

Final

These notes are in the following order:

1. Attendance
2. Correspondence and Handouts
3. Administrative Items
4. Update on Peconic River Sampling, Part I, Skip Medeiros, Long Term Environmental Operations, Safety and Security
5. Community Comment
6. CAC discussion on questions posed by the Pine Barrens Society at the January 2007 meeting (continued from February)
7. Agenda Setting

1. Attendance

Members/Alternates Present:

See Attached Sheets.

Others Present:

S. Aronson, M. Bebon, J. Carter, F. Crescenzo, A. Csorny, K. Geiger, G. Goode, T. Green, B. Howe, S. Johnson, S. Kumar, M. Lynch, S. Penn, A. Rapiejko, J. Tarpinian, K. White

2. Correspondence and Handouts

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

1. A copy of the March 8 draft agenda
2. Draft notes for February 8, 2007
3. Final notes for January 2007
4. Final notes for November 2006
5. Revised draft agenda
6. A copy of the presentation on the Peconic River

3. Administrative

The meeting began at approximately 6:35 p.m. Reed Hodgkin reviewed the ground rules and the draft agenda. Those present introduced themselves. Members of the CAC asked for an update on Jeanne D'Ascoli. Kathy Geiger reported that Jeanne was doing very well and said her thoughts would be with the group, but she decided not participate this month as the discussion was difficult to understand on conference call.

Statement by Dr. Aronson

Sam Aronson, Director of Brookhaven National Laboratory responded, as requested, to the CAC discussion on the questions posed by the Pine Barrens Society that took place during the February 8 meeting. Aronson said he believed it was important to be at the CAC meetings and

attends each one unless he is traveling. Aronson said the CAC discussion was a positive process and applauded them for the development of the sophistication of their process that has occurred over time. That is the value the Council adds to the Laboratory. Aronson commented that he felt the current mission of the CAC was about right and did not see a need for major renovation or replacement. He said the mission was aimed at the right issues and provided direction for the CAC to be of great assistance to the Laboratory. Aronson said he believed the DOE saw similar value in the CAC and he hopes that the Laboratory and the DOE are providing the assistance the CAC desires to help its members interact with their constituents and continue the process.

Aronson said the CAC should not be viewed as a completed work and said examining how to go forward or whether or not aspects should be reengineered is a positive exercise. Although he was not able to attend the evening's discussion due to travel, he assured the CAC he would stay abreast of the discussion through the minutes. He said it was important to him that the basic processes of the CAC be preserved, though if the CAC chose to make improvements they would be supported. Aronson urged the CAC to continue the discussion and the self assessment process.

Member Chaudhry asked if there was a copy of the CAC mission statement available to members. Reed said the mission statement had been placed in last month's meeting packet and Member Chaudhry would be provided with that material.

ACTION ITEM: Send material on mission and draft charter to Member Chaudhry.

Approval of Minutes

Reed asked for corrections, additions or deletions to the February 8 draft notes. Member Jordan-Sweet asked that the phrase "to help" in paragraph six on page 11 be changed to read "the health". She said her concern at that time was the health of the Laboratory. Member Proios asked to change the term "Mad Cow Disease" in paragraph one of page 15 to read "Hoof and Mouth Disease". Member Chaudhry asked if the statement in paragraph nine on page two – "...it was not possible for a spike to be detected on a particular day because it was a continuous sample." was recorded accurately. The statement was confirmed and explained. Member Chaudhry also asked if the comment "Must guard against avoiding conflict with BNL and with each other" on page 19 contained in the flip chart notes should read, "Must guard against creating conflict with BNL....". Reed explained the issue was that conflict is an important part of issue resolution and the CAC must guard against avoiding it when it is important to have. Member Guthy noted the attendance sheet for the February 8 meeting was missing from the minutes. Member Kaplan commented that he found the notes valuable and appreciated the level of detail provided. The notes were approved pending the requested changes with no objections and three abstentions.

George Goode announced that the Laboratory was sponsoring a "Get Ready for Earth Day" mini fair on April 9, 2007 from 7 to 9 p.m. at the Mastics-Moriches-Shirley Community Library. Among other activities a display of an aquifer model, a natural resources wildlife display, a hazardous waste display and a Pollution Prevention display will be featured. He extended an invitation to attend to the CAC members.

Member Sprintzen announced that the Long Island Progressive Coalition was going to be celebrating its 28th anniversary. He invited the CAC members to the March 24, 2007 celebration.

Les Hill gave updates on the HFBR and the BGRR. He said the reanalysis of the activated compounds in the HFBR is completed. He said the amount of activated materials contained in the control rod blades and the radiation dose rates were found to be less than initially projected.

The Feasibility Study (FS) was revised and will be sent to the regulators early next week. He expects to be able to discuss the FS in detail within the next few months.

Hill reported that extensive work had been done on the Document of Safety Analysis for the BGRR, which is a DOE document that provides an analysis of the pile removal project. A draft had been submitted to the DOE last fall and comments received in January were addressed. Hill said he anticipated DOE approval within a couple of months. Currently, they are completing a remote camera inspection of the inside of the graphite pile to reconfirm its contents. Hill offered to share those pictures with the CAC at a future date.

Member Giacomaro asked if there was anything left beside the pile at the BGRR. Hill confirmed that only the pile remained to be removed.

4. Update on Peconic River Sampling, Part I

Skip Medeiros, Long-term Environmental Operations, Safety and Security presented Part I of an update on the Peconic River sampling that focused on sediment and fish data. Medeiros said he would present Part II, the data for surface water and wetlands sampling, at the April 2007 meeting.

The long-term monitoring requirements for the Peconic River involve monitoring sediment, fish and surface water to determine the long-term effectiveness of the remedial effort and to ensure that deposition and downstream migration of contaminated sediment is not present. Wetlands are monitored for re-planting success and invasive species control. Monitoring data is reviewed annually with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC), Suffolk County Department of Health Services (SCDHS) and the Department of Energy (DOE) to evaluate the need for additional monitoring and action.

Medeiros said there is a long period of time between the collection and sharing of data due to steps required in the monitoring process. The steps include completion of sampling, data evaluation, data transmission, implementation of follow-up actions and completion of the Annual Peconic River Report which is then presented to the regulators for review.

Medeiros reviewed the sampling focus areas that are located in sections of the river from one tenth of a mile upstream of the Sewage Treatment Plant (STP) down to Donohue's Pond .

Member Giacomaro asked for clarification on the data being referred to.

Medeiros indicated that he was reporting on surface water, sediment and fish data.

Member Giacomaro asked if that included the chemical make-up and radiological data.

Medeiros said it did.

The Peconic River cleanup areas between the BNL Sewage Treatment Plant and Schultz Road that were remediated included a 1.5 mile section out to the site perimeter, the section of the river to Schultz Road which is approximately 3.1 miles downstream of the STP. Sediment samples were also taken at Manor Road, about 5 miles downstream of the STP. Thirty sediment samples were collected.

In the sediment sample data collected in June of 2006, Medeiros explained that ninety percent of the samples were within or below the goal of 2.0 mg/kg of mercury. This goal was met in all but three sample locations. Two of those samples are located onsite and one is located just offsite. He expressed concern over the three elevated sample results. After discussions with the regulators, the three locations were re-sampled in August of 2006 to confirm the results. The

regulators were offered the opportunity to take split samples in order to have their laboratories confirm the BNL findings. SCDHS accepted the Laboratory's offer. Four additional samples were collected within a five-foot circumference of the original sample. The SCDHS and BNL's results were very similar. The results were compared using the EPA's criteria for duplicate samples.

Member Kaplan noted that the data comparing the sampling results was not correct.

Medeiros apologized for the mistake in plotting the data and went over it verbally. Peconic River sediment sample (PR-SS) 19 was lower than the 2 parts per million (ppm) average, I believe. PR-SS-15 had three values also above the 2 ppm and two values below. PR-SS-10 has three values below and two above.

Member Garber asked if the 14 mg/kg was repeated in any of the new samples?

Medeiros said the 14mg/kg was not replicated. The Lab sampled around it, as I described but we did not find anything that high.

Member Kaplan asked what the highest reading was initially and in the re-sampling.

Medeiros said that the highest reading in June was 14.2 mg/kg and in the August re-sampling it was 7 mg/kg at PR-SS-10.

Member Shea asked where the 14 mg/kg was located, where the highest reading offsite was and if it was near any residences.

Medeiros responded that the 14 mg/kg was located on Laboratory property very close to the downstream section of the river close to the site boundary and the 7 mg/kg location was about a quarter mile further downstream. He said it was downstream of a residential location. What was important to note was that between the locations, there were perfectly normal results. The entire stretch of the river is not contaminated but an 80 to 100 square foot area around the sample points has been confirmed to have elevated measurements. The Lab has discussed the results with the regulatory community and additional samples will be collected in each area in early spring to determine how wide spread the elevated measurements are. The Lab will sample intensively in those areas.

Member Corrarino asked what the highest split sample level was in SS-15.

Medeiros said the highest level was about 5.8 mg/kg.

Member Corrarino asked if the Suffolk County levels were lower than the Lab's in locations 15 and 10.

Medeiros said the Suffolk County results were routinely lower than BNL results for mercury and that he had more data available at the end of the presentation and in handouts.

Member Guthy asked if the Suffolk County data was lower due to equipment differences or testing methods.

Medeiros said it was not clear why the data is lower. In the past, the results have always been similar. This seems to be something systematic, but we're not sure whether it is or isn't. Because sediment is heterogeneous, the results from split sampling are often different, however, they are not often so systematically different.

Member Heil asked if Brookhaven Lab used a contract lab.

Medeiros said the Lab used the same contract laboratory that was used for the original characterization of the area.

Member Garber asked if location PR-SS -10 was in a river stream. He noted the section on the map looked dry and if any of the testing sites may have dried out in the summer.

Medeiros said the location was in the actual flow of the river and indicated the water was thigh high, though the location had dried out in past summers.

Member Garber proposed that if you take a drop of coffee on a counter and let it dry, it is very interesting. You'll find that around the perimeter of the coffee you'll get an enormous concentration, it's not very colored in the middle but around the perimeter there is a concentrating of the colloidal suspension as it's drying out. If you have concentrated colloidal suspension, as it is drying, it is able to draw on the perimeter and you can get much higher concentrations. It may be relevant to why you could get some real anomalous hot spots. Just a suggestion.

Medeiros said that was interesting and that it would be looked into when doing the evaluation. The additional data that is collected in June will be helpful in addressing that.

Member Chaudhry noted that the results it look like SCDHS is consistently 20 percent below BNL's results and thought maybe it was in the baseline or calibration.

Medeiros said that both laboratories are believed to be dependable.

Andy Rapiejko, SCDHS, explained further that when these analyses are reported they each have an error bar. There is a plus or minus to each of them. They are not usually typically recorded, but each time you get an analysis, it has an error bar to it. So probably if you overlap them and overlap the other bars, probably most of them....these are parts per million, parts per billion, these are very low numbers so if they were laid out with all of the error bars a lot of the error bars would overlap, which would mean statistically they are the same. When we look at this, to us, these numbers match. We're looking to see if the Lab gets 50mg/kg and we get a 5 mg/kg or 10 mg/kg that would tell us something is drastically wrong. It is a systematic low. We could spend all kinds of energy to try to figure out why but in the end the Lab had a 2 ppm and we had a 1.7. It really doesn't matter.

Medeiros explained that this is one of the reasons multiple samples are taken. The decision to go no further with evaluation is not based on one sample, but on the six in each of these locations.

Member Conklin asked if there could there be a certain amount of methylation taking place here between June and August that could explain why you have the drop.

Medeiros said that's an unusual amount of loss due to methylation. We have the surface water samples that were collected, not exactly at these locations but they're bracketed, they're downstream of these locations. They didn't show a superbly high elevation in methylmercury in the surface water. There is an elevated methylmercury upstream of this but not downstream of the high sediment values. I don't think that would have escaped via methylation.

Member Hall said that in June of last year we didn't have any dry beds in the lake, or in the stream.

Medeiros said that was correct. There was plenty of water in both June and August.

Member Hall: And that number 15, (PR-SS-15) that's where the wood duck house is right near the border.

Medeiros: Very close to that. To follow back on Don's area that's an area that periodically goes dry during periods of low precipitation.

Member Hall commented that he was surprised at the difference between the two lab's results because when the Sportsman's Club has shared samples they were a lot closer in the final analysis.

Medeiros had no comments on what was causing the difference.

Member Jacobs asked how deep down were the samples?

Medeiros said the Lab cleaned up on average nine inches of sediment. Following that confirmation samples of the top six inches were taken. The samples were collected in the same way, a core of about the top six inches of the sediment. That would be the area where the most elevated measurements would be found.

Medeiros said that additional monitoring confirmed concentrations greater than the 2.0 mg/kg at three stations. Sampling will be conducted in June to define the limits of the elevated Mercury. The data will be reviewed with the EPA, DEC and SCDHS to evaluate what is being planned for future sampling.

Member Kaplan asked what would cause the need to do additional cleanup. He said at the first point here, there is almost no difference. I'm looking at the average of all five values; there's only one place where it goes from 1.9 mg/kg to 3.2 mg/kg. That's the middle point 15 (PR-SS-15). The other two points are right on. Andy said they're essentially the same. So if we're dealing with a 2 ppm goal, what is the trigger level here?

Medeiros said the Lab will have to work that out with the regulators when the distribution of the elevated concentrations is determined - how large an area it is and what the magnitude of it is. Are these numbers representative of what is found over a large area? I would expect that at that point there would be an evaluation based on potential health impacts and potential ecological impacts. He did not want to speculate further without all the information.

Member Kaplan asked what level would rouse the County's suspicion.

Rapiejko responded that he wouldn't even think of additional cleanup at this point. He would want to see what the extra data shows and thought that there would be a longer process. "You're not going to make a rash decision on one or two samples and say we've got to go back out and clean this." We've got to try to understand what's happening. The river is a lot different than it was a couple of years ago. The water levels have been really high since there was 14 inches of rain in October 2005 and haven't come down. The river is flooded where it really hasn't been flooded for a long time. Remember how dry it was when we were out there, it's a lot different river this year. He said he thinks that more sampling is needed to try to get an idea of what's happening. Is it just something that's flushing down or something that's coming from the banks? Something that's going to stay around and be a problem? It's way too early to even think about that.

Member Kaplan asked what were the numbers were before the cleanup began?

Medeiros said in the area of the 14 mg/kg was where the highest contamination was found before cleanup and that was on the order of 39 mg/kg.

Member Hall asked if that was by the gauge house.

Medeiros reported that it was downstream of the gauge house.

Reed clarified that these kinds of numbers generate additional sampling and analysis, but don't necessarily generate additional action. It depends upon what is discovered after everything, including other media, is looked at.

Medeiros said that was correct and that not only do other media play into this, but also this is the first year of sampling and we'll be looking for several years.

Medeiros said the Lab is required to monitor mercury and cesium-137 throughout the complete stretch of the river. Monitoring for PCB's in fish tissue is required on Laboratory property. This year they collected samples throughout the entire stretch of the Peconic River. The post-cleanup data was evaluated against the pre-cleanup data. The 1997 Remedial Investigation data was used to represent pre-cleanup conditions; that was the best year of sampling. The data was based on the analysis of the whole body of the fish.

Medeiros told the CAC the evaluation of 2006 data included the use of filets to enable the evaluation of potential human health risks because the EPA suggests monitoring potential human health risk through the use of an edible fillet.

The data for average mercury concentration in fish gathered in 2006 was presented in comparison with the data collected in 1997. Testing locations included North Street, Manor Road and Donohue's Pond. Medeiros noted the number of fish available for collection upstream of Donohue's Pond has decreased as compared to 2006. He was concerned about the low number of fish collected, but said there are simply not that many fish available. The data from Donohue's Pond evidenced a decrease from 1997. North Street showed a slight increase in concentration but a large decrease in the range of concentrations. Manor Road showed a slight increase of both.

Member Proios asked if the size and age of the fish was relatively the same for each set?

Medeiros said the fish were larger in 1997. We had measurements then but we don't have measurements for the 2006 data. I will tell you that they were smaller.

Member Chaudhry asked what the criteria was for choosing the size of a fish and if there wasn't some regulation that gave a range of the sizes that you could stay within.

Medeiros said the young of the year are not as insensitive to the collection equipment, which means they cannot be collected as readily as a more mature fish. So basically fish this size (Medeiros indicated) are difficult to collect. They are never the target. The equipment is intended for collecting larger fish. It would be inappropriate for us to be collecting those fish because of the impact it would have on the population. In fact, on Laboratory property, for the past ten years, there has been such a low population of fish that Tim Green has put a ban on collection onsite until the population has grown in size. That is characteristic of other sections upstream to Donohue's Pond but not to the same extent.

The Lab collects what it can in order to make the numbers, trying very hard not to impact the population by taking too many fish. Our target is five fish of two different trophic levels; five fish that are bottom feeders such as a Brown Bullhead or a White Sucker and five fish that are a top carnivore such as Chain Pickerel or a Large Mouth Bass. We haven't always been able to find that many fish and we've supplemented that in times with other carnivores, not quite as high, but that were available such as Bluegills.

Member Sprintzen asked for clarification on the number of fish in Donohue's Pond in 1997. Medeiros reported that 11 fish were caught in Donohue's Pond in 1997.

Member Jordan-Sweet asked Medeiros to explain the range of values? "Did you take more than one sample from each sample?"

Medeiros said yes. They're based on the number of analytical samples that there were. In some cases it represents a single fish where the fish was large enough to provide sufficient mass for analysis. And in other cases, it represents a single composite of several fish that were required to provide enough mass for analysis.

Member Jordan-Sweet said so you took whatever you had and divided it up into how many samples?

Medeiros explained that it was based on the requirement to get five if we can and there was not sufficient mass to do that. In 2006 they were tissue samples of individual fish, they were not composites. In 1997 we had whole body composites.

Member Corrarino asked if the concentrations in the fish were representative of the rest of the food chain concentrations.

Medeiros said fish would represent the maximum concentrations that one would find in the aquatic food chain. Consumers of fish that are not in the aquatic food chain would be birds, muskrats, and mink. We haven't measured them because of the difficulty in getting the quantity to do that and we haven't had an interest in anything other than the fish.

Member Corrarino asked if there was anything in the literature about this.

Medeiros said there is quite a bit in the literature about it however it is very variable depending the actual environment and habitat that it pertains to. A study done in Connecticut for instance would be very relevant for the same type of habitat but the Peconic River is not that type of habitat. That's the concern when you use comparisons like that.

Member Corrarino asked if it was fair to say that there were probably concentrations in other parts of the food chain but they just haven't been measured.

Medeiros said concentrations, yes, but he couldn't characterize whether it is a higher concentration than in the fish.

Member Garber said he thought it has been demonstrated that if the largest fish sample is taken that the remaining one will evolve to be not so large. It is a disaster in the fishing industry. Throwing back everything but the large fish, and it doesn't take many generations, so in the Peconic River I suspect in not too many years if not now, they'll be dwarf fish.

Medeiros said the PCB levels detected in 2006 were very low. He presented information that showed the maximum levels (4,400 – 4,600 ppb) before the cleanup in 1997 at North Street, Manor Road and Donohue's Pond have now been reduced to below the detection level. He said there is a very clear downsteam slope to the concentrations and explained how the non-detects were calculated. He commented that the PCBs look good but noted that it is necessary to continue to monitor onsite for PCB's but not offsite.

Medeiros told the CAC that cesium-137 is represented as pCi/g of fish tissue. He said it had not always been possible to obtain sufficient sampling mass to test for cesium-137 because of the low number of fish and the high sample mass required. While there were samples at North Street in 1997, there were none in 2006. In 1997 there were no samples at Manor Road, yet in

2006 samples were obtained. Samples were obtained at Donohue's Pond for both testing periods. In 1997, the cesium-137 level was 1.27 pCi/g. In 2006, the detection level had been reduced to 0.18 pCi/g. Medeiros said the cesium-137 had reduced substantially, based on the sample obtained at Donohue's Pond.

Medeiros said the data shows that several years are needed to determine the effects of the clean up on the amount of contamination in the fish. It takes time for the fish to eliminate the contaminants in them or to be replaced by younger fish that reflect what is currently in the environment. The 2006 average mercury concentrations are about the same as the pre-cleanup. The average for all fish collected between North Street and Donohue's Pond is about 0.3 mg/kg, which is the EPA health criterion for fish. Medeiros said it is still too early to determine the cleanup effectiveness, but there has been a substantial reduction in concentrations of PCB's and cesium-137 in the fish. He indicated that better control of releases may be a contributing factor to this.

Member Proios asked if anyone has analyzed the air samples that have been taken on site for other programs?

Medeiros said there have been recent measurements and asked Tim Green to explain further.

Green explained that the Lab has just started looking at atmospheric deposition and one set of samples was obtained in January from rainfall. The atmospheric deposition that we measured was 0.7 nanograms/L (ng/L) at two different locations.

Medeiros told the CAC to keep that number in mind for next month when he shares the concentrations of mercury in surface water. There are locations that are not much different.

Member Kaplan asked if there is any data on similar substances for fish from the other rivers on Long Island, like the Connetquot.

Medeiros said there is very little data. The Peconic River is the most intensely sampled river on Long Island. The Lab also collects samples downstream of Donohue's Pond and Forge Pond. Samples are also collected in the Yaphank River.

Green added that the lower Carman's River is utilized in the Lab's surveillance monitoring. We take fish samples there when we can and analyze them for the same things; mercury, PCBs, pesticides and heavy metals. Typically, mercury levels in the Yaphank lower lake are a bit lower than the Peconic River and he couldn't recall ever detecting PCBs.

Member Corrarino asked if a baseline study of all four rivers had been done in 97'?

Medeiros said that samples were collected from other areas such as Sandy Pond. but did not recall the date on the other locations. He said the bottom line is the Lab does not have any indication that the contamination in the river was caused by anything other than the Laboratory. It may have been augmented by other sources but most likely the principal cause was Lab releases.

Member Hall commented that the Peconic River could not be compared with the Nissequogue, Connetquot and the Carman's because fish in them are coldwater fish whereas the Peconic River has no coldwater fish at all, it's all warmwater fish.

Green said that was correct, but similar species are utilized. They use pickerel and largemouth bass and sunfish from the Lower Lake. Even though it's coldwater, it's the same species of fish so they can be compared.

Medeiros said that other things that complicate strict comparison between different bodies of water is the size of the watershed which would be collecting contamination and filtering it into that body of water, the various environmental aspects that control Ph and the dissolved oxygen concentrations, all influence methylization.

Member Garber commented that there's a place called Foundry Cove, which is intensely polluted with cadmium from a battery factory. People went in and studied the benthic community and it turns out it's just thriving, it's great. It's a super toxic atmosphere but people have found out if you start ramping up the pollution, the benthic community, in all its facets, adapts. And then survives as long as you don't turn off the pollution. So, if you characterize something by the vibrancy and the diversity of the benthic sample, it just doesn't mean anything. So I'm glad we're sampling extremely small concentrations.

Member Guthy asked if the sections of the river between the cleanup areas were not cleaned up because there was no pollution there or because you couldn't get to it.

Medeiros said that the lines were drawn for the cleanup from an extremely extensive survey network that included extensive sampling. Transects were set up every hundred feet or so and up to ten samples, going from the highlands on the right side of the bank, cross the middle, to the highlands on the other side, were taken. The lines for what should be cleaned up and what shouldn't, were drawn from excellent data.

Medeiros told the CAC that BNL will evaluate removal of a sediment trap to facilitate flow and upstream fish passage. It is thought that barriers to flow may lower dissolved oxygen levels and effect the fish populations. Also, sampling will occur in late spring to increase the sampling yield.

Member Anker asked why all the samples aren't taken at the same time.

Medeiros responded that the basic reason was because the Lab has a limited collection staff. He also explained that you don't want to be in the river, collecting sediment or doing things that disturb the bottom when surface water samples are being collected because suspending sediment could distort the measurement of what's actually in the surface water.

Member Anker asked if there is still a threat of mercury for the people that fish in the water. She asked if it was into a park area and if Suffolk County did any monitoring.

Medeiros said that neighbors have reported that they've seen fishing but he has never witnessed it even though he's run along North Street and ridden his bicycle to and from the Lab by way of North Street. He has seen fishing line in the trees, but said that it's not an intensely fished area. There's not enough fish there to support an intense fishing area.

Member Hall thanked Medeiros for giving him the opportunity to sit down and discuss the numbers. He asked if it would be possible to take more than one sample from other locations next time the sampling is done.

Medeiros indicated that was possible.

5. Community Comment

Member Kaplan introduced Dennis Ryan, a participant in the Lab's Environmental and Waste Management Master's Degree Program. Mr. Ryan is currently working on his Master's thesis and chose "Community Involvement in the BGRR and HFBR in the Decision-making Process" as his subject. To augment his research, Ryan asked the CAC members to participate in a survey to provide feedback regarding their impressions and opinions related to their involvement in the decision-making process. Packets containing background information and the surveys

were distributed to the members to complete and return to him by mail. Ryan thanked the CAC for their participation.

6. CAC discussion on questions posed by the Pine Barrens Society at the January 2007 Meeting (continued from February)

Reed suggested that the CAC begin with two of the topics that were brought up at the last meeting. He said continuing to examining yourself and talk about the topics was more than one night's work. Composition and committees, especially the agenda setting committee, were the topics that he recommended be discussed during this meeting then we can see what you also want to do and talk about for future meetings. He said that Member Kaplan had requested the opportunity to make some comments based last month's transcript. We'll do that and then we'll dig into our topics.

Member Kaplan: Thank you very much. I've put some words together, just after reading those minutes; there were just so many thoughts that went through my head. Unfortunately, as Reed said, I wasn't able to be here last month and I felt even worse when I saw the depth of discussion that you all had in addressing the questions that were put to us. The comments and suggestions that I read in our minutes were very impressive; especially considering the circumstances under which we were born, the CAC was born. The nature of our individual organizations especially in my opinion, the disbelief and skepticism that so many of us brought to the table when we first met. What surprised me most were typical comments like Adrienne's that BNL was so forthcoming, that our mission is good and clear and important. Rita observed that our relationship and perhaps that of the press with BNL was a bit on the chummy side. And what several others said was that we've become too complacent and need to be proactive. I wholeheartedly agree with Reed's statement that the window of scrutiny into BNL is good for the community and good for BNL. Jean Mannhaupt's observation about the dynamics of how we operate and go forward, for example, she gave an example of nanotechnology; environmental safety and health issues. A perfect example of something we need to focus on, especially given the Lab's plans in this area that we've heard about. I might add that another one of our BNL students is actually addressing this in her Master's thesis. So I'd like to add a few personal observations that I would have made if I were here last week. First, given the manner in which we've been accepting new members into our group, I don't believe that the composition needs to be changed. But I do think we need to make our existence better known to the various communities that are out there, that might be interested in joining us. That I think is, in some way we can handle that area. Second, our charter says that "No less than annually the Laboratory will provide the CAC with a list of pending issues or upcoming decisions that could be of interest to the CAC." I don't believe that this has happened in any formal way. The procedure that we've been following is more ad hoc and I think we should return to that vision. This relates strongly to what Mary Joan Shea said last month. Mary Joan thought that we didn't hear from regulators on particular issues until after decisions had been made and we need to have longer lead times for our deliberations. This can happen if the Lab provides us with pending issues on a timelier, periodic basis. Lastly, I fully agree with David and Adrienne's suggestions to have BNL and CAC sponsor a community lecture series, particularly as David said at venues away from the Laboratory. Fortunately, I believe the Lab and Department of Energy (DOE) demonstrated their commitment to be better neighbors, in almost every sense of the word. And moreover that we've come to recognize the expertise and commitment of the scientists and non-scientists here and the many ways in which their contributions benefit not only Long Islanders but just about everybody anywhere. So in answer to Dick Amper's third question, an important change in the CAC process could be strong outreach, so that we make efforts to various communities to widen the two-way window of scrutiny that we mentioned and make it an instrument whereby local citizens can become proud of the Lab. Thank you.

Member Guthy: I just wanted to speak; I just realized I could do that since I wasn't here either. I wanted to mention how much also I appreciated the minutes because as I was reading them I

was feeling like I was right there hearing everybody's opinions going back and forth. As Ed said, they were very in depth. I mean really, initially when these questions came out, I had no idea what we could possibly need to talk about. But as I read everybody's opinions and suggestions and ideas, I see where everybody was going and how really important this could be. But one question that keeps coming up is "What happened in the past and how it started." Now, I have some information I dug up from 1998. It has the report of the Brookhaven Executive Roundtable (BER), the background, and the methodology. It has everything in it - the results of the people that were polled, the conclusions, and the comments from some of the groups. Just to let you know, initially, we mailed out 1,469 surveys to groups or individuals belonging to one of 36 categories. I have the categories they were sent to and some of the comments they sent back. If anybody is interested in this I have the actual questionnaire that went out and those that responded. Out of all those mailings, I think we have 35 categories; some came back as faxes, some were mailed; the numbers were ridiculous. That's why people keep saying, they thought people would be running to our door to come and join us. We couldn't drag them in at the time. If anybody does want more information or to see the lists that we had from the past you can have them.

Reed asked the CAC if it was okay to talk about composition for a few minutes, first. One of the things that you came to, I believe, was a conclusion during your discussion last time, was that the composition is basically okay the way it was set up originally; that the issue in front of you is that you have seven open positions that aren't filled and to move forward appropriately you need to make sure those get filled with individuals who will be dedicated and add fresh insight to the group in making sure you have the balance that you want on perspectives. That's what I remember taking away from the discussion last time. I think one thing that is in front of us is to figure out how this group can recruit in order to fill those positions.

Member Sprintzen: I thought Ed said it very well just a moment ago and Reed put it slightly differently. I don't think there is any need to fill those positions, it's not something that ... I think that we need to reach out in such a way that if there are people out there, or organizations or constituencies that want to be involved and are prepared to make that commitment we certainly want to have them. But there is no reason why we need to go and do something. There's nothing magic about those numbers or positions, they're just numbers. The question is, do people here know of individuals or groups that would want to make this kind of commitment? I mean you're talking about commitment. You're coming here basically regularly over a period of time and is there a systematic way where we can reach out in a constructive fashion without going crazy about it? But I mean it seems to me there's no need for us to do that, to somehow fill those positions. I think we're doing quite well with the numbers we have. But if we know people out there who should be involved, let's try and find them.

Member Giacomaro: If I recall correctly I think we had, in the beginning, before the CAC, when we were looking for people to get involved, we put an ad in the local papers, as well as sending out a mailing. I don't believe it costs anything to put in the papers. You send it out as a press release and then as long as you are going to continue to do it, if we want to have something like that on a continuing basis for every month, the newspapers will just put it as part of their printing. So if anybody sees it, the door is open for them to come and respond.

Reed: So you're suggesting do a press release saying that there are positions open and if anybody's interested, come on down.

Member Garber: Related to this topic, in the last issue of the Civic Sentinel which is the Associated Brookhaven Civic Organizations (ABCO) publication that goes to the Civic Associations in Brookhaven and elected officials, I wrote an article about an earlier CAC meeting; what we did, and characterized it, to make sure people know about the existence of the CAC. I think if each of the people here representing constituent groups would publicize the

role of the CAC so people would know we're here, then we might get more attention and possibly get volunteers who might be interested. They'd know we're here and would find us.

Member Hall: Here's where I lose all my friends. There are soon going to be eight openings because the Peconic River Sportsman's Club is considering leaving. The reason why we're considering leaving is we joined this group for environmental purposes. I represent 800 members of the Peconic River Sportsman's Club. We send out a newsletter every month. I have had nothing to report. For example, last month, I couldn't report anything. My view is if I wanted to come to this I would have signed up for an adult education course. I don't think this is what I joined the CAC for. I had some issues in my organization, where I had employees that lived on the property. I have a manager who lost his wife in her late 30's. I have a young girl, age 14; her leg will not heal after it broke. I have another person that lives on the property that has a growth on his neck, last November he was operated on. The doctor can't explain why it happened. These are my concerns. I don't care about the Big Bang Theory. I don't care about...and I don't mean... the Director was fantastic, he kept my interest, but I'm not interested in that. I would go to an adult education class. I already have my Master's Degree. I really don't need any more education than what I've got. But I've got to learn what's happening environmentally, here, and to my property, which I control. My new president took over on January 1st and gave me six months. I'm to evaluate it in six months and then we're out. That's our feeling about this.

Reed asked Member Hall if his issue was that there are no environmental issues or they're not being addressed by the Lab?

Member Hall: They're not being addressed.

