

Community Advisory Council
April 10, 2008
Action Items/Notes

Final

These notes are in the following order:

1. Attendance
2. Correspondence and Handouts
3. Administrative Items
4. The Large Hadron Collider at CERN, Tom Ludlam, Chair, Physics
5. Nano Committee Report, Jim Heil
6. Agenda Setting
7. Community Comment
8. Deer Management, Tim Green, Natural & Cultural Resource Manager

1. Attendance

Members/Alternates Present:
See Attached Sheets.

Others Present:

M. Bebon, P. Bond, J. D'Ascoli, L. Garber, K. Geiger, D. Gibbs, G. Goode, T. Green, J. Higbie, M. Holland, S. Johnson, T. Ludlam, M. Lynch, R. McKay, M. Theisen

2. Correspondence and Handouts

Items one through five were mailed with a cover letter dated April 4, 2008. Items six through nine were available as handouts.

1. April 10, 2008 draft agenda
2. Draft notes for March 13, 2008
3. Final notes for February 14, 2008
4. Copy of letters re CAC recommendation on HFBR PRAP
5. Copies of nano articles
6. Copies of the presentation on the Large Hadron Collider at CERN
7. Copies of the presentation on Deer Management
8. Copies of the deer management options table
9. Copies of press releases on SB Opera, lecture on Solar Grand Plan (and Scientific American article), and on RAD damage to DNA

3. Administrative

The meeting began at approximately 6:36 p.m. Jeanne D'Ascoli explained that Reed Hodgkin would not be present and reviewed the ground rules and the draft agenda. Those in attendance introduced themselves.

Approval of Minutes

Jeanne asked for corrections, additions or deletions to the March 13 draft notes. Member Jordan-Sweet pointed out a typo on page 3. Moot was spelled incorrectly and on page 4 Member Barbara Henigin's name was misspelled. The notes were approved as corrected with two abstentions.

4. The Large Hadron Collider at CERN, Tom Ludlam

Tom Ludlam, Chair of the Physics Department, spoke about the relationship between RHIC at BNL and the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) at CERN. He explained that Brookhaven is leading the U.S. effort in the giant ATLAS detector. The primary goal of the LHC is to look beyond the quarks and discover new particles predicted by fundamental theories, with highest energy man-made proton-proton collisions. The primary goal of RHIC is to collide heavy nuclei at high energies to create and study a new form of matter: the Quark Gluon Plasma. The RHIC experiments have found this new form of matter and are mapping out its properties as a "perfect liquid". During one month each year the LHC, like RHIC, will collide heavy nuclei, at an energy 30 times higher than RHIC. He explained that RHIC has opened a new field of research that has spawned important new efforts in Europe at LHC and the Facility for Antiproton and Ion Research (FAIR) at GSI, Darmstadt, Germany. With its upgrades which are now in progress, RHIC-II will be the flagship facility in this field for the next 10-15 years. RHIC's unique ability to accelerate and collide spin-polarized proton beams will not be matched at the new European accelerators. A major new U.S. facility, the Electron Ion Collider (eRHIC), based on RHIC, is in the design stage, with construction planned to begin in the next six to eight years.

Member Sprintzen asked about the significance of the quark gluon plasma. He asked what it says about the nature of the world and what the implications are.

Ludlam responded it is one more step toward understanding the fundamental structure of the matter around us. It tells us some things of importance for cosmology, how did everything come to be. He imagines that sometime in the future this kind of information will be used to engineer new kinds of nuclei, maybe ones that are better suited for the things we want to do. In addition to answering some of the most important questions of today, this is a great training ground for the next generation. There are about 30 PhDs a year that are produced from work on these experiments.

Member Proios said he took physics a long time ago and was told that the difference between atoms was the number of protons, neutrons, and electrons. He asked if a gluon is the same regardless of what the element or particle it came from, or if there is some differentiation that occurs at that level?

Ludlam explained that if there is such a structure in this, we are not yet at the level of being able to see it. We do know that there are important structures. One of the early discoveries made in these collisions was that quarks and gluons were seen coming out of them. What actually starts that process is a very dense state of just pure gluons. This is one of the reasons we want to build the electron collider. As the gluons, which are now in this hot dense state, begin to cool off the energy goes into making quarks and anti-quarks. That is what then becomes the quark gluon plasma and condenses into normal particles. That leaves the way the universe formed a big mystery. Why don't we have things made of quarks (like matter) and things made of anti-quarks (like anti-matter). That's one of the big questions in cosmology.

Member Garber asked how CERN compares to Isabel in luminosity and aperture.

Ludlam responded that it is a slightly smaller aperture than Isabel and in luminosity, it is about a factor of five or six higher. It is much higher energy than Isabel.

Member Jordan-Sweet said it must take years to plan and build these machines. You said RHIC spawned these machines, but is it more that they all just complement each other and whatever gets built is dependent on how technology develops?

Ludlam said that is true. RHIC did not spawn LHC. What was spawned by RHIC was the plan to accelerate heavy nuclei as well as protons. FAIR was designed based on RHIC.

Member Graves asked what the private funding gift that had allowed RHIC to run had meant for RHIC.

Ludlam said it was critical. We do have instability sometimes with federal funding. Most of the money received to operate these machines goes to pay the salaries and materials; only about 10% pays the power bill that allows the machines to run.

Member Henagan asked Dr. Ludlam to comment on black holes.

Ludlam said that there are theories that micro-black holes could be produced in a machine like this, but there is not enough energy in this machine or any machine that mankind could build to produce a black hole of the critical size that could start eating up what's around it. It would be a tiny thing, much smaller than a proton, inside some complete vacuum and it would live for 10^{-21} seconds. Once you get into that you start discussing extra dimensions and string theory and it turns out there is another connection with RHIC. Some of the properties found in quark gluon plasma have been explained over the last three or four years by string theories, working in extra dimensions.

Member Shea asked about the practical applications of these experiments, other than answering questions on cosmology.

Ludlam said that most important practical thing is the constant flow of young people into the scientific workforce. It is also true that in building these detectors new technologies have been developed which are now showing up in medical imaging technology. Any time you push technologies which is electronics technologies, computing technologies, these experiments are now pushing the limits of computing technology both in storage and calculation, and also in data transmission. The LHC and RHIC are now driving the effort to move the world wide web to levels of data transmission that are orders of magnitude greater, which among other things means that you will be able to download a movie in a second. The immediate practical application that we understand quark gluon plasma may not show up on your next microwave oven, but just getting to that point is something that our culture, our science, the way we set what we want to prioritize is important. Of course we do have peer review panels that we have to answer to.

Member Mannhaupt asked if something can only be seen for 10^{-21} seconds, how long does it take to make a determination on what it is that is actually being seen and how many of those 10^{-21} second groups of things does it take to get to the next step.

Ludlam responded that you can't look at a single collision and learn very much. You can get a sense of how hot it was by looking at the number of particles that come out of the collision. The people doing these experiments need to be able to look at particular kinds of particles that come out of these collisions, how frequently they come out, how frequently they come out with other kinds of particles, and how their distribution around the collision-axis looks. To do that you need to look at billions of events, that is why the machine needs to run for years even though we're talking about something that only lasts for a 10^{-21} seconds.

He said they look at billions of collisions and all of them are recorded as digital data so we can see why they are repeated. They look at how many particles and the kinds of particles that come out of the collisions. There are particles that go through the very dense quark gