

Final

These notes are in the following order:

1. Attendance
2. Correspondence and Handouts
3. Administrative Items
4. Cosmology, Sam Aronson, Director
5. Community Comment
6. CAC discussion on questions posed by the Pine Barrens Society at the January 2007 meeting
7. Agenda Setting

1. Attendance

Members/Alternates Present:

See Attached Sheets.

Others Present:

S. Aronson, P. Bond, J. Carter, F. Crescenzo, A. Csorny, K. Geiger, B. Howe, S. Johnson, B. Lee, M. Lynch, A. McNerney, D. Paquette, J. Tarpinian, K. White

2. Correspondence and Handouts

Items one through five were mailed with a cover letter dated January 18, 2007. Item six was mailed with a cover letter dated February 2, 2007. Items seven and eight were provided in the member's folders, and item nine was available as a handout at the meeting.

1. A copy of the Pine Barrens Society questions
2. A copy of the Draft Charter and Attachment 2
3. A list of the membership categories
4. A list of CAC actions to date
5. A summary of presentations to the CAC by topic
6. A copy of the Draft agenda for February 8
7. Draft notes for January 11, 2007
8. Copy of email from Member Guthy
9. A copy of the presentation on Cosmology

3. Administrative

The meeting began at approximately 6:35 p.m. Those present introduced themselves. Member Don Lynch of the Suffolk County Fire Rescue introduced his Arson Squad dog, L.P, and asked if the members would be comfortable with the dog's presence. He was assured the dog was welcome any time.

Reed Hodgkin reviewed the ground rules and the draft agenda.

Marge Lynch, Assistant Lab Director for Community, Education, Government, and Public Affairs (CEGPA) told the CAC that Jeanne D'Ascoli was on medical leave until the end of March. She said tonight's meeting would be teleconferenced to Jeanne at her home. Jeanne greeted the CAC. Lynch explained that Kathy Geiger is serving as the interim manager of Community Relations during Jeanne's absence and will serve as the point of contact for the CAC. Kathy Geiger can be reached by telephone at 631-344-3129.

Reed asked for corrections, additions or deletions to the January 11 draft notes. The notes were accepted as presented with no objections and three abstentions.

Bob Lee gave an update to the CAC on the tritium detection at the Sewage Treatment Plant (STP). Lee reviewed the data presented by George Goode at the January meeting and said as of December 15, 2006 all concentrations were at or below the detection level. He told the CAC the Lab was still trying to locate the possible source of the tritium. The HFBR and the Collider Accelerator Systems were evaluated and ruled out. Split samples were reanalyzed by an independent laboratory and by Suffolk County. These actions yielded no explanation for the tritium release. Various research laboratories onsite, such as the Brookhaven Medical Research Reactor (BMRR) and other authorized release sources were also investigated. There were no significant sources of tritium found. Investigations were done on maintenance work refrigeration discharges and BMRR pressure tank discharges to determine if the cumulative effect of these very low sources could have affected the tritium discharge. Lee said other maintenance activities, such as air-conditioning coil winterization, will be examined as the investigation continues. Additionally, the departments that use tritium for research will be contacted to conduct a review of the procedures in place for proper discharge and notification.

Member Talbot said when decommissioning nuclear power plants there would sometimes be a spike detected after decontamination called "hideout". He asked if this had been considered as an explanation for the tritium detection.

Lee said the HFBR confinement structure contains tritiated water. It can be found in pipe systems and in the concrete, which has absorbed tritiated water vapor. The air in the HFBR is monitored and the air ducts, filters, and air conditioning were considered but there was no detection of tritium discharge. There is an ongoing monitoring system and samples are pulled routinely. Water samples from the BMRR pressurization vents were also checked and nothing was found.

Member Talbot asked if there were any environmental impacts from the levels of tritium detected.

Lee said there were none, but given that this (the tritium detection) was unusual, it warranted further investigation.

Member Giacomaro asked how often the water was monitored at the STP and if it was conceivable that a spike could occur on one day and drop the next.

Lee said continuous samples are pulled on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. The sampler measures how much flow leaves the plant. It pulls four fluid ounces every 5,000 gallons, approximately 150 samples per year at each location. Lee said it was not possible for a spike to be detected on a particular day because it is a continuous sample. The sampling is started at eight o'clock Monday morning and continues for a 48-hour period until Wednesday morning. The STP acts as a sieve. Water enters the tanks, is treated, and then exits the tanks. Lee said there would be a gradual increase or decrease, but not a spike.

Sam Aronson, Director of Brookhaven National Laboratory gave an update on the Continuing Resolution. He told the CAC the Senate would vote on the new resolution this week or next. The

Laboratory is currently operating under a temporary spending measure based on last year's funding which is due to expire February 15, 2007. Among other things affected, operating under the Continuing Resolution has required the Laboratory to delay the run of the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider (RHIC). This is of special concern because RHIC will be run for a 30-week cycle and cannot be run during the summer months due to power supply demands and electric rate issues. The Continuing Resolution has also had a major impact on funding for Research and Development (R&D) work for NSLS II because that funding was not provided in the 2006 Budget. The budget that was passed by the House of Representatives looks good for science overall. It will soon go before the Senate and should provide the Laboratory with a substantial part of the funding it needs to operate. This would enable the Lab to fund the work on NSLS II that was planned for this year, the existing Light Source could be run as usual, and the RHIC run would proceed. Aronson asked if there were any questions from the CAC.

Member Giacomaro asked if RHIC could be run during the summer if this coming summer were as tepid as last summer. Aronson said it is financially risky to run RHIC during the summer. He said this is less related to weather conditions than to the effect it would have on BNL's electric rates throughout the year. The high demand during the peak demand season would retroactively increase electricity costs for the entire year. The energy market is now deregulated and the Laboratory must play the market and tell the state the Lab's projected energy needs daily. Futures are purchased to lock in favorable rates in order to try to do everything to secure the best rates in a deregulated market. That is what makes it so complicated and risky. Running RHIC in the summer is not a good idea.

Member Graves asked if a letter from the CAC in support of the budget currently being considered would be helpful. Aronson said he did not think so. He said visits have been made to Senators and Congressional representatives and they have done quite a bit to assist the Lab with this effort. He said that BNL has a lot of political support. Last year was a different situation because there was a bad budget from the Administration that was a challenge to overcome. This year the Administration developed a great budget but the outgoing Congress dragged its feet passing budgets.

Doug Paquette gave an update on the pending Record of Decision (ROD) for g-2 and the status of the recommendations made by the CAC. In addition to their recommendations, comments from four member organizations were received. Work on the draft ROD began after the public comment period ended. Modifications to the remedies in the proposed plan have been made based on the recommendations received and have been incorporated into the draft ROD. The draft was submitted to the regulators three weeks ago with a Responsiveness Summary attached. Preliminary comments have been received from the regulators and responses are being developed. The ROD should be finalized and signed in the spring. Paquette said a more thorough discussion on the specifics of the recommendations could occur at that time. He thanked the CAC for their diligence, input and months of hard work.

Member Esposito asked if Paquette could be more specific about the date the ROD would be finalized and asked for confirmation that the CAC would receive an update. He said it should occur in early May. Paquette said he could detail how the CAC comments influenced the changes made to the ROD at that time.

Member Giacomaro asked why, since the recommendations were already made, wouldn't Paquette know what they are? Paquette said he knew what they were but the regulators hadn't been able to review the entire document. Normally changes are not discussed until concurrence is received from the regulators.

4. Cosmology, Sam Aronson

Sam Aronson, Director of Brookhaven National Laboratory, gave a presentation to the CAC on Cosmology and BNL's plans to conduct this type of science. He explained that Cosmology is the study of the history and state of the universe. This type of research has resulted in the finding that most of what exists in the universe is still unknown. Brookhaven is developing its role in discovering the connections between that which is known and the unknown. During the introduction of his presentation, he offered a publication to the CAC members called "The Quantum Universe". The publication was created to make this topic more accessible to the public.

Members asked for an explanation of dark matter and dark energy.

Aronson explained it was discovered that there was not enough mass in the visible universe to explain the velocity of stars. It was determined that there had to be an invisible mass that interacts with gravity. That invisible mass was called dark matter. There is evidence that large amounts of extra matter that cannot be seen are responsible for the gravitational interactions of galaxies. Aronson explained how dark matter is detected in a Bullet Cluster.

Aronson said gravity slows the rate of expansion of the universe and there is a question as to whether or not there is enough mass (gravity) to cause the universe to slow down and reverse into itself. During the 1990's two groups of astronomers discovered that the expansion of the universe was actually speeding up, which meant that something other than gravity was determining the fate of the universe. This undetermined influence is called dark energy.

Aronson explained the strategies and technologies needed to study dark matter and dark energy. Finding large concentrations of mass and mapping the universe are two strategies under development. A very large telescope is required to support this work. As a result, the Large Synoptic Survey Telescope (LSST) is being developed. It is a ground-based telescope of huge proportions with a specialized camera. BNL will develop the camera for the telescope in cooperation with other DOE facilities as well as Harvard, Illinois, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) and Stanford Linear Accelerator Center (SLAC). Aronson told the CAC that Brookhaven had a sizeable amount of experience building large scale silicon-based detectors and would have a lot to contribute to this project. He said he would like to develop an astronomy group at BNL to support this work and said this is the most interesting question in fundamental physics at the moment.

The CAC members asked many questions and participated in a brief discussion on the topic. They expressed their appreciation and gratitude for the time and effort the Director gave to the presentation. Members commented that they would appreciate more presentations on this and other topics.

5. Community Comment

There was no community comment

6. CAC discussion on questions posed by the Pine Barrens Society at the January 2007 meeting

The questions before the CAC are:

1. Has the mission or purpose of the CAC changed?
2. What is working and what is not?
3. What changes to the composition and process would improve the CAC as we go forward?

Reed asked the CAC to focus their discussion on the three questions posed by the Pine Barrens Society last month noting that it is appropriate for the CAC to examine its mission and processes periodically, to look at what the CAC is doing now, and how best the CAC can serve its constituents, the community at large and the Laboratory. He opened the discussion on the first question regarding the mission and purpose of the CAC. He asked if it was different now than it had been, whether it had changed, or whether it should change.

Member Amper: If I can preface that question, I would like to explain what this is and isn't. First, I would like to thank Member Alayeva who represents the Pine Barrens Society at the CAC. She has deferred to me kindly, for tonight's purpose, because this was an idea that emerged from a group of other associations we have, people who are doing some introspection and looking at their own organizations at mid-course and seeing what they can do. There is no glowing matter here; some of the folks sitting around the table wondered whether we were trying to get rid of members or not. In fact, if the exercise works well we ought to retain and even attract new members. I would like to avoid, if we possibly can, negative criticism unless we can all benefit from it. If it's constructive about something that may be the matter with the CAC, it's on the agenda, but it's not, repeat not, the purpose of this exercise. It seems to me that in any group, it's useful to take a look at yourselves as you go along and say, "Are we making progress, are we not, what could we do better?" I think we've all, depending upon what the particular subject was over the years, gotten excited about something that we did. I took an enormous amount of personal pride in the involvement that the CAC had with Senator Schumer and the efforts to accelerate the clean up of this program. We all got together and went to Washington and talked to Office of Management and Budget and other folks. I want to continue to feel as excited about this. There's stuff that we don't know, and lord knows none of us knows all that much about Cosmology, but I think that's probably a big part of it. But if we know better where we've been and what we were doing and what we're proud of, then it may be possible for us to sort out, as we move into the next period of the CAC, what should we do that we haven't done or what should we stop doing that we've drifted into? That's the purpose of the exercise. When I reread the mission statement of the organization it talked about a particular focus on health and the environment. I know we all come from different areas. I'm not saying that's the only thing we need to do. In fact, some of the things that may not appear to be directly related to health and the environment may actually have implications for that as well, so we're not taking anything off the table either. The only other thing we said is, it would be useful to distinguish the kinds of things we all think as members of this group and whose organizations have been regularly represented here, do we ever go back and talk to them and find out what they hope for this? How can we better represent those organizations? If we could work that into these answers I'd be very grateful. At the end of the day we may find that everything is exactly as it should be, that we've grown and are continuing to grow, and we won't benefit from mid-course corrections. I'm very positive; I always think you can do better. With that spirit, I would like to go to the very first question.

Member Proios: We have had a couple of discussions about this in the past, at least twice. I think the last time was a year and a half ago and I think at that point some of us said based on some presentations that the Lab had reached a major point where a good portion of the legacy waste had been removed and we asked the question, what are we going to be doing? My comment back then was that we should use the good science coming from BNL and use technology transfer and try to see how we can apply it to some real problems occurring in the community. That resulted in Jim Heil volunteering to get involved. We had George Goode give a presentation to Public Works Departments on the issue of using vegetable oil instead of hydraulic fluids. I thought that would be a great segue into determining what we could be doing because at some point all the waste is obviously going to be cleaned up. I don't think we should just go away, but see how we could use the knowledge that we learn here. An example of that is we should probably go back to see if any of the ten townships have actually changed their use of hydraulic fluids. If turns out that none did, then we know we've got some work left. I know the Suffolk County Department of Public Works has not done that. We need to figure out if some

good information that comes from here to help protect the environment gets into the hands of decision makers.

Member Anker: I have the same comments. I think BNL can do more for our area. I pulled out the article "BNL Survives \$ Perils". This came out in Newsday this week, February 10th. It says that BNL shouldn't rely on big chunks of money, last minute big chunks of money kind of thing. I think BNL, with our support, could do more for the environment. I know BNL has, but I think we can be more aggressive; BNL can be more aggressive in inventing technology and studying technology. The wonderful Sierra Club article "Can Technology Change the Planet?" talks about BNL and the bacteria-eating pollutant. I think this is something BNL (pause) as far as a legacy, let's change the legacy of BNL. It's incredible what they're doing right now but you were explaining that I think our concern here around the table is let's look to what we can do now to advance in the future. That is my position.

Member Hall: My comment is to George and it's positive. We, at the Peconic River Sportsman's Club went to vegetable oil two years ago for all our hydraulic equipment, especially in items of what is on the lake. So we learned something from it. We did implement it.

Member Graves: I want to address the questions in general; I'll start with the first one. I want to thank the Pine Barrens Society for asking the questions. I think it's a very healthy exercise and needs to be done. What I see is in the years we've been meeting it's only a small part of the lifetime of the Lab. Right now, and I think it's a little bit quiet, I think our primary purpose, in my mind, when we were created was to be a pipeline between the community and the Lab to try to open up what goes on at the Lab and help people who are not a part of the Lab to understand it. I think that mission continues and is working well. I think in terms of controversy, over experiments etc., the reactors were controversial and there was a lot of discussion and focus on those early on. Ten years from now, twenty years from now, nanotechnology may be controversial and we may again be a more contentious body than we are now. To try and look at the long term, I think the mission hasn't changed, but we may be in a period that is quieter than the period when we started out.

Member Amper: Is a follow up question in order here? How are you informing the community, how should we be informing the community? I do agree, at the outset the object of the game was to bridge the gap between what the people at the Lab do and what the community knew or didn't know. How are we doing that? Can we do that better? Do you have any thoughts about how that message leaves this room and goes to the community?

Member Graves: I don't have specifics on that. It's largely been left to each organization to do that. In my organization, I circulate some memos, there is a lot of word of mouth that goes on and I would like to believe that through Jim and myself the ties between BNL and the Town are stronger than they were before the CAC was in place. This is a very independent body and I am not sure that the different organizations would take direction on how to get the word out.

Member Henagan: I'm going to follow up on this one. Being a representative of Ridge, Brookhaven (BNL) is not only figuratively in our front yard; it is literally in our front yard as well. I walk down my driveway, cross the street in front of me, walk a couple of hundred yards and I hit the firebreak on Brookhaven. That's how close I am. The people of Ridge are interested in what goes on in their front or back yards. These meetings give me information so I can go back and answer questions. I can find out what's going on here by going onto the website. I can understand what's going on with the scientists. But having this meeting, being able to come in and talk to the people here, I can find out anything I want. They are so forthcoming. I can answer questions. I can tell people "This is what's going on in your backyard." That is what's most valuable about this association with the Lab. If there's something important going on, it goes in our newsletter; it's discussed at our Civic Association. We make sure our people know about it. That, to me, is what is most valuable.

Member Esposito: So it's information and a relationship.

Member Henagan: The relationship. The information, you can find other ways. It's the relationship and being able to take the concerns back that are important to us.

Member Shea: I think that, on the issue of global warming, the Lab has a tremendous opportunity to bridge the knowledge that is available out in the scientific community to bring it back to our organizations. Especially since the latest study that was done showed that there was 90 percent of human involvement in the problems that cause global warming. I think the public is still confused and I think this is an important path for the Lab.

Reed summarized: So what I captured from that is even if it's not an item or an issue that the Laboratory may be working on itself, the Laboratory is full of very competent scientists and it would help the community if they brought issues into the community and explained them in a way so they can bring them back and that they are getting it from someone they could trust.

Member Shea: That's right because it would give you prestige asking a scientific source that they could count on to go to for information.

Member Talbot: I'm just trying to be more specific here. I wasn't on the committee when it first started; I am at least the second predecessor for my organization. In spite of what the mission statement says here, I was lead to believe, that the original intent of the CAC was to open the Lab to public scrutiny and comments basically because there was a perception that there were some nasty things going on here, particularly with the environment. There were maybe unreported spills or hidden things going on. Now I believe the perception to the public is drastically changed. I think the CAC had no small part in making that happen. The Lab is doing a lot of good stuff and is actually a source of pride in the area here. However, for the mission of the CAC, if we have to go back to the mission, and specifically have environmental and health issues, the wonderful talk we had here tonight doesn't fit into any of those categories. But it is a very valuable and interesting topic and I'd be very happy to share that with my community. I also think that part of the CAC's purpose is to educate the public as to what in fact is going on at the Lab, where the money is being spent, what is getting back to the community, and things of that nature, which actually go beyond the confines of the original mission statement. So I say, has the mission statement changed? I give a qualified yes. But I think it's changed in the right direction.

Member Amper: We would like to follow up on that as well. This is exactly what I hoped would come out of this kind of interaction, but the answers that we are getting are answers to the question, "Why is the CAC good?" I hope that before we run out of time and the process ends that we really will go to those three specific things; how is the purpose changed and what's working? These are all very useful things and they all support what it is that the CAC is doing but if we can understand how that's changed. Some of the speakers have said it's a change for the better, but they are responding to a different set of challenges today. That's helpful but at the end of the exercise, I'd love it if, do we have a consensus about these specific questions, if we can.

Member Esposito: This is not answering Dick's question but I want to build on some of the things that that others just said. I think if we want to talk about has the mission changed; I don't think that the mission has changed; I think that the way we operate has changed. I really do. I think we operate more as a team, rather than adversaries as we did back in the old days. When did we start? In 97'? So I think that what has changed is we have changed and the relationship has changed. I like our mission, I think it is good and it's clear and it's important. I want to draw upon how could this be a conduit of information and the relationships continue and just make a suggestion. One thing we can do with our future mission is have the CAC and BNL sponsor a

community lecture series. I think it's very true, what Mary Joan and Sarah have said. One way for BNL to change the legacy is to build on what you have here. There's been a good relationship here that has been developed. Take that a step further. A good example, though a controversial one, you'll probably remember this Reed; we had that lecture on the effects of low-level radiation. We had hundreds of people come. If we had lectures on global warming - What was the IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) report? What does it mean for Long Island and New York City? What is the Lab doing on renewable energy? What is the future for renewable energy? What is the capacity for renewable energy to change our energy structure on Long Island, in New York State or the United States? I think those are things we have found people really want to hear about. That would be an example of how the Lab could say we're not just here and doing better, we're here and we're going to help with the answers. I think the community would like that. It would be a good way for the CAC to reach out to our membership, bring more people in and have a greater understanding of what BNL means.

Member Sprintzen: To follow up on Adrienne's suggestion, which I think is excellent; the only other thing is I think it is important for some of those presentations to be conducted away from the Lab, in locations in the community where people don't have to come here but that's done actually out in the community at different locations depending on the topic or subject. I think Adrienne's suggestions were excellent, I totally agree with every one of them.

Reed said one of the things that were so good about the panel discussion on the health effects of low-level ionizing radiation was that it brought a variety of viewpoints to the table. It wasn't just the Laboratory giving its view on low-level radiation; it provided a variety of perspectives.

Member Esposito: Remember that it cost a lot of money to do that, too. I am just thinking about keeping costs down.

Reed said he understood, but there may be some things to be done that could be like that instead of just having experts talking.

Member Esposito: And people could get up and ask questions.

Member Biss: I don't know why but there have been lectures at high schools and junior highs. I have found that the press and BNL have gotten a lot chummier. They will talk about the stories here and tell people around what's happening here. I find that interesting even though I come to these meetings. I think a lot of people like to hear about what's going on. Even the meetings we have had at the high school have been enjoyable.

Member Giacomaro: Being someone who has been involved with the Laboratory since 1988, there have been many times when you come to a meeting, when I've been involved, and you hear something new that's happening from the Laboratory. This contamination. That contamination. It is a laboratory and they are doing research, so we really have to keep the mission as it is right now, focused, because the Lab is always getting into new areas that may effect the environment or the health and well being of surrounding communities. I don't view the mission as being changed. It should continue just like it is giving a forum for the Laboratory to explain as things happen.

Reed said he was hearing that the environmental and public health issue remains an important focus and if it is quiet today, it may not be quiet in the future. The window of scrutiny into BNL is good for the community and good for BNL. In addition, there are other opportunities for BNL to serve the community and the CAC can contribute to that.

Member Mannhaupt: I'd like to answer the first question with the two statements at the beginning of our draft charter with my understanding of what those two sentences mean. In the world of communication, one reads a sentence one way, and another reads a sentence another

way. I want to explain my understanding of the two sentences. “The purpose of the Brookhaven Community Advisory Council is to insure that the ideas, interests and concerns of Brookhaven National Laboratory’s communities are considered by the Laboratory in its decision-making process”. That sentence says to me, all ideas, interests and concerns of surrounding communities, interested parties or stakeholders are to be addressed by the mission of the CAC. We are to look under the rocks, we are to look in the corners, we are to ask the tough questions, we are to go out and help educate, and we are to ask BNL to go out and educate. We are to do all we can, in making recommendations to Brookhaven National Laboratory to get the best good neighbor stewardship we possibly can out to the community. That’s what that sentence says to me.

Member Mannhaupt read aloud the second sentence of the mission - “The CAC’s mission is to address the concerns about the Laboratory’s policies and operations, explicitly those related to environment and public health issues”. She said: Now the word environment, I know we can get locked up in the fact that you polluted my water, you polluted my air, you polluted my soil, or you leached this or you leached that. When I read environment here, explicitly those related to environment, my brain sees environment just not clean air, soil and water, but the environment itself of being a good neighbor, the science that goes on here, the technology of the United States that we have to push forward. I have a global view of what this facility means when I look at that word. My priority in becoming a member of the CAC was to go after the CERCLA process, which I knew after the Task Force, was wrong when they did the baseline study in 1992. Anybody back then could point out the data gaps, which we worked on, and got it done. That was our primary focus as the CAC because that was the priority of the site. To get it cleaned up and deal with it. But I don’t see environment as that word that boxed us in to just doing that, as the whole CAC, as a board. Finally, the public health issues, I think anything regarding science has a public health issue attached to it. I think scientists know that. It’s up to the Community Advisory Council to help remind scientists in any hypothesis they bring up, to work on anything, to say “Hello, while you’re working on the science, and your very technological scientific brain is over here, don’t forget us on public health hazards and how that may work. So with the upcoming science at RHIC, NSLS, and nanotechnology I think we have our own responsibility, as did the members down through the years, to make that stay a priority within the purview of working with BNL and continuing to make the CAC. To me, what is working and what is not is important to the dynamics of how the CAC goes forward, not the mission and purpose because I don’t think it’s changed since day one.

Member Amper: A quick follow up on that, Jean, do you think with respect to the community’s interest in environment and public health that we’re doing as much as we were doing?

Member Mannhaupt: I think we’re at a point right now where we need to discuss the dynamics of where we want to go and the methods we want to use, like Adrienne has brought up, maybe doing seminars. But then again, we also have to educate ourselves. BNL and their scientists will do anything, for any of us, come to our civics and all. But how do we not infringe upon their time, keep them out late and away from their families? I think it’s up to us to draw up an outline of projects.

Member Amper: I am not complaining about what the Lab is doing. I’m saying do we need to be more proactive; do we need to go back to our roots and bring the community concerns to this forum? They’ve (BNL) always been responsive. I’m not sure we’re being as proactive as we were five to seven years ago.

Member Mannhaupt: We’re not being as proactive in so far as there isn’t the hype. You scream contaminated water, and everybody’s running. You don’t have to do marketing or advertising to get them out of their houses. If you carry on about high amounts of particulates in air quality, you don’t have to do anything to drag them out of their house. To get them to understand what a

tool BNL is, in their backyard, for those who are not paying attention, those are the things the CAC should try to decide how best to approach that.

Reed said he captured two important points. First, the CAC is to assume that all science has a potential health or environmental impact and search for that and use the CAC role to scrutinize, help identify the impact and help the Lab insure it looks for it. That's different from what you've done in the past. The second is the CAC should to seek out the community's concerns related to BNL that still remain, take them as a charge and bring those concerns back to the Lab. Whatever other concerns that exist in the community, beyond what the Interagency Agreement (IAG) says or if there's a Record of Decision (ROD) coming, the CAC should take that as the charge and bring that to the table.

Member Henagan: A follow up. Except for Scott here, I am a newer member and I wasn't here during those days. The question was asked are we as proactive as back then? Has the relationship with the Lab changed to the point where that degree of proactiveness is still necessary? Has the Lab become more forthcoming?

Member Mannhaupt: Are you asking about the CAC being proactive with the Lab or proactive with the community? It's two different things.

Member Henagan: Proactive with the Lab because the feeling that I get, though I might be reading something into Dick's question, is back when this group started, information needed to be pulled from the Lab, the Lab was not necessarily forthcoming.

Member Mannhaupt: It's the federal government we don't have to tell you.

Member Henagan: From what I see now that seems to have changed. They do a routine and now, even if they find naturally contaminated sand that was brought in from somewhere else, they tell us about it. The Lab has become very proactive as far as letting us know what is going on.

Member Amper: You're right on. I think the Lab has been very forthcoming. That is very good and that has been very helpful. I think it also runs the risk of lulling us in the community into a sense of complacency. Since we're not adversaries and the process had made us feel like we can participate with one another and sort this stuff out, maybe we're not being active enough. Maybe we're not going back to the community. I don't know how many people around this table are going back and having consultations, as you say you are with the town through memos, etc. Adrienne said maybe we should be bringing this stuff directly out to the community. Maybe this is a self-indictment. Maybe the Pine Barrens Society is front and center in the problem and that is are we taking the same attitude or have we been lulled, because we're friends in ways that we weren't in the beginning, because we have developed some confidence in the quality of the information we are getting. Are we being as proactive, are we being as aggressive to move this to the next level as we were when we came in the door or are we enjoying a Cosmology lecture that benefits us all, that may not be meeting our responsibility to the community? Those are the kinds of questions I am eager to have sorted out.

Member Sprintzen: Can I answer Dick? Yes.

Member Mannhaupt: I concur. If I felt that complacent and I felt the Lab was doing everything at it's fingertips to be straightforward, and the Department of Energy was my best friend in my backyard as a federal entity, and I don't mean the site guys, with all due respect, but the fact of the matter is I'd go home and not come back, because they're doing everything. But that's not what I do. And everything and anything that comes out, I call up and I ask and I question. If I get the wrong answer, I'm going to go after it. Everybody is complacent with Les Hill for instance, but he stood up here one night and he thought he had things pat and I went after him.

Very nice man, wants to do right by us, is doing the job and wants to take care of the things in the community, but I knew that I was strategically being manipulated with the information that he wanted to give us. You're not going to decide how I am getting my information; you're not going to decide how I'm getting the answers to my question. I'm asking my questions and you're answering them until I understand them my way so when I go back I can relate that information so all those other people can get that communication. I can't do that if you're going to give me pat information the way you want it churned out because you're the federal entity and the contractor.

Member Graves: Dick, do you have any more questions about complacency?

Member Mannhaupt: That's just me. Do we all do it that way? Do we all feel secure that way?

Member Sprintzen: No one does it the way you do Jean.

Member Amper: Reed, you said earlier, that you were going to stay on this; what's working and what's not. I haven't heard any of what's not. It sounds perfect to me. I would think that everything could be improved upon. Can anybody put up a sign to say maybe we could do better? I'd love to hear that too.

Member Sprintzen: I must say I think we are beating a dead horse. My answer is that everything is working, there is nothing that's not working and there are suggestions that have been made here about how we can do things differently and how we can improve on it. It seems to me quite obvious.

Member Mannhaupt: To answer Dick, in all fairness, what is not working, I don't know yet. I haven't bumped against it. Usually when something is not working for me, I'm very vocal about it. When we get to the nanotechnology, I have one hundred and one questions on environmental safety and health, there's no standard on this stuff. Who's kidding who here, what are we doing, how are you going to provide safeguards?

Member Proios: I think the operational philosophy was something like "the price of freedom is eternal vigilance", but it's hard to plan for eternal vigilance. I think that's what we're talking about. The turning point here was when DOE fired the Associated Universities and we had the interim government that was here and the beginning of Brookhaven Science Associates (BSA). As people say, there was a change in the culture related to openness and access to information and also instilling that in the people that work here. Some people were actually fired, because their philosophies didn't fit the changes occurring and others had to adapt. That's what's working. What hasn't worked is every so often you see residuals of the old mentality, in terms of "we're scientists, we're doing something for the greater good". Sometimes it's the Lab. Sometimes you could go many days without an accident then all of a sudden there are a series of accidents. The challenge is, not that the Lab isn't doing what it needs to do, but that they have to be constantly on their toes. How you are instilling in the people working here, their responsibilities as stewards of the property they are on. There are consequences to their work. I think it is even more difficult when there are so many visiting scientists that are coming here that are not the actual workers. When you have visitors coming and using machines, are they getting the adequate training to make sure that something they do isn't going to have an adverse consequence and all of a sudden we're going to get a report back that somebody did something here inadvertently and it caused a problem? It's an ongoing, constant responsibility the Lab has just to be sure they do that training to instill that sense of responsibility.

Member Jordan Sweet: I just wanted to address the complacency issue. I don't think this group has become complacent. I think what's happened is that we've learned how to work with Brookhaven and the group is able to have such a good relationship that we can detect the BS when it happens. The lights come on and Brookhaven knows it and we know it and things get

done. I think in the early days everybody was in an adversarial relationship with the Lab, everybody had their own constituencies that they were looking out for the interests of. In the early days an important part for me was the health of the Lab. That wasn't necessarily so for a lot of the other groups here. But I think as the relationship has evolved and the Lab has shaped up so much, I think now, everybody around the table considers the health of the Lab as one of their concerns. That is one of the biggest changes that has evolved over the years and that would enable us to expand some of our mission because now we can think about ways to promote the Lab to the community and look at what it is about the Lab that would be useful for the community to know.

Member Amper: That is particularly helpful because if everything is fine, and everything is working and there are no problems then maybe that answers the third question that we don't need to change the composition or the process. If everything's honky-dory then let's just continue the way we are. We ought to sort that out if we can in the last few minutes.

Member Shea: I have a suggestion. I think two things. When we go to vote on consensus, on a couple of important meetings, I have been out of town and I haven't been able to vote. I feel that if it is an important issue (Member Shea explained she would like a vehicle that would allow for an absentee member to register a vote on a consensus item). I would appreciate if we could discuss that. If we're going to consensus or something important like that. The other problem I have is, when we are discussing important technical issues, we have asked in the past for the regulators to come and discuss these issues. Sometimes they come after the vote on the issue, rather than before. I think that happened just recently. Then when the regulators come, we say what were we going to ask them? We don't even remember. I think that it would be more timely to have them come, on a specific date, that we're given advance notice about so that we can have some information on what we are voting on.

Reed captured her comments as if you've become involved in an issue and it comes time to have a vote, you'd like to have input into the conclusion of the issue even if you can't attend the meeting. Member Shea agreed.

Member Henagan: Just a question. Isn't that the purpose for having alternates? What you're saying is do you not have an alternate?

Member Shea: I have an alternate but that person was not able to attend at the time.

Reed said under extremely extenuating circumstances could a dispensation be made? Member Henagan said yes, like a third alternate.

Member Anker: My suggestion would be, when I started a couple of years ago I didn't know anything about any of the projects or remediation that were going on. I guess that's when Adrienne helped me too a little bit. When we have an alternate or someone new that's just getting in here, I think it would be a great idea, not to do this right away, to have an overview of all the remediation projects that have gone on in the past decade.

Member Anker: If the Lab could do it, not even just for CAC members, but also for DOE people who come or the Suffolk County people that come that may be new. New people. Just to get a rough, extremely rough idea about what is going on here, what has gone on in the past and what the plans are for the future? I created maybe three or four sentences for some of these, I think Jeanne wasn't too happy with my very, very condensed version and I do understand her issue with that because a lot has been going on and it's hard to condense something so involved. Just to get a rough overview. I just joined the school board. Was I given any information about being a new member? No. It's a struggle to try and understand when you're given a responsibility. It's nice to know what you're working with.

Reed said what he captured on that was the need to have some sort of orientation and training for new CAC members and other new people who come to work with the CAC on the mission of BNL, the future of BNL and the issues that the CAC is dealing with associated with BNL and the process of the group itself. Member Anker agreed.

Member Campbell: I'm probably going to be repeating, in my own way, some of the things that have already been said. The CAC was formed at a time of a lot of conflict and critical problems had to be addressed. In the sense that the mission and purpose has changed and we're beyond that point, we now have to adapt to a longer-term mission, of being eternally vigilant. Our time frame among other things is changing. I think we have adapted to that fairly well. One of the things that I would point out that the presentations that the Lab people have made on their programs improved the communication into the community about what's happening here at the Lab and tends to break down the walls. I'd like to point out that it works the other way as well. BNL people rarely get a chance to make presentations to the general community. It sort of drags them out of this shell of concern only with their community of like-minded people. I think it helps change attitudes of the Lab people as well. I think continuing those presentations is probably one of the more important things the CAC can do.

Member Esposito: Just two things, and this actually ends up being kind of a follow up to what was said. One is that under the mission and the purpose, another thing the Lab needs to think about under the CAC purpose, and I'm just using my own experience as an example, I think that the Lab should see us, (pause) I don't know how the Lab sees us, actually, it would be interesting to hear that. I feel that the Lab sees us as kind of a watchdog or a community liaison but I think they need to expand their vision of how they see us. When two years ago my organization was working on a campaign on the beneficial reuse of dredge materials, we were searching all over the globe for the best beneficial reuses of dredge materials to advance our campaign. Lo and behold, research showed that one of the best beneficial reuses of dredge materials was developed right here at Brookhaven National Laboratory. After a lengthy exercise of research I found out about the cement block. I called the scientist and we chatted and I directed the press to him and touted what great work this was. Afterwards, reflecting on that, I was thinking why didn't someone call us from the Lab and say, "You're working on this campaign and here's what we do to advance this". To be perfectly honest, I don't want to always be the person criticizing the Lab's clean-up. I'd love to be the person that also says, "Here's the great technology; here's a solution to a problem that we've been looking for five years and here it is right here in our own community. I'd like them to look at us more as a resource and not only those folks you have to squeak that clean-up plan by. That is truly more of a partnership and a mutual benefit that I hope the CAC has become. My last comment, to build on what Jean said, I also think that even when we disagree, instead of having a conflict about it, we have a discussion about it. That is because we have evolved and I think that is good. But I do feel that sometimes it's a double-edged sword because people instinctively try to move away from conflict. Especially when it's with other people you like and you have a relationship with and communication with. I think there have been times when there are some who never disagree with anything that the Lab says. As someone who has been married for 18 years, no matter how good your relationship is, you've got to disagree at some time. That just seems normal. I just would hope that those who have never taken a position other than what the Lab has taken that they really do feel that way and aren't doing it because they're afraid to not do it.

Member Amper: We would like to hold up and speak to that exact same thing before we change subjects. The example that I would use would go to this issue of the composition and process. It is, and by the way, not the Lab's fault and no member of this committee's fault but we're underrepresented of the environmental community at the moment, we just don't have that representation, maybe we have to be proactive and go out and get it. I would ask people who are genuinely trying to sort out problems here, whether the absence of greater input from environmental groups and the exchange of ideas that may have gone around the table during the g-2 issue might have improved the quality of that discussion. Whether we would have

arrived at the same conclusion or not, I'm not sure. But would the decision-making process have benefited by more environmental input. My suspicion is yes. If I were to ask the question that we posed about composition it's going to come back to Adrienne and me and some other people in the environmental community. Maybe we need to fill some of those vacancies. But is there some consensus that there's a certain benefit to the dynamic tension that goes from people who have a specific bent with respect to the environment or public health and those people who have historically been defensive of it? Isn't that why we've been successful up to this point and are we seeing as much of that as we used to?

Reed said he wanted to make an introductory comment on that. At the beginning of the CAC's tenure as a group they set up a balance of perspectives that they wanted to apply to the issues discussed here. That was done very deliberately to bring all those perspectives to the table and to deliberately produce the type of tension being talked about. He said the make up of the group, as is on the list in the packet, isn't really significantly different from what it was then. There are some open positions now that aren't filled but the structural make-up hasn't changed.

Reed asked if the question on the table was if the CAC wanted to make a structural change to the make-up in order to produce the right set of interests or if it was a matter of making sure that all of the vacancies are filled.

Member Amper: It's more the latter but it's also not just like the environmental community should fill the three vacancies. It's that everybody benefits from that. We should look at the entire list and see how that mixture...the mixture seems like to me that it was well designed but we don't have the same mixture because of the vacancies and it may require that this group be proactive and going out and saying "Hey, we're missing two people from education that we used to have that were helpful to us" as well.

Member Giacomaro: I think as part of this soul-searching process maybe we should plan a field trip to some other laboratories and see what they are doing. Because we are comparing ourselves to ourselves right now. If we look at other laboratories we may pick up those little tidbits of interest that might be useful to us or maybe not.

Reed said that Member Giacomaro could find that type of analysis has already been done and could be found in a report somewhere.

Member Mannhaupt: There is no other board like us. There is no comparison.

Member Giacomaro: Actually, that's true. What I can recall when we set up the CAC; the other boards were called Site Specific Advisory Boards.

Member Mannhaupt: A Site Specific Advisory Board advises the DOE not the contractor.

Reed guaranteed the CAC they were unique. He said that was not up for debate but there may be some things that other folks have learned that the CAC might want to take advantage of and he thought that's what they were trying to bring to the table.

Member Jordan Sweet: This is to address what Adrienne said, I think when the group was first formed you probably could find a few yes men around the table, myself probably included, but I think that the group has matured to the point where I don't think that is really true. Especially if you look at the list of actions, there have been a number of consensus decisions that have been against the Lab, for instance, throwing out the whole End State document.

Member Esposito: I didn't mean to imply there were yes men or women, I just didn't know if people were uncomfortable because they didn't want to feel that they were insulting the Lab or something. I think that's different than trying to protect the Lab. It's a different dynamic. If you

feel like, okay," Gee, I like these people" I'm just wondering, that's all; it was really more of a speculation than a determination.

Member Sprintzen: Can we determine whether or not we want to continue this discussion much further?

Reed said he would examine the process and decide with the CAC how to continue because they were running over schedule.

Member Biss: I think it depends on everybody's background. I was an engineer for 45 years. I don't think in terms of this guy is mad at this guy or this one doesn't like this one. It's what does it mean in science? That is strictly where I come from. Maybe you need people with more of a science background, I don't know but I don't look at things personally. What does it mean to the environment and what does it mean to the world? That's where I'm coming from.

Members exchange comments.

Member Proios: I want to respond to something Adrienne said two questions back, about the Lab not knowing what she was interested in doing. We had talked about whether the Lab has a role to play in terms of looking at local problems on the Island. As an example of something that didn't work right, this is the only National Lab that's on an island and there was a small oceanography unit, and it was dismantled due to budget cuts. I mean we have brown tide, we have loss of shell fishing, loss of fin fishing and here we had a National Lab that couldn't even provide some of the answers to our problems. For example, I was working on something on Plum Island last year and I had written a letter to the former director saying we ought to have some collaboration between what's going on at that Laboratory and this Laboratory. We had presentations from a woman who was doing some work on scrapie virus and how her laboratory was using some big machines to breakdown the structure of proteins. I said one of the problems they have with Hoof and Mouth Disease is they can't tell the difference between vaccinated cattle and one that has the disease and maybe a big machine could break down the virus and find some way of doing that. I was just thinking out loud and mentioned it. They said the public would go crazy if we were to bring Hoof and Mouth Disease here. It's unfortunate that we have three facilities, we have Plum Island, we have Brookhaven Lab, we have Cold Spring Harbor and there's some collaboration but not enough in terms of looking at what's going on locally on Long Island. The population of Suffolk County is larger than some states. Together, as an Island, we're larger than, I think, more than a dozen states. It would be nice to have a list of what is crucial here and whether it's Brookhaven Lab with Stony Brook University taking a lead on saying "What environmental problems you are dealing with?"

Member Esposito: I just have to add, because with Stony Brook, the State mandate that was passed last year to have Ecosystem Based Management for oceans, estuaries and great lakes. As you could imagine, it was a voluminous task to devise the EBM plans. And to have BNL involved in that, it would have been great.

Member Mannhaupt: I have three follow-ups and I do have a proactive thing that I think would be good for a process of what Dick is looking for. But to Sarah's question about new members of the CAC, I don't think it is BNL's responsibility to bring them up-to-date. I think it's ours. I think we should suggest to Sherry and maybe when Jeanne gets better and comes back we use her presentation of topics and make a small handbook for new members easy enough to read on the diversity of the group. The groups should all put a paragraph together for a biography of their organization, how long they've served and what their specialties are so when a new member comes to the table, they kind of feel like when they see names, they know where that person is placed and what's the background of their organization. They would get a copy of the last six months of minutes so they have something to review before they come to their first meeting. In regard to what Adrienne said about her needs with dredging and other things, I

really don't think BNL should be saying to any of us as groups, "Hey we can help you there." I think that's becoming too complacent.

Member Esposito: No, no, no, they had technology that filled a local need. It's not helping me.

Member Mannhaupt: But we don't know, as a federal entity, whether or not they're allowed to fill that local need on the state or local level.

Member Amper: They're giving us information on every subject under the rainbow and if they are applied to things on Long Island that would be utilizing a tremendous resource.

Member Mannhaupt: Wouldn't you have to ask that question first of them or do they just supposedly know everything that is going on, on Long Island?

Member Esposito: Wait, it was in the press voluminously. I assumed that they have people....

Reed said what he was hearing and what he captured was that the CAC supports BNL in being proactive about identifying where its technology and knowledge can be used in the community. Member Esposito agreed.

Member Mannhaupt: I want to say to Dick that I think we need to be more proactive in the way we set our agendas every month. Once upon a time, we used to sit and say, "We want to see these topics over the next six months, and this has priority, and we'd wait six months for that." I think we need to do that more instead of being told what's upcoming and what's going to be presented. I think we need to be more proactive about what our topics are going to be each month.

Member Amper: There's no way I would say the Lab would resist that in any way. That's something we need to do.

Member Mannhaupt: But that goes to the process, the changes to the composition and process. That is process.

Reed said the CAC had on the table at one point establishing an agenda committee that would set the agenda for the CAC. That just hasn't yet come to fruition; maybe that is something the CAC should reconsider as a group.

Member Mannhaupt: Or perhaps we could e-mail all our topics we would like to see over the next couple of months to Jeanne and get them in some sort of priority for the year.

Reed said he captured the point about agenda setting and said the question, what changes to the composition or process would improve the CAC as it goes forward was just lightly touched on and asked if anybody felt this needed to be put on the agenda to be dealt with more thoroughly.

Member Sprintzen: The answer is no. The composition is fine. I think that there is the point about filling up the slots but some of this is ambiguous. There are organizations that are environmental that are listed under other things, for example. That's just not clear.

Reed asked if they needed to address the third question in a follow-up discussion.

Member Amper: If there is a consensus about this, then maybe we don't. And if there isn't, maybe one should revisit it. I'm wondering, again, you were taking your notes and I appreciate it, I'm just trying to respond to the reason we came here with this request in the first place. Our point of view is that a lot of stuff stops here. It may not be going back to the community. You're

sending memos to the town; you're talking to folks in your community about this. The education is great for us; the presentation tonight was wonderful for us. I'm not sure how it benefits those who we represent and so when Adrienne said can we take this road show to the community, they are...Jean said it's the neighbors, it's the relationship between the Lab and the community that is at stake, this may be lost if they were not responsive to our specific responsibility of taking it to the community. But can the CAC through the Lab in a collaborative way, take more of this to the community than I'm afraid is getting there. That was one. The second thing is I think we need to remain proactive, I think that is when we were doing our best work. I think setting the agenda is a good way to do that but I think reaching down into ourselves and going back to our communities and saying, "What is still on your mind with respect to the Laboratory and where it's going and how it's working and where we are relative to where we were." I think we need to do more of that. That should definitely be on the agenda. Finally, I don't know about the rest of you but when I walk out of any meeting I want to feel like we've accomplished something. And I used to feel that more than I do now. I enjoy the meetings every bit as much, I feel I'm better informed, I think we've all have a better relationship with the Lab but in terms of coming here and investing our time and representing our organizations, I'd like to walk away from every meeting saying "We, the community are better off for having been in this process." And I felt more that way in the first three or four years than I have in the last three or four.

Member Proios: But isn't that something positive, Dick? What will we have to do if everything is cleaned up?

Member Amper: It's all positive, then we may need to discuss that but I'd become concerned when any organization, and I like my organization, but I'd become concerned when any organization arrives at a point in its history where they say, "We've done it all, we're happy with the continuing dialogue, but we don't need to change the agenda". With the possible exception of David's, I'm not going to state his position other than the way he said it, but if we don't feel that way it becomes our obligation to go back and look at what we did that we thought made us feel that way and do more of it. Or make some kind of mid-course correction but you don't just keep showing up every month forever, if you don't think you're taking, in my judgment, at least as much out of it as you were.

Member Mannhaupt: So can we take a vote? Do we need this back on the agenda for another discussion by a show of hands?

Reed said I think we certainly can.

Member Esposito: Can I ask one question? It would be good, in my humble opinion, if we could hear the Lab's response to some of this. I really meant it when I said I don't know what their perception is of our role.

Member Mannhaupt: If the Lab wants to do that, can I know? I'd like to leave. I don't want to know the Lab's position on us in an advisory commission. I think that jades my point of view when I have to go after them with tough things. I don't want to know whether you like me or not.

Member Amper: Jean, the Lab created this and we need to know how they think it's going the same way....

Member Mannhaupt: Just by the fact that the Lab created it I know why I'm here and I think the Lab feels that we are important.

Reed said the vote on the table was whether or not to continue this discussion in the next meeting, looking at item number three.

Member Amper: If it includes some input from the Lab, about their perception of how we're doing. Then that would change my disposition.

Reed said and it includes the input from the Lab on their position on the mission and purpose of the CAC. He asked for those who would like to see that on the agenda for the next meeting to please raise their hand.

Reed said they were talking about continuing the discussion examining the composition and process of the CAC and also getting a viewpoint from the Laboratory about what they see the changing mission and purpose of the CAC is. That's the next topic in this discussion if you wish to have it.

Member Esposito: And what they think about the suggestions.

Member Esposito: I'd like to know the Laboratory's reaction or response to some of the suggestions made on expanding the purpose of the CAC.

Reed said the agenda topic is the Lab's response to what they heard tonight at the next meeting. He asked for those in favor of the agenda topic to raise their hands. Reed asked for a count of the total people around the table as he counted the votes. There were 16 votes in favor out of 19 in attendance and the item was placed on the agenda. Reed said that was a majority for setting the agenda and it's on the agenda for next meeting.

7. Agenda Setting

Reed asked the CAC for other agenda items. Member Hall said he received a call that mercury was found on his organization's property and asked if that could be placed on the agenda. Member Sprintzen said there was an article in Newsday about mercury and asked that be included in the discussion.

Member Anker asked how many people were missing from the membership list and if BNL or the CAC would seek other members. Reed asked if the topic of recruiting was something Member Anker would like to know more about. She agreed.

Member Henagan asked for a show of hands of people who felt they were representing environmental groups and said his impression was some of the groups are environmental even though they are not defined that way on the list and we may have the composition we're looking for. He said even though he represents a civic association, he is interested in the environment.

Member Proios asked if there could be a discussion about CAC sub-committees. He said he would like to have a sub-committee formed to identify critical environmental issues that the Island is facing that could be used to dialogue with the Lab in order to seek assistance with problem solving.

Member Shea asked that a committee be formed on nanotechnology and Reed said that could be addressed during the discussion on sub-committees.

There were no objections from CAC members on these agenda items.

Reed told the CAC there would be an update on the HFBR and the BGRR at the next meeting. He said the annual report on the Peconic River was completed and will be presented to the CAC.

Member Esposito said this was a lot for an agenda and Reed said these items could take place over the next few months.

March Agenda

Continue discussion on composition & process of CAC

Lab response to discussion of 2/8

Peconic River update (include Newsday article in discussion)

Membership recruitment

CAC sub-committees

HFBR / BGRR Updates

Meeting adjourned 9:39 p.m.

**CAC Meeting
February 8, 2007
Flip Chart Notes – CAC Discussion**

Mission

- Legacy waste reduced
- CAC involved in other issues of public interest that BNL can contribute to
- Support BNL contribution to the environment
- Be the pipeline between community and Lab – open up communications from Lab out to the community
- Mission not changed, controversy will be back
- Should pipeline from CAC be more structured?
- Information on Global Warming
- The Lab bring science information of interest to the community
- Serve to open the Lab to public scrutiny
- Educate community on what is being done at BNL
- Mission hasn't changed, CAC has – a team
- Sponsor community lecture series
- Lectures in community as well as at Lab
- Must keep focus on environment/health mission
- All ideas, issues and concerns from the community should be brought to the table
- Environment
 - o Clean air, water, soil
 - o Also broader “community environment”
 - o Job of CAC to remind Lab anything regarding science has health implications
- Bring community concerns to BNL
- A partnering relationship breeds complacency
- Nano
- Eternal vigilance!
- Call BNL on lapses
- CAC has learned to work with BNL effectively
- Consensus - should be able to have input if you're away
- Get regulators in at the right time
- Have training / overview information for new members and visitors
 - o Overview of mission
 - o Future
 - o Issues
 - o Process
- Mission changing from urgent / crisis to eternal vigilance
- Lab should expand (explain?) vision of how it sees CAC
- Lab see CAC as a resource to get to the community
- Must guard against avoiding conflict with BNL and with each other
- Under represented by environmental groups
- Examine similar proc with other Labs
- Support work on LI issues
- Encourage collaboration among facilities
- CAC should seek new members
- Handbook should include “diversity” section
- Be proactive about setting agendas
- CAC should be proactively taking information to the community
- Hunt the tough issues as a commitment
- The beginning

2007	Affiliation		First Name	Last Name	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
Chart Key - P = Present																
ABCO	(Garber added on 4/10/02)	Member	Don	Garber	P											
ABCO		Alternate	Doug	Dittko												
Brookhaven Retired Employees Association		Member	Graham	Campbell	P	P										
Brookhaven Retired Employees Association (L. Jacobson new alternate as of 4/99)(A. Peskin 5/04)		Alternate	Arnie	Peskin		P										
CHEC (Community Health & Environment Coalition (added 10/04)		Member	Sarah	Anker		P										
			Ann Marie	Reed												
Citizens Campaign for the Environment		Member	Adrienne	Esposito		P										
Citizens Campaign for the Environment (Ottney added 4/02-takenoff 1/05 Mahoney put on)(7/06 add Kasey Jacobs)		Alternate	Kasey	Jacobs	P											
E. Yaphank Civic Association		Member	Michael	Giacomaro	P	P										
E. Yaphank Civic Association (J. Minasi new alternate as of 3/99) (M. Triber 11/05) (Munson 6/06)		Alternate	Brian	Munson												
Educator (changed 7/2006)		Member	Adam	Martin	P											
Educator (B. Martin - 9/01)		Alternate	Bruce	Martin												
Educator (A. Martin new alternate 2/00) (Adam to college 8/01)(add. alternate 9/02) (changed 7/2006)		Alternate	Audrey	Capozzi												
Environmental Economic Roundtable (Berger resigned, Proios became member 1/01)		Member	George	Proios	P	P										
Environmental Economic Roundtable (3/99, L. Snead changed to be alternate for EDF)		Alternate	None	None												
Fire Rescue and Emergency Services		Member	Joe	Williams												
Fire Rescue and Emergency Services		Alternate	Don	Lynch	P	P										
Fire Rescue and Emergency Services		Alternate	James	McLoughlin												
Friends of Brookhaven (E.Kaplan changed to become member 7/1/01)		Member	Ed	Kaplan												
Friends of Brookhaven (E.Kaplan changed to become member 7/1/01)(Schwartz added 11/18/02)		Alternate	Steve	Schwartz												
Health Care		Member	Jane	Corrarino												
Health Care		Alternate														
Huntington Breast Cancer Coalition		Member	Mary Joan	Shea	P	P										
Huntington Breast Cancer Coalition		Alternate	Scott	Carlin												
Intl. Brotherhood of Electrical Workers/Local 2230 (S.Krysnak replaced M. Walker 1/11/07)		Member	Scott	Krsnak	P	P										
IBEW/Local 2230		Alternate	Philip	Pizzo												

2007	Affiliation		First Name	Last Name	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
	L.I. Pine Barrens Society	Member	Richard	Amper		P										
	L.I. Pine Barrens Society (added P. Loris 6/05)	Alternate	Elina	Alayeva	P	P										
	L.I. Pine Barrens Society	Alternate	Susie	Husted												
	L.I. Progressive Coalition	Member	David	Sprintzen	P	P										
	L.I. Progressive Coalition	Alternate	None	None												
	Lake Panamoka Civic Association (Biss as of 4/02)	Member	Rita	Biss	P	P										
	Lake Panamoka Civic Association (Rita Biss new alternate as of 3/99)	Alternate	Joe	Gibbons												
	Long Island Association (Groneman replace 10/05)	Member	Lauren	Hill												
	Long Island Association	Alternate	William	Evanzia	P											
	Longwood Alliance	Member	Tom	Talbot	P	P										
	Longwood Alliance	Alternate	Kevin	Crowley												
	Longwood Central School Dist. (switched 11/02)	Member	Barbara	Henigin	P											
	Longwood Central School Dist.	Alternate	Allan	Gerstenlauer												
	NEAR	Member	Jean	Mannhaupt		P										
	NEAR (prospect taken off ¾)(Blumer added 10/04	Alternate	Liz	Bowman												
	NSLS User	Member	Jean	Jordan-Sweet	P	P										
	NSLS User	Alternate	Peter	Stephens												
	Peconic River Sportsmen's Club (added 4/8/04)	Member	John	Hall		P										
	Peconic River Sportsmen's Club	Alternate	Jeff	Schneider												
	Ridge Civic Association	Member	Pat	Henagan	P	P										
	Science & Technology (added 1/13/05)	Member	Iqbal	Chaudhry	P											
	Town of Brookhaven (Graves made member 6/06)	Member	Anthony	Graves		P										
	Town of Brookhaven	Alternate	None	None												
	Town of Brookhaven, Senior Citizens	Member	James	Heil	P	P										
	Town of Brookhaven, Senior Citizens (open slot as of 4/99)	Alternate	None	None												
	Town of Riverhead	Member	Robert	Conklin	P	P										
	Town of Riverhead (K. Skinner alternate as of 4/99)	Alternate	Kim	Skinner												
	Wading River Civic Association	Member	Helga	Guthy	P											
	Wading River Civic Association	Alternate	Sid	Bail												