Member Amper: Well John don't go. I share your concerns. Part of the reason we raised some of these questions is to find...we're not looking at the things we were looking at a couple years ago. A lot of them have been resolved. But, that was the reason we came and I think we do have to continue to look at those things. I think that needs to be part of the agenda and I don't share David's assessment that we don't necessarily need to fill those positions. I absolutely agree with the consensus that you describe that we reached that it's not that the structure is flawed or the relative balance or the composition was part of any design flaw. But we don't have environmental folks and the more I thought about it, and that's why I'm asking you to be patient with this process. I think it's the responsibility of some of us in the environmental movement to fill those vacancies ourselves, to go out and do some outreach to identify people who really care about the environment, which is part of how Sarah got here, and to say, "Hey, we know people who do care about this and we'll want to move the agenda." I've not had a case where the Lab declined to put something on the agenda that anybody asked them to. I don't think that there are any issues that we've raised that they said, "We don't want to talk about that." It's not our position that the Lab won't talk about what we're interested in or isn't as focused on the environment as it ought to be. I don't know what all those issues are. I think there are continued community concerns that ought to be addressed. Maybe we need to be more proactive in bringing them up or helping to set the agenda. Remember, the Lab doesn't tell us what we're going to do. We have complete control over the agenda. That's always been the case. But I do think that less and less of the time that we are spending deals with what it is we were convened to do in the first place. I'm trying to figure out in the period of time, in what I consider to have been a very thoughtful conversation that was conducted last time out, with a lot of very valuable input. You know what increasingly came to me is that what needs to be done needs to be done by the membership here. If there is not a proper representation and we're not doing as much about the environment as we used to, whose fault is that? It's not the Lab saying they are unwilling to do that. It may be... I mean the Society certainly wants to take some affirmative action to go out and talk to those people that are interested in these issues and share the concerns that you and I share. But I don't think there's anything about the CAC or about the Lab's management of the CAC that is preventing our doing that. It's just we began to look at one problem after another. We've made recommendations, the Lab set about to correct

problems and so forth. So clearly, the agenda is different from what it was in the beginning. But I agree that we ought to be spending more time on the reasons for which we were convened. I think that's just going to require our doing more. This is a community advisory committee and I think it really depends on our taking some initiative. At the end of the day I sort of thought, well we are doing a sort of self-examination; a self-assessment and I think it's valuable. I didn't hear anybody say I don't want to talk about the environment any more. I certainly don't think anybody is saying we shouldn't hear presentations from the Lab; they're very interesting, they're just different in preponderance or the percentage of our time than it was before. If we want to deal with the environment more then I think it's our obligation to bring people in who are willing to do that and to help raise the issues and ask the questions that the Lab in turn could respond to. That's what this was represented to be and I don't think it's on the Lab to do that. I think it's on us to do it. To some extent I think the Pine Barrens Society and maybe your group needs to do more rather than just to expect that it's going to land on us. I hope you stay. We're going to stay and we're going to try and find other people who think the same way. If we need to spend more time talking about environment and health, then I'm sure the Lab would be perfectly happy for us to do that.

Reed asked the CAC to focus on the membership issue. He was hearing ideas about how to do outreach in general to make people aware if they want to come in, and then how to be more active so that different interests go out and recruit according to the interests that need to be represented. He asked that they continue that discussion and also move on to the issues part of it, which is about setting agendas.

Member Anker: I agree with Dick. I think I never got a packet of why this organization, or committee or council was formed. I think a lot has to do with what has happened in the past, the remediation of the issues and the projects that are going on, but also to look at what's going on right now. An example is nanotechnology. Are we comfortable with that? Can we make sure that the Lab doesn't make mistakes that we might not feel... we may feel uncomfortable about? I think that's another reason why we're here. I do feel though, again I brought this up last time, that this is going towards the agenda but I think we need an overview of everything that's going on at the Lab so people can feel comfortable as far as what's going on when we do bring those new members in. I think that's important too. Again, I think it's oversight of the past and it's oversight of what's happening now and also the future. That's probably reaching toward agenda.

Member Proios: John, I'm sorry too that you don't feel like you're getting as much out of this. I know that we've gone to different topics but I think tonight is an example, probably because of the stuff you are interested in. Between you and Bob Conklin, you have the most information about how the river is being impacted. Having looked at the Site Environmental Reports over the last 20 years, they have changed dramatically. I can show you one from 20 years ago. It had a real paucity of information and now you get encyclopedias in terms of what's coming out. And you look at the type of data here and a lot of this stuff is because we've asked for it. Skip Medeiros has gone through this so many times. He'd revise and revise and revise the same report because of all the questions and things that we were asking him to do, making it into a much better report. So we've had a good impact on it. Based on this, I'm just trying to get a better understanding of what you would like to see. Is there something that you feel is missing that he hasn't included?

Member Hall: No, definitely not. Tonight what was presented to us is what I'm here for. Not for what happened last month and the month before that. I don't care about all what's going on. I care about the environment and how it affects us on the outside. What Skip has done, I mean Skip broke down...Brookhaven National Lab has come to our property since 1997, to take samples. Suffolk County Department of Health Services (SCDHS) takes samples. We kept all the information we got from the Department of Health. We never got anything from Brookhaven Lab. We started to get a little curious. We met Skip, we sat down with him, and he showed us

everything. He took samples from our property and he showed us the results right away. And then we did surprise him once. He came out and took samples from our property, we had our lab there and we split the samples. Not that we didn't trust the Lab but we wanted to be sure what we were being told was the truth. That's what I'm interested in and I keep saying this but I'm not really interested in what happened in last months' meeting. If I wanted that I would go to an adult education course or I would go back to college. I think I'm too old for that right now.

Reed clarified that Member Hall was looking to identify and work on environmental and public health issues.

Member Hall: That's correct.

Member Chaudhry: I was not here last month and I missed participating in this discussion. I think it was wonderful. I really enjoyed it a lot. I want to say at the outset, my personal feelings at this time. In the last two years I have been involved with this, I have learned more than I have contributed, really. I find it wonderful. I must admit that the Lab has provided a wonderful forum for people to learn. They are forthcoming. They bring issues to the table, educate us first, and then help us follow our minds to be able to make some commentary from our backgrounds. I will go to this question about, "Has the mission of the CAC changed?" I think the mission is going well and I don't find any need to change the mission. Of course I believe that there's always room for improvement. Any idea that comes to mind, people or CAC members are free to bring it to the table and I believe the Lab will be responsive to accept the idea. I do have a couple of small things in mind, which I will point out. I just want to, before I forget, expand on Richard's comments, he really spoke very well. That really it's up to us, the CAC members to be able to understand the issues well, by spending our own time and effort, and then be able to point out views positively. So we have to help ourselves. By getting a good grasp of the issues and then make our comments and be able to sort of set a response that is satisfactory. It's more our effort than any gap in the Laboratory. I think they are doing adequately already. I don't see any big deficits here but what came to my mind and it's like a question also, if we don't understand something very well, with the time being limited here during the meeting, are we able to call or contact the particular presenter of this subject in the meeting to be able to see and meet with the person one to one on our own time a mutually convenient time, to be able to clarify some issues we were not able to either really understand or if we want to have a little bit more expanded discussion on the subject?

Reed: That's happened frequently throughout the history of the CAC and a number of members have taken advantage of that sort of thing. I would direct you to Jeanne D'Ascoli or to Sherry Johnson or to Kathy Geiger in Jeanne's absence, to be directed to the right person if you have a specific comment or questions you'd like to follow up with.

Member Chaudhry: Because I never really thought of venturing into taking up the time of the Lab people if I need an answer in certain cases. The other thing I want to bring for the information of the committee is there are some groups who are representing some constituents and there are others, if not many, who don't seem to have a particular constituency and I am one of them. I'm supposed to be representing Science and Technology and I keep asking myself, "Who do I represent?" I believe I'm not representing any group and I'm not obliged to report to any group. Of course I'm an engineer by background and I've worked on the design and construction of nuclear power plants. I know a reasonable amount about hydrology and sampling all these things and I also deal very much with regulatory issues and environmental aspects. For example before we designed a nuclear power plant, we virtually took two years to interact with these regulatory agencies getting permits for design, permits for construction, engineers wrote books for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). That is the way I am able to contribute and also am able to understand what you are presenting, so it's helpful. I am involved with a number of organizations, which are not really locally based here, for example I'm involved with the National Society of Professional Engineers. That is an organization, which is

on a national level, also there are New York State chapters. I am involved with the American Foreign Service Association. I worked for the State Department Foreign Service so I go to the meetings and we sometimes bring our issues to the Hill. So in casual situations I am able to tell them what the CAC is and how good or bad their function is. So unofficially I spread the word. In many cases, people may not be aware they have been wrongly informed of the situation, some people have made comments to me like, at the outset "The Lab is a bad boy, the Lab spreads so much pollution. It's very, very dangerous. People are afraid to live around there." And with what I learn here I'm always able to quell their thoughts, quell their impressions, and I sincerely believe in that and that's very useful. That was what I wanted to share. But my question maybe again is I do not represent a constituency, that's the case.

Reed explained that there are some members on the CAC that represent specific organizations and others that represent a particular knowledge base or interest. Everybody is on the CAC because they represent a different interest or perspective that's coming in from the community. Some of those are associated with organizations and some of them aren't but they're all about getting a mix of perspectives. And yours is an example of one of the perspectives that the CAC wishes to have.

Member Sprintzen: We have a series of different concerns and interests and I think Richard is absolutely correct that usually it is up to us, if we have issues of concern that we want addressed, to raise them. I've never seen an occasion where our concerns have not been responded to by BNL; they are then put on the agenda or they've not made available the material we have requested. So if John has concerns or feels there should be issues addressed that are not being addressed, he really ought to raise them. But I do not particularly share that more limited view. I see the role of the CAC as wider, in terms of the involvement of BNL in the community on Long Island. I think Sarah was right in talking about understanding the range of issues that are talking place here at the Lab. Understanding their impact, their economic impact, as well as their environmental, health, and safety impact and as well as their capacity to play a role in the community. That's why Adrienne and I were in agreement as Ed mentioned, to urge BNL to take the show on the road. We did that specifically around the pollution prevention stuff. We just began that. I think there's much more to be done. It's extremely important to me for my organization, we were really here at the very beginning with Helga and in fact that survey, which Helga referred to was actually coordinated by Judy Pannullo, who at that time represented the LIPC (Long Island Progressive Coalition). I was her alternate. It is extremely important for our purposes that the role and function of the CAC not be limited solely to health and safety, though I think that's important. If there are people here who think there are issues, they should raise them. It was in fact I who pushed Dr. Aronson to make a presentation; I was glad and excited by it. I found the meeting last month fascinating and interesting and I certainly would hate to see a situation where somehow we were lobotomized of the capacity of understanding those kinds of activities that are involved. Same with nanoscience, same with the kind of stuff that Stephen Dewey was doing with respect to studies of the brain and the effect of chemicals and drugs. So I hope that we will not narrow our vision to that specific thing. If John feels that's too limiting for him, that's unfortunate. I would hope he would stay, I agree with Richard, I would urge you to stay, I think you have a lot to bring and I hope you will participate. But I certainly would not want us to belong to the condition that was so narrow and limited that we couldn't address a wider range of issues and get better input from BNL and have a wider input into BNL.

Member Guthy: To get back to the membership please, and also some of Sarah's question when she said why this group was formed in the first place. The main reason I believe it was formed is because there was so much mistrust and lack of information. We were being told things by some groups and organizations that scared a lot of people. It turned out most of it wasn't even true. There was no direct information from the Lab to communities. That's why it got started. And that's why we didn't limit it to any few groups of people. I could tell you if I read you some of these things. We sent to anybody and everybody who could be impacted by anything near the Lab or around the Lab because that was the fear at the time that the Lab was

doing these strange things and everybody was going to die. We included tourism, Leisure Village seniors, fire districts, real estate, Long Island Geologists Association, legal profession, the Pine Barrens Commission, local governments, water purveyors, regulatory agencies, organized labor, fisheries, agriculture, and children's advocacy groups. I mean it was not an environmental...or kind of a... It didn't start out that way, if that's what you want to go back to. It was anybody that lived in this community or on Long Island and had an interest in what was going on at the Lab so we'd get direct information of what they were doing and pass it on to our neighbors. And if there were any problems or fears our neighbors had, we were to come here and find out the truth and get back with whatever it was. Like David said right now, to me, it has changed a little bit because a lot of the clean up is either done or ongoing. But I think the Lab is doing such great things. But still, with nanoscience and all that, most of the people haven't even heard of that yet. I'd like to see the community be informed about these things that are going on here and share the information with them. And also have it help us in whatever way it can, whether it's environmentally or in just our quality of life. To get what they're doing in here out to us as quickly as possible and have us use whatever they've learned.

Member Jordan-Sweet: I want to support what David said. While I do agree that the environmental impact of the Lab is probably the most important thing for us to grasp, the Lab is a lot more than just environmental impact. The more we can understand the whole package the better off we are and the better we can operate and obtain our goals. Plus the more that the surrounding communities understand about the entire package the better off they'll be also. We do set the agenda, so if there are environmental issues that we want to have addressed it is certainly up to us to bring them forward. The other thing I wanted to mention was since we get the agenda a week before the meeting if environmental issues aren't on it that month, it is certainly up to the members if they want to attend that month's meeting or not. The other thing I wanted to say was that I agree that having a wide range of expertise of the community is very important. It's not just representing a constituency but having this wide range of expertise available to all of us.

Member Corrarino: I agree with what Helga said regarding our composition. I see our role as being advisory to the Lab, not from one perspective. Perhaps one of the reasons we were formed was that, I think inside the Lab there was more of a one-perspective approach to things. I think that since we've been working with the Lab over these years that a tremendous amount of progress has been made in connecting the community with the Lab. Not just the kinds of knowledge that was going on inside the Lab but the communications, which are important. I agree with Helga that the community is not just the people interested in the environment. It's scientists, it's people who live around here, people from different institutions within our community, colleges. One thing I would recommend about membership is we have a community right next door to the Lab that's comprised primarily of ethnic minorities and yet not one of them is represented here. I'm not blaming us but I think that we should consider reaching out to some other members who are amongst us. The other thing I want to say is that I think there is a lot of strength in the mixture that we bring to the table and the different perspectives. And John for me, I can't change your mind, you can make your own decisions, but for me this is kind of like going to church in the sense that some days it's very interesting and I'm very engaged and there are some days when I'm totally bored and I say, why did I get up out of bed this morning to do this? I think that we have to keep...for me it's a longer perspective. We're working with big bureaucracies, several of them layered here in the Lab. And I think it's amazing we've gotten anything accomplished. So I just offer that perspective that sometimes taking the long view, for me, is helpful in affecting change.

Member Giacomaro: The Lab and scientists make the best decisions they possibly can with the data they have at the time. So why did we have contamination and why did we need clean up? The Lab didn't become God and now has the knowledge for anything that's coming on in the future, so if anything that's going to take place, or anything that the Lab is going to be doing like nanoscience. They were doing radiation research for space travel. How do we know those things won't affect the environment and what goes on now? And what questions you may have

to bring up for the research that they are doing so that can be stopped or to make scientists just think for a moment about the public, about the people who are around it. So I think it's very important for us to still be part of it and continue with everything and know everything that's going on so we have some insight or input to the Laboratory personnel so they give us some thought. Give us some feeling about what they're doing and just stop and think for a second. Maybe you might be avoiding some contamination and clean up further on down the road.

Member Lynch: I hear people talking about who belongs here. I look around the room and I see a lot of good organizations and I'm sitting here with a dog. For years I was trying to figure out what we were doing here. I didn't realize you invited the Fire Departments and stuff like that. I don't think you should leave either. I don't know you but groups like this need guys like you. That being said, I think a majority of the stuff we should cover should be the environmental effects. I've learned a lot of good stuff here but I sometimes sit here and wonder what does this have to do with what we're supposed to be doing? A lot of times I find the agenda goes way over what it was supposed to be. Maybe we could get things a little more pertinent to what we're supposed to be doing; but the face of the world is changing. It's not all environmental. I kind of wonder why I sit here as the only emergency service group. I see BNL has electricians, I don't know why BNL doesn't have their Fire Department here. Why isn't the Police Department represented because things that we would address...and I know how they mitigate things, they work with the county very closely; but I don't know if a lot of you know how... A couple of months ago we talked about terrorism. I heard the word terrorism come up many times. And I looked around the room and I said, "Does anybody really know what they're going to do and what's being done?" I do. But maybe those types of topics could be done. I still think the majority of it needs to be environmental. It also seems to me that every month we keep hearing about the same things and a lot of these things are going to take a long, long time to fix, so why do we have to hear them every month? This is my opinion after being here two years. I wasn't here in the beginning. I often wondered why, like I said, we were here, fire rescue. I can find a niche in here...

Member Graves: John, I just want to warn you about the letter writers in this room. I want to say that I think that BNL and this group have benefited greatly from the knowledge of the Peconic River Sportsman's Club and if I had questions about the Peconic River, at this point there are probably three places I'd go, BNL, Suffolk County Department of Health Services, and the Peconic River Sportsman's Club. Every organization has limited resources and they have to decide how they are going to allocate those resources. I want to say, maybe it's not an either or decision. Maybe your organization wants to take a little while, you look at the agenda, if there's something pertinent, you attend. You don't necessarily have to attend every single meeting to be a member of the group. That's not something we've discussed but I think everybody here has missed a few meetings, maybe they had a conflict or maybe they looked at that agenda and said, "This doesn't effect my organization." So I just throw that out at you to bring back to your organization. Maybe you don't have to make a decision right now. I thought it was very interesting interplay between you and Skip when Skip was finishing up his presentation and you said, "Hey, Skip, could you do some additional sampling and he said absolutely, we'll talk." Well, that's a great relationship that you have. And you can have that outside of the BNL CAC but it probably arose to some degree because of your participation in the CAC and that's something you can bring back to your organization too.

Member Amper: I'm with the folks who remember this as being in response.... we raised a lot of questions about things that were going on....no I want to make that very clear. Representatives of the Department of Energy (DOE) came to me on their own initiative from Hanford and said, "This is what we do when we run into problems, when the community does not understand what we're doing and needs to understand and needs to be a partner in what we have to do environmentally and in health, and we want to create a CAC and who are the kinds of people that should be on it." That happened. That's how we got involved and that's how we have an understanding with the management here, that when those issues came up and we needed to

be here we would be here; that we'd have a bunch of other things that we'd have to address. But that when these health and environmental issues came up and all you had to do is say this is an important issue and by gosh we were going to be here. I think we ought to do that. I do think that John, you and I, and Sarah and Kasey and other folks for whom that's a priority have the obligation to take affirmative action. When we needed to increase funding to clean up the Lab at an accelerated rate, Senator Schumer did not come to us. Governor Richardson, when he was the Secretary of Energy, did not come to us. This group said, "Hey, let's join with this Lab and with the DOE and with our Congressional delegation and let's make this thing happen." I felt really good about it. I thought that, boy I'll tell you, if there's anything we can look back and feel good about it's that the community joined with its government and said, "It's our problem now, we're going to address the problem head-on." The way this Lab has responded to some of the clean-up issues I think is very positive. I for one am making a commitment, and I am going to have conversations with others for whom the environment...we're not saying, David or Jane or anybody else here, that we don't think that there's anything else going on at the Lab that matters to the community. We're saying that a lot of us are here for that reason and that's how this thing began. But at the same time, I'm asking the Lab to look and say okay, as they have on many occasions, hey, we had an accident, we had a spill out in the...we'd like to tell you about that if there's health incidents that are occurring that can be reported. One of the things that the Lab committed to doing was to changing procedures around here so as not to have the kind of problems in the future. How are they working? So I think the Lab and the members of the CAC can both say, "What are we doing? How are we doing, are we making progress?" We would like to think that some of the things that caused the problems that raised concern and brought us all here are less likely to happen because of what we're doing. Let's hear about that progress. Are there other national laboratories that are dealing with some of the kinds of problems we've dealt with? Are they succeeding in the same way? Do we have anything to learn from them? We're building the agenda but the Lab can build the agenda too. I'm just saying the best stuff that we've done, in my opinion, apart from being very well educated, having a much better sense of what this Lab does today, and I think that's valuable for the Lab and for the community; one of the best things that ever happened was that the people of the community were represented. They came in here, they worked with the people who were facing problems and concerns and accomplished an enormous amount. I don't think we're done with that job and I think that has to be a continued front priority. It's not everything but it needs to be, in my judgment, more of a priority today than it's been recently. That's all.

Member Garber: Are we moving to agenda and topics?

Reed: Yes we are moving to agenda and topics. Do you want to talk on that?

Member Garber: Yes.

Reed: Last time you talked about the possibility of becoming more proactive as a group about setting your agenda. It is true that over the last months and year or two it's gone more and more frequently to the Laboratory to set the agenda, partly because the issues have been there and partly because it's just kind of drifted that way too. One thing you talked about last month was the potential for setting up an agenda setting committee in which the CAC would set its own agendas every month with participation from the Laboratory and be more formal about it. I think you've got a couple of choices. I think you can either bring topics to our agenda setting session that we do at the end of the meeting or you can establish such a committee to work agenda items and set them on your behalf. Those are two options that you have that we identified last month.

Member Garber: Speaking about agendas first, I'd like to also second, John, I'd hate to see you go, mainly because you've added a considerable amount to this committee. And to Don, we had, I think, almost an entire session having to do with emergency services coordinating the controlled burns and the training programs that were going on in the Lab. But with regards to

agenda, something that I've actually brought up in the past, I think probably, one of the major environmental problems befalling Long Island, ironically, is overpopulation of deer. It isn't that bad on this part of the Island, but further out, when the deer get hungry, they will first eat everything on the ground, then they will start eating the tree bark., The eco-system is completely destroyed, all the animals that normally gain shelter, they die. Ultimately deer start dying. You are left with a landscape devoid of undergrowth, devoid of trees. This has happened out further on the Island and it's coming further in. I think the Lab is in a great position to take leadership on that and the main reason is because of the CAC. Because a movie called *Bambi* was made, there are a lot of people that are opposed to doing what needs to be done with deer. And if the Lab could work with the CAC, it's such a diverse group, and come up with solutions that the CAC by consensus could support, they could start controlling the population on the Lab property and it could be an important environmental model, for not only Long Island because out-of-control deer are a problem elsewhere. So I think it's really an environmental problem and it's a political problem. The combination of the Lab and the CAC might be able to address and accomplish something. So that is my pitch.

Member Anker: Following what you said, that was brought up at Senator Ken LaValle's Environmental Roundtable and it was by ...who brought up the deer...the Farm Bureau. And also the DEC (Department of Conservation) and also a bunch of others. And so relating to that, I would like to see projects or issues that BNL is working on or could work on that affects us locally, like the deer. I was at DEC's remediation meeting on the RCA property last night and there's concern that there are 55 gallon barrels buried illegally on 5,100 acres and the DEC said they measure with metal detectors and it only goes five feet. Again, what I would like to see is, this is a scientific community right here, between BNL and Stony Brook, again, I think there is a lot of networking that can be made. Even with Anthony and the stewardship program, again, I would like to see more projects related to community.

Member Proios: I have two suggestions for projects. One is that list that Helga spoke about with all the names; that came from a book called the Suffolk County Source Book. It had everything from garden clubs to yacht clubs. But I think it would be useful; I've seen a few other CAC's at the other Labs put out an annual newsletter to tell people what they've done. It might be useful for us to work on a newsletter as a project and then to send it out to all those same people again and maybe peak their interest. Now at least we can tell them what we've been doing, what's happened over time and at least it would be something for us as a way to give a presentation to everyone, including elected officials too, exactly what's going on. I think there is a lack of interest even on the County Legislature then there used to be years ago. So I think it would be a useful project. Aside from that, something that Dick mentioned in terms of finding out what everybody else is doing. That is something that initially we talked about and that is forming a FACA (Federal Advisory Committee Act) group, a Federal Advisory Committee, and I've looked at a couple of sites like Oakridge and they had a press release that they added a new member to their CAC and it was a big deal. I've always wondered, especially tonight after Skip's presentation. Savannah River is on a river, Oakridge is on a river, and how they deal with contaminated sediments and is there something to learn from what's going on at other facilities? So we have other national laboratories that are dealing with problems, obviously in different stokes but we haven't interacted with them and maybe that's another topic we can have. Way back they sent us down Chicago to talk at one time and I found that very, very useful and I think we should try and reestablish (inaudible).

Reed said that every such group that he has worked with has put out such a newsletter. He offered to bring in a couple to show what they tend to look like. He said it's a fairly useful thing if you're trying to do outreach to the community. DOE at least used to have a consortium where all their SSAB's (Site Specific Advisory Boards) under the FACA met annually. I don't know if anything like that is still going on, but that's something that could be discovered for sure.

Member Jacobs: Something I noticed came up at the last meeting when I was reading the minutes. There was a seminar discussion about climate change and renewable energy technologies and I felt like that would be a good issue that the CAC could go around, either doing the seminar or some other meeting. Especially on Long Island, the amount of energy every day that is used, that is something that needs to be addressed and I think BNL is a good resource for that.

Member Kaplan: Well John I'm sitting here and I'm saying, I heard you, tell us some more about these concerns you are talking about, which might be relevant. Are you finding, for example, that one or two of your employees or members has health impacts that you think are related to the Lab? I'm trying to understand. Are you saying that at this point, there aren't any issues that relate to Brookhaven National Laboratory and your club? Am I getting it right?

Member Hall: Well we have health concerns about our employees who live and reside on the property. That is our concern, as an employer that is our concern. And on the advice of counsel, we have been told to look into every possible reason for contaminants. Everything is taken from our property. Even mosquitoes are taken from our property every year. We have health concerns and as an employer, we have to look into those health concerns.

Member Kaplan: So why not ask, why not bring up something on that order and get to the bottom of whether or not there's anything going on here that might relate to your group unless what I'm hearing is that you are sufficiently convinced that your participation here has contributed enough to your own concerns and there's no reason for you to be here anymore. I'm confused that you raised issues and now you're saying there's nothing else left for you here.

Member Hall: What I'm saying is that I'm not here for an adult education course. I'm here more for the environment and how this property affects my property which is downstream from here. I had a lot of other concerns; the tick problem that we have. Apparently, we are about the same age. The woods you walked into on Long Island years ago are not the same woods that we can walk in today. We have to have all kinds of protective clothing and sprays because of ticks and chiggers. It's not the same place that we grew up in. The Lab is not responsible for that.

Member Kaplan: You raise an interesting point. About 15 years ago, maybe even 20 years ago, the Lab did a study. It collected field mice, collected deer and it found out almost 100 percent of the field mice had deer ticks on them and apparently that was the vector. That was 15 to 20 years ago. Now that's an issue that's relevant, I would imagine, to your group. But we never heard about it. I'd love to hear, I'd like to hear you guys come in and say, "Look, we've got this problem, somehow the Lab may or may not be involved, but let's talk about it." I see that is a very relevant issue. You probably have a bunch more issues too, that might be useful to discuss here. On the other hand, if you pull out, my implication would be, you're happy. The group has fulfilled whatever participation you've had here, and that's it.

Reed: There may be some issues that are perfect for the CAC to examine, that have application above the Laboratory.

Member Shea: I'd like to suggest that we have another symposium on Low Level Radiation. Since we haven't had one for quite a while and some new information has come up and the Lab is also involved with studying this issue with regard to space travel.

Member Garber: Kasey mentioned global warming. I heard an excellent talk by Gilbert Hanson who is a professor of Geology at Stony Brook University, on the impacts on the Pine Barrens. It was a really very sobering thing that as the temperature starts going up what will happen to vegetation, etc., and the water table. If this group is really interested in global warming, the talk was about an hour unfortunately, but it was much to be thinking about. It's probably the best talk about the Pine Barrens and putting it into context that I've ever heard.

Reed asked the CAC to consider whether this kind of discussion, from meeting to meeting, about agenda topics and bringing them the way they just did, was an okay way to go or if they needed to do something more formal, for their next meeting. He said "I'm not proposing either way to you but what I'd like to do is to vet that and come to a conclusion. You just came up with more topics than you have in a while and it may be that you don't need to do anything more than operate this way and pay attention to it. But I would like you to think about that and decide where we want to go next time. I would also like to recommend that you continue these discussions for a short period of time or a moderate period of time at the next meeting because it seems to be really beneficial."

Member Jordan-Sweet: I think this method for setting the agenda worked pretty well and I think the only time that the agenda is changed is when some issue comes up when something takes precedent and needs to be addressed immediately and needs to be put on it so I think this works pretty well.

Member Amper: First of all I want to thank the Lab and especially the members of the CAC for participating so cooperatively and enthusiastically. The participation was wonderful. I think there was some hesitation when we first raised it. I'm a great believer that organizations need to keep growing and reinventing themselves and we can always do better. I think some of the suggestions that have come up in the last two sessions have been useful. I promise to go back and examine agendas, examine environmental motions and environmental participants to make this thing work. This is as good or better than anything I could have imagined when we raised these questions. In no way were we or are we in any way are we saying that the CAC is not a good thing or has become a bad thing, but merely that we've done some remarkable things. I think there are still some remarkable things for us to do. So thank you very much for responding the way all of you have and let's continue to bring our ideas as to how to make this thing better and more effective and more responsive to the concerns of the people around this table, it's a good process.

Member Jacobs: I just have a quick question, have we decided about composition that we are going to reach out and look for new members? Is that what we've decided?

Reed said that what he heard when that topic was closed is to suggest to the Laboratory a moderate outreach involving a press release and then for each organization that believes they need more representation to go recruit candidates and bring them back to the CAC and that the CAC will do that as organizations have interest in bringing them back and into the CAC. He said he'll put it on the agenda for next time to reacquaint the CAC with their process that was developed kind of informally for vetting new candidates, bringing them on board, and talking to them.

7. Agenda Setting

April Agenda

BGRR Pile Pictures

Update on Peconic River Sampling Part II

BGRR/HFBR Update or Presentation

Meeting adjourned at approximately 9:44 p.m.

Flip Chart Notes – CAC Discussion

Issues:

- Periodic review of issues list (Pending)

Process:

- Add an outreach component to CAC mission

Composition

- 7 positions
- May not be urgent
- Press release inviting interested organizations and individuals
- Publicize through constituent groups
- Environmental issues not being addressed by CAC
- Interests should do outreach to get perspectives represented
- Need overview of Lab activities for old and new members
- CAC should look at potential environment and health issues with current and upcoming operations
- Should identify and focus on environmental issues
- Members should follow up with questions between meetings
- Members should raise issues of concern
- CAC should understand range of activities at lab and consider and take information out to the community
- Role and function should go beyond environment and health
- Environment and health are the most important but CAC should understand the whole package and take information to the community
- Consider recruiting more ethnic diversity from nearby communities
- New activities at the Lab have potential environment and health impacts – CAC should track and provide advice on environment and health issues
- Majority of time should be spent on environment and health
- Security and safety are also possible topics

Agenda

- Overpopulation of deer (leadership by Lab and CAC)
- See projects that BNL is working on that could help local community
- Annual newsletter from CAC to community
- Coordinate with other CACs and laboratories
- Seminar discussions
- Health concerns of Peconic River Sportsman's Club
- Ticks
- Another symposium of Low Level Radiation
- Global warming- impact on Pine Barrens and BNL area
- Stony Brook

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		P									
ABCO		Alternate	Doug	Dittko												
Brookhaven Retired Employees Association		Member	Graham	Campbell	P	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	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		P									
E. Yaphank Civic Association		Member	Michael	Giacomaro	P	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	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	P									
Fire Rescue and Emergency Services		Alternate	James	McLoughlin												
Friends of Brookhaven (E.Kaplan changed to become member 7/1/01)		Member	Ed	Kaplan			P									
Friends of Brookhaven (E.Kaplan changed to become member 7/1/01)(Schwartz added 11/18/02)		Alternate	Steve	Schwartz			P									
Health Care		Member	Jane	Corrarino			P									
Health Care		Alternate														
Huntington Breast Cancer Coalition		Member	Mary Joan	Shea	P	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	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	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	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		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	P									
	NSLS User	Alternate	Peter	Stephens												
	Peconic River Sportsmen's Club (added 4/8/04)	Member	John	Hall		P	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		P									
	Town of Brookhaven (Graves made member 6/06)	Member	Anthony	Graves		P	P									
	Town of Brookhaven	Alternate	None	None												
	Town of Brookhaven, Senior Citizens	Member	James	Heil	P	P	P									
	Town of Brookhaven, Senior Citizens (open slot as of 4/99)	Alternate	None	None												
	Town of Riverhead	Member	Robert	Conklin	P	P	P									
	Town of Riverhead (K. Skinner alternate as of 4/99)	Alternate	Kim	Skinner												
	Wading River Civic Association	Member	Helga	Guthy	P		P									
	Wading River Civic Association	Alternate	Sid	Bail												