

Community Advisory Council
March 14, 2002
Action Items/Notes

FINAL

These notes are in the following order:

1. Attendance
2. Correspondence and handouts
3. Quorum
4. Administrative
5. Rauch Foundation and Press Release, as per D. Sprintzen
6. Update on deer sample, Tim Green, Environmental Services Division
7. Update on Groundwater, Bob Howe, Group Manager, OU III
8. Community Comment
9. Peconic River Subcommittee Report, including follow-up on re-vegetation plan
10. BGRR Status and Path Forward, Les Hill, Director, Environmental Management
11. Proposal re Quorum, Bruce Martin and Rita Biss, CAC members
12. Agenda setting

1. Attendance

Present:

Members – R. Clipperton, R. Conklin, A. Esposito, M. Giacomaro, J. Gibbons, H. Guthy, J. Heil, E. Kaplan, J. Mannhaupt, J. McLoughlin, G. Proios, M. Shea, D. Sprintzen, M. Walker.

Alternates – R. Biss, A. Graves, B. Martin, J. Minasi.

Others – M. Bebon, P. Bond, J. Carter, J. Clodius, F. Crescenzo, J. D'Ascoli, K. Geiger, P. Genzer, J. Granzen, T. Green, K. Grigoletto, M. Hauptman, L. Hill, R. Hodgins, B. Kinkead, S. Kulma, S. Layendecker, S. Medeiros, L. Nelson, M. Parsons, P. Paul, G. Penny, V. Racaniello, A. Rapijko, K. Shaw, T. Sheridan, K. White.

Absent:

Members – R. Amper, M. Barrett, G. Campbell, A. Capozzi, M. Cohn, J. Corrarino, S. Cullen, N. Essel, D. Fischler, A. Jones, J. Jordon-Sweet, 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, B. Henigin, L. Jacobson, R. Johannesen, G. Miglino, J. Pannullo, P. Pizzo, W. Prospect, K. Skinner, L. Snead, P. Stephens, K. Timmins.

2. Correspondence and Handouts

Items 1 - 3 were mailed with a cover letter dated March 8, 2002. Item 4 – 6 were included in the folders, and items 7 and 8 were available as handouts.

1. Draft agenda for March.
2. Draft notes for February.
3. Final notes for January.
4. Copy of draft Charter dated 10/8/98.
5. Copy of Attachment 2 (CAC Decision making process)
6. Attendance reports for 2001 and 2002
7. Copy of presentation on Groundwater Cleanup Activities by Bob Howe.
8. Copy of presentation on BGRR Path Forward by Les Hill

3. Quorum

The meeting began at approximately 6:36 pm. A quorum was not present and was not achieved at any time during the meeting.

4. Administrative

A new ground rule was added that asked members to show respect for people presenting by not carrying on side conversations.

As a quorum was not present, approving the minutes was deferred.

It was announced that Lori Cunniff, Manager, Environmental Services, would be providing an environmental surveillance report at the April meeting and all were encouraged to attend. Reports on the central steam facility, water in the basement of Bldg. 801, the Natural Resources Management Plan and the Upton Reserve will be included.

Frank Crescenzo, DOE Deputy Manager, Area Office announced that Michael Holland would be reporting to the Oak Ridge Operations Office in Tennessee as Acting Manager for 6 months effective April 1. Crescenzo said that he would be Acting Manager in Holland's absence from Brookhaven.

Tom Sheridan gave an update on the search for a Laboratory Director. He stated that there are two new candidates that have extensive experience in DOE and have been interviewed.

Dr. Paul joined the meeting a few minutes late - he had been on travel; Kathy Geiger represented Marge Lynch.

5. Rauch Foundation and Press Release, Member Sprintzen

David Sprintzen explained that he wanted to create a form letter so that when CAC recommendations are made, they can be submitted as press releases. He stated that he thought if there was a form that the resolution could be plugged into, it would allow recommendations to be issued publicly when appropriate with little difficulty. The letter that he had drafted to the Rauch Foundation was to simply clarify a misconception. He felt it was important to try to maintain the integrity of the CAC and promote an adequate public understanding of its role and function. Further discussion was deferred until a quorum was present.

6. Update on Deer Sample, Tim Green, Environmental Services Division

Tim Green gave an update on the deer sampling that had been reported on in February. A sample had been sent to the NYSDOH at their request so that they could test it. The Lab result was 21 pico curies per gram wet weight; the DOH sample tested at approximately 8 pico curies per gram wet weight. The reason for the difference is being examined. Tim noted the Lab continues to take the issue seriously regardless of the final sampling results. He discussed some of the actions the Laboratory was taking.

Focus was on two areas, the 650 sump outfall and the former Waste Management facility. The sump is in the process of being cleaned up and is expected to be complete by the end of the summer. The site is fenced with an 8-foot fence and barbed wire strands. That facility was ruled out as a possible source of the high rate of cesium in a deer.

The Waste Management facility has a 7-foot fence. Green said that there were gaps in the gates that could allow deer through and there were holes in the fence that have been repaired. In addition, a secondary fence is planned. There are black cherry trees near the fence, which

will be cut down to eliminate a food source. Some berms that are at a right angle to the fence will be cut back to remove any possible access. He stated that soil maps are being reviewed to make sure nothing was missed. He also said that the Lab was working with the DEC to obtain a permit to take some deer from the site to obtain data in specific areas. Other vegetation that could be a food source is being looked into. CAC members asked many questions about testing the vegetation, Bldg. 650 and the Waste Management facility, testing additional deer and small mammals, the deer population in general, and alternative sampling methods. Additional concerns were expressed about cesium getting into the food chain and about the release of cesium if there was a brush fire.

7. Update on Groundwater, Bob Howe, Group Manager, OU III

Bob Howe reviewed the objectives of the groundwater cleanup program, which are to remediate groundwater contaminants, including VOCs on-site and off-site; to have all systems operating by July 2005; to operate, maintain and monitor performance until cleanup is completed; to reach drinking water standards within 5-30 years, and to prevent or minimize plume growth. He reviewed past activities, which included groundwater characterization and investigations, including locations of plumes. There have been 1,400 temporary and 1,100 permanent wells installed.

To date, nine treatment systems have been installed on-site and one installed off-site. Data collection is being completed for six additional off-site systems and the Lab is working with the community to address their concerns. He also discussed the status of the HFBR tritium plume, three new wells installed to monitor the g-2 plume, Records of Decision, and characterization of the Magothy Aquifer. CAC members asked questions about the EDB plume, if the contamination off-site was from some source other than the Lab, data for the Magothy Aquifer and when the report would be ready, if the dry weather pattern had any impact on groundwater measurements, and what compounds are sampled for when testing. Member Giacomaro asked numerous questions about the off-site treatment systems including design and appearance of the facilities, security, alternative location of the facilities, and about the possibility of donating the buildings to the community when the remediation is complete.

8. Community Comment

There were no comments from the audience.

Adrienne Esposito commented on a flyer that had been left on cars recently at a function in Center Moriches. The flyer called for closing the Laboratory and directed people to call her for more information. Adrienne stated that her organization did not print or distribute the flyer and that they were trying to find out who did. She asked that anyone call her if they had any additional information.

9. Peconic River Subcommittee Report, including follow-up on re-vegetation plan

The subcommittee submitted a written report to the CAC that was distributed in the folders. Pictures, which showed the work in progress at the wetlands remediation pilot at Area D and at the vacuum guzzling pilot in Area A, were taken by Bob Conklin and were passed around the table. Kaplan commented on the work that subcommittee members had contributed since the last CAC meeting: sitting in on working group meetings and going out into the field,. He said that they've been following the pilot projects very carefully. He stated that the written report began by giving some background information and answering some of the common questions about the pilot studies. He said that at this point the two pilot studies that they focused on over the past two months are the Vacuum Guzzling Project and the Sediment Removal and Wetland Reconstruction Project. Kaplan said that the sediment has been removed from Areas A and D and they were now looking at the restoration/re-vegetation plan for the areas that has been put

together by the Lab. He said that the subcommittee had put together some recommendations for consideration by the CAC.

Member Esposito identified the increase in size of the wetland area needing remediation in Area D and the fact that there are a limited number of cleanup methods that can be used without disturbing the wetland. She said the group wanted to focus on the restoration and the first issue she identified was the requirement in the re-vegetation plan that called for replacing the sediment removed with topsoil. She explained that Chris Pickerell, from Cornell Cooperative Extension, had advised against the use of topsoil in the wetland area and preferred that sand or sub-soil from a Lab borrow area be used. Whether the topsoil was needed, and if it were, where would it come from was discussed extensively by CAC members.

Member Kaplan stated that another major issue the subcommittee had with the pilot studies was that no specific criteria to evaluate them exists. The subcommittee made several recommendations for the CAC to consider. Member Esposito stated that the lack of standards for cleanup and the lack of standards to determine whether the restoration of the wetlands is successful or not was a problem and that was what led to the formation of the following recommendations.

