

These notes are in the following order:

1. Attendance
2. Correspondence and handouts
3. Quorum
4. Administrative
5. Recommendation on Quorum, Member Bruce Martin
6. Rauch Foundation and Press Release, as per Member Sprintzen
7. Presentation on Grant for Analysis of Reactors D&D, Robert Alvarez, STAR (requested by Scott Cullen)
8. Presentation on 801 Basement, Bill Gunther, Assistant to the Associate Director for Life Sciences
9. Environmental Surveillance, Lori Cunniff, Manager, Environmental Services Division.
10. Community Comment
11. OUV Update and Peconic River Subcommittee Report, Skip Medeiros, Group Manager, OUV
12. Agenda setting

1. Attendance

Present:

Members – G. Campbell, R. Conklin, S. Cullen, A. Esposito, M. Giacomaro, J. Gibbons, H. Guthy, J. Heil, J. Jordon-Sweet, E. Kaplan, J. Mannhaupt, J. McLoughlin, G. Proios, M. Shea, D. Sprintzen, M. Walker.

Alternates – R. Biss, A. Graves, B. Henigin, B. Martin

Others – M. Bebon, A. Carsten, J. Carter, J. Clodius, F. Crescenzo, J. D’Ascoli, K. Geiger, P. Genzer, A. Givens, J. Granzen, T. Green, K. Grigoletto, L. Hill, R. Hodgins, B. Keeler, B. Kinkead, S. Kumar, S. Layendecker, S. Medeiros, J. Ottney, P. Paul, R. Paulson, G. Penny, A. Rapiejko, K. Shaw, T. Sheridan, K. White.

Absent:

Members – R. Amper, M. Barrett, A. Capozzi, R. Clipperton, M. Cohn, J. Corrarino, N. Essel, D. Fischler, A. Jones, J. Kassner, C. Kepert, P. Martino, C. Swenson, T. Talbot, F. Towle, J. Tripp.

Alternates – S. Bail, S. Carlin, A. Cooley, K. Crowley, W. Evanzia, T. Guglielmo, L. Jacobson, R. Johannesen, G. Miglino, J. Minnasi, 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 April 5, 2002. Items 4 – 7 were included in the folders, and items 8 - 10 were available as handouts.

1. Draft agenda for April.
2. Draft notes for March.
3. Quorum proposal.

4. Copy of revised draft agenda.
5. Copy of proposed letter to the Rauch Foundation.
6. Copy of information and comments on Risk Assessment from Member Conklin.
7. Copy of presentation on 801 Basement, Bill Gunther, Assistant to Associate Director for Life Sciences.
8. Copy of presentation on Environmental Surveillance, Lori Cunniff, Manager, Environmental Services Division.
9. Copy of presentation on OUV Update, Skip Medeiros, Group Manager, OUV
10. Statement by STAR on the grant for an Analysis of Reactors.

3. Quorum

The meeting began at approximately 6:38 pm. A quorum was not present.

4. Administrative

When a quorum was achieved the notes from February and March were approved with no changes, corrections, additions, or deletions.

5. Recommendation on Quorum, Member Martin

Bruce Martin explained his proposal to adjust the number of members needed to form a quorum. Discussion ensued. Member Proios expressed concern that the formula was too complicated and suggested removing members who had failed to participate. Members Esposito and Guthy agreed stating that members who don't attend meetings can't make informed decisions. After further discussion on alternates and on the ability to petition for a leave of absence, a motion was made to drop the three organizations who had not responded to the most recent letter sent out in November. The CAC members present voted unanimously to drop three organizations (Leg. Fred Towle, EDF, and L.I. Builders Institute) and to include a statement in the notification letter that if the organization wanted to be reinstated they should have a representative present at the May 9 meeting or send a written request to the CAC.

Action Item: Send letter to organizations notifying them of the CAC's intent to drop their membership.

6. Rauch Foundation and Press Release, Member Sprintzen

David Sprintzen explained that the letter he had drafted to the Rauch Foundation would correct some misstatements that they had made in announcing their grant to the Pine Barrens Society. One suggestion was made to change Lab's director to Lab's management. A motion was made to send the letter with the change and unanimously approved by the members present.

The need for a template form letter for sending out the recommendations of the CAC was discussed. Member Sprintzen volunteered to draft a document for review at the next meeting.

Action Item: Send corrected letter to Rauch Foundation.

Action Item: Include draft template in next CAC mailing.

7. Presentation on Grant for Analysis of Reactors D&D, Robert Alvarez, STAR (requested by Scott Cullen)

Robert Alvarez of STAR spoke about the study STAR has commissioned to review and evaluate the decontamination and decommissioning of the three closed Brookhaven Lab reactors. He stated that the review will address issues related to contamination of the environment, options for disposition of the reactors over the long term, the health and safety of workers involved in the disposition, and a human risk assessment. Alvarez discussed how the study will be conducted, data collection, stakeholder interaction, and the project schedule. He said that Dr. Gordon Thompson from the Institute for Resource and Security Studies, and Bernd Franke from the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, Heidelberg, Germany, will be conducting the study. CAC members asked about peer review of the study, commented on getting outside perspectives on issues, and venues that will be used to raise public awareness. Alvarez said that they plan to have the study published, use scientific forums such as the Health Physics Society, and that the news media will be tapped to raise awareness. Several CAC members expressed support for the study and the desire to remain informed.

8. Presentation on 801 Basement, Bill Gunther, Assistant to the Associate Director for Life Sciences

Bill Gunther reported that in December a storm water drain line had been crushed during excavation activities. This caused approximately 8,000 gallons of rain water to flood the basement of Building 801. He said that the water was sampled and cesium-137 was detected at approximately the drinking water standard. A plan was put in place to pump the basement water into a tank, treat it to remove the cesium and then discharge it. Prior to that happening, treatment of water that was being stored in the tank needed to be completed. There appeared to be no immediate hazard or environmental concern. Although the water level was being monitored, it was determined in March that approximately 3,000 gallons had leaked out.

The remaining water was pumped out of the basement into a tanker truck.

Gunther reported that the cesium binds to the soil; the groundwater is 60 feet below the basement floor and that the building will act as a cap. He said that the area will be extensively monitored. Tom Sheridan presented additional lessons learned and outlined several corrective actions.

CAC members questioned the sampling, where the water came from, if there were any other radioactive contaminants in the water, and the reliability of waterproof coatings. Member Proios suggested that the Lab be more proactive and look at areas where water could enter other buildings and member Esposito suggested that some type of remediation be considered beyond monitoring the area. Member Shea asked if any other radioactive contaminants had been found in the water.

Action Item: Provide water sampling data for Mary Jean Shea.

9. Environmental Surveillance, Lori Cunniff, Manager, Environmental Services Division.

Lori Cunniff gave an update on the performance trends and issues of the Environmental Services Division. She explained the Stewardship Policy and its commitments and stated that the Lab is ISO 14001 registered. Cunniff said that number of environmental incidents has been declining. She discussed radiological and non-radiological air trends and the Title V permitting process. She stated that an air assessment had determined that continuous monitoring of the BLIP facility may be in order because increased operations and a calculation error have raised the estimated dose. Cunniff discussed the Sewage Treatment Plant upgrades and compliance percentages and lead found at the Steam Plant Outfall. Lead has been found in the upper layer of soil, samples are being taken to delineate the contamination, and soils at or near the action

level will be remediated. Cunniff also described plans being drafted for fire, weed, and deer management and stated that the Lab was moving forward with preventative actions to keep the deer out of contaminated areas. She told CAC members that the discrepancy between the Lab's deer sample (21 pCi/gm) and the NYDOH sample (8 pCi/gm) had been attributed to human error. An employee had used an incorrect standard for the type of detector used. Cunniff also talked about pollution prevention initiatives and events planned to celebrate Earth Day.

CAC members asked questions about the monitoring at BLIP, corrective actions on the detectors used for sampling deer meat, about the Earth Day events, the makeup of the sewer lines, if there were plans to test the wild turkeys onsite, (no pathway), and lead levels in the runoff water and in the soil and what caused it. Cunniff stated that the source is believed to be from the water used to wash down the boilers. She said that no longer occurs. The CAC decided that they would like to hear environmental updates quarterly.

10. Community Comment

There were no comments from the audience.

11. OUV Update and Peconic River Subcommittee Report, Skip Medeiros, Group Manager, OUV

Skip Medeiros updated the CAC on the status of the pilot studies, specifically the re-vegetation plan, on samples taken in Area D, and on the Risk Assessment process. He reported that sampling showed that Mercury and Cesium-137 levels in Area D were considerably lower after the sediment removal and therefore he feels comfortable that the process being used is all encompassing. He reported that the NYSDEC would not approve a sub-pilot study using sand in the re-vegetation plan for a section of Area D, which was recommended by the CAC. Medeiros described the process used to restore the area and said that the re-planting had just been completed. Contours were established, two types of seed, winter rye and switch grass, were used. Soft rush was planted, and burr weed will be planted in May.

He reported on the progress of the vacuum guzzling in Area A. He said that samples had been collected for Area A1; after removal of the sediment in Areas A2 and A3 at the end of April samples would be taken there. He went over CAC input, protocols, and risk assessment. He explained the schedule that he put together and said that he would be looking for input on cleanup goal options. He said that he would not be available for the May 9 CAC meeting and suggested that the Working Group prepare a report for the CAC evaluating the range of scenarios being included in the Risk Assessment. He would like to brief the CAC on the Risk Assessment on June 13 and also on how cleanup goals are established. Cleanup goals and options should be available for CAC discussion in July. A proposed remedial action plan will then be drafted in August. Early input roundtables are expected at that time. The goal is to begin the public comment period in late September. Skip outlined three scenarios in the risk assessment: the child who lives by the river and plays in sediment 150 days out of the year; increases in the fish rate consumption per day by individuals; and the inclusion of deer meat consumption. There are also different fish consumption rates for residents and recreational fishermen.

