed on the agenda, he said the CAC should determine the agenda, but thought that some inside information was good so that the operations of the Laboratory could be seen. In terms of membership, Dr. Paul said that anyone that wants to come as visitor can and that if someone wants to invite someone, that it is an excellent idea. He added that perhaps the Lab could challenge the CAC more and ask for advice on other issues.

Member Esposito thanked Bob for raising the issues. She agrees with others that the council works well, but she would like to do more and be more aggressive and thinks the CAC has reached a level of complacency. She supported setting up some kind of committee.

CAC members talked about public visibility and agreed that the CAC had gotten complacent and should go out and look for different opinions. It was suggested that periodically the CAC have an open discussion. Member Shea said she was opposed to a steering committee but liked the idea of an open discussion, she thought it was a good idea to invite outside people, and suggested having the discussions earlier. Member Giacomaro suggested forming an executive board to talk about what happened and what's going to happen at the meetings. They could review everything, and have the chairperson act as a spokesperson. Reed suggested having an open executive session, an agenda setting session, before meetings every other month, perhaps from 5:30 to 6:30. It wouldn't be a formal committee, it would consist of everyone who wanted to come and participate. The CAC agreed to discuss the issue further at the next meeting.

Reed said that regardless of whether it's a steering committee or a committee of the whole, the two things that the CAC has come up with and that are important to continue to discuss is that most on the CAC are feeling that the CAC has grown complacent and that there is a need to get more aggressive about setting the agenda around issues that are important to members. Finally, members need to take ownership as well as identify and bring in outside experts. Reed also told the CAC that this was a job that they needed to assign to themselves to be effective.

9. Agenda Setting

- Steering Committee; CAC sets issues; CAC brings in outside opinions
- P2 Conference Planning
- OU V RA
 - subcommittee progress report on path forward
 - process/steps on path forward from BNL,
 - CAC discussion on path forward
- Future Agendas
- Update on Reactors D & D
- g-2
- Budget
- Copy of article or short presentation on Lab's impact on LI economy. There was a request that the analysis that addressed the closing of the HFBR, including the impact to science, be included in the discussion.
- Update on new Director/New Director.
- Presentation on Applied Science, requested Yakov Shamish (SB) be present. Discussion on Tech Transfer should be included.
- Identify critical issues, from the CAC and the Lab

Meeting was adjourned at 10 p.m.