Subcommittee recommendations for CAC consideration:

- *BNL should finalize its re-vegetation plan ASAP.*
- *BNL and regulatory agencies should reach agreement on remediation goals ASAP. If done quickly enough, these goals could be helpful in evaluating Peconic River pilot studies.*
- *The CAC should continue to monitor the progress of both Sediment Removal and Wetland Restoration, and Vacuum Guzzling Pilots with specific emphasis on re-vegetation activities, and the success with which benthic communities have recovered after disturbances during vacuum guzzling and sediment removal. Follow-up monitoring is extremely important, especially to know when restoration is complete. As yet few details are available concerning such monitoring.*
- *BNL should finalize its decision on whether the phytoextraction pilot project is feasible, and present this information to the CAC ASAP.*
- *BNL should be reminded that 'advice' is part of the CAC's mandate, and that sufficiently detailed information is required before the CAC can provide meaningful advice.*

There was some explanation of the recommendations and discussion on them. The first recommendation was intended to address the issue of the re-vegetation plan. Adrienne noted that they had received a draft re-vegetation plan on March 6 after their report was written. Skip Medeiros explained that the plan had been done in conjunction with the DEC and had taken into consideration some of the working group's comments on the soil.

The second recommendation was to establish remediation goals. Skip said they are in the process of addressing regulatory comments on the Risk Assessment. They are meeting with the DEC in early April to address the resolution of all comments and hope to come to an agreement on the path forward. After that, he said they expected to be able to create the preliminary remediation goals.

The third recommendation called for continuing to monitor the progress of both pilot studies with an emphasis on the re-vegetation activities. Skip Medeiros explained what DEC had requested in their permit. There was discussion on the use of topsoil and compost from off-site versus

replacing the sediment removed from the wetland with soil from on-site. The contractor was asked if there was a benefit to using on-site soil; the response was no. It was stated that there are three sites on Long Island that are sources for topsoil, some of the wetland plants will come from local sources, and because of the numbers of plants needed, some will have to be shipped in. There was some discussion on the use of fertilizer, if there was soil in adjacent areas that could be used, and how the river should look when the project is complete. The contractor explained how he had worked with the DEC to put together the draft re-vegetation plan. After further discussion Member Proios suggested splitting the restoration of pilot study area "D" to include two scenarios - *"Each of the two pilots gets a different substrait, one matches the recommendation of Steve Lawrence (NYSDEC) which is an organic rich substrait, the other what has been recommended by Mr. Pickerell, which is more sandy, less organic substrait."*

As a quorum was not present it was decided that a poll of the CAC members would be taken on the recommendation to split the pilot study. It was the sense of all 15 CAC members present that they supported dividing Area D into two sections and using topsoil in one section, and a sandy substrait in the other section.

10. BGRR Status and Path Forward, Les Hill, Director, Environmental Management

Les Hill explained that the BGRR originally had been broken into seven individual pieces and described the actions completed to date. The initial concept for the BGRR was to start at the outside and work in, shrinking the footprint. He said it was now logical to link the remaining activities and treat them as one. One of the advantages of a new approach is to facilitate the ability of the Lab to complete cleanup of the BGRR in '05.

The underground piping has been removed, contaminated soil cleaned up, and most of the contamination from the canal structure has been removed. At this point, plans are to cease work on the canal because final determinations on the pile and the reactor building could drive what is done with the canal. He stated that he would like to do a comprehensive risk assessment for the project and noted that whatever path forward is chosen, it has to have flexibility built in to accommodate the removal actions for the heavy pockets of contamination. CAC members asked questions about the risk assessment and the criteria that will be used. Hill said that they were going to establish a process for doing the risk assessment and that it would be shared with the CAC. The process will revolve around the ResRad risk analysis technique. The issue of characterization of the soil beneath the reactor was also raised.

Member Esposito suggested establishing a CAC subcommittee that would be on the BGRR Working Group (similar to the OUV subcommittee). She warned the issues will be complicated and urged the CAC members to follow them carefully. It was agreed that a BGRR subcommittee would be established at the April meeting.

Member Mannhaupt asked if there was any background material available to study. Hill said that some information from Hanford could be made available.

11. Proposal re Quorum, Bruce Martin and Rita Biss, CAC members

Bruce Martin spoke about his proposal to change the quorum so that business of the CAC could be conducted. He is proposing a modification of the by laws be considered at the April meeting. Currently, about 20% of the membership is inactive. He would like to base the quorum on active members. George Proios indicated that he would rather drop members than change the numbers. It was decided that Bruce Martin would write up his proposal and it would go out in the packet for discussion in April and that George's suggestion would be treated as a separate proposal.

Action Item: Get copy of Bruce Martin's proposal.

12. Agenda setting

Counter-terrorism Research (drop?)
Environmental Surveillance
Deer Update
Groundwater Update
Establish subcommittee on BGRR
Rauch Foundation issue (deal with first)
Quorum issue