CAC members Conklin and Esposito gave a report from the subcommittee. Member Conklin indicated that there was information from him in the folders. Member Esposito explained that the working group had been discussing the rates of fish consumption that had been agreed to in the Risk Assessment. There were questions and concerns initially about the number to be used (6.5 grams per day), where it came from, and the reality of what it means. A different scenario had been proposed at a working group meeting. Now, there will be three different fishing

scenarios – 1) the resident that doesn't fish, 2) a non-resident recreational fisherman, and 3) a resident who is also a recreational fisherman and hunter. Les Hill said that they have covered just about every possible combination. Member Proios stated that he thought the process of risk assessment was very complicated. Hill said that the risk assessment was really a mathematical model that gives information. He said there would be a spread of risks, a spread of consequences, and a spread of implications and that will be evaluated and compared against one another. CAC members asked questions about the fill material used in the re-vegetation of the pilot area, about groundwater being included in the risk assessment, how the bioaccumulation issue for the fish is being handled, and about the process of hiring contractors for the work.

Sprintzen: Series of very brief questions. The work is being done, is that being done by contractors or by people who work for the Lab?

Reed : The risk assessment work or?

Sprintzen: Yeah, the work that you're talking about.

Medeiros: The risk assessment work is being done by an off-site contractor.

Sprintzen: And is there any relation with the off-site contractor that will do the risk assessment and the off-site contractors who will do the final cleanup?

Medeiros: The remediation contractor will not be selected until the Proposed Plan for remediation has been finalized.

Sprintzen: Separate projects or?

Medeiros: The contractor that has done the risk assessment does not *always* provide the same services that *are required of a remediation contractor. Remedial investigation and risk assessment, for instance, planning an investigation and interpretation of data are very different skill sets from planning and implementing a cleanup. After a cleanup plan is established we will be better positioned to discuss the required background of the remediation contractor. ***

Sprintzen: Ok, so you'd have to then find different contractors.

Medeiros: When we reach a decision on how to cleanup then we post in the commercial business daily or some other mechanism, a description of the types of tasks that will be involved. They submit their qualifications, we go through a rigorous evaluation of their qualifications and hire people that are specialists in what needs to be done.

Sprintzen: Is there any consideration or preferential treatment given to local contractors as opposed to ones off the Island?

Medeiros: The pilot studies were largely local people (Long Island) *and local firms did submit bids. For the vacuum guzzling, the work was performed by New Jersey contractors, who submitted the lowest price bids. For the sediment removal the prime contractor was Long Island based and the sub contractor was New York/New Jersey based. All soil was purchased on Long Island and all plants were grown on and purchased on Long Island to the extent possible (about 50%). Most of the money was going by the people that were Long Islanders. ***

Sprintzen: When you evaluate the people who apply for doing the final work. Is that a consideration or not?

Medeiros: It is a consideration. There's typically, when I hire a contractor I typically construct an evaluation matrix. It has several criteria. One criteria is experience with similar projects.

Another criteria is distance from the site. That's important not only to hire local, to give points to local business, but it's also very important in the service that they can provide to me.

Sprintzen: Is there any consideration of whether or not the contractors are union contractors or not?

Medeiros: That isn't a.... there isn't a bias one way or the other on that.

Sprintzen: What is the reason for that?

Medeiros: I haven't ever felt a reason to justify giving more points to an organization that hired only union labor versus those who didn't.

Sprintzen: Is there any consideration with respect to the whether or not the Davis Bacon law is operative in this....

Medeiros: Davis Bacon is very closely monitored here at the Laboratory. There must be a Davis Bacon determination made before a project of this size is....

Hill: That's done for every work package.

** The recording was unintelligible at these points in the discussion. The notes were sent to Skip Medeiros in an attempt to clarify his comments. The words in italics are his addition to the transcript after the fact.

Member Mannhaupt said that there were complicated variables involved in the risk assessment and urged members to read the available material so that everyone can participate in the discussions.

12. Agenda setting

The CAC discussed the schedule for input that had been proposed. It was pointed out that dedicating significant portions of time at the regular meetings would be necessary. Upcoming items were reviewed to make sure sufficient time would be allowed on the agenda. It was suggested that the Counter-terrorism Research presentation be moved to June or July. Member Conklin suggested having someone from Suffolk County come in at the May meeting to discuss risk assessment to present a balanced view. It was agreed to dedicate most of May and June's meetings to the risk assessment and have a groundwater update in May and a Counter-terrorism presentation in June.

Member Mannhaupt asked about providing information on the uptake in Mercury in fish and how it moves through the food chain. Skip said he would provide it for the April 28th meeting. He said that the state is writing a report interpreting the data, but he would provide draft data if the report is not complete.

Agenda-
Counter-terrorism Research (June)
Groundwater Update (from March)
OUV Protocols
Fire Management Plan
BGRR – brief update on schedule, when appropriate
Input from County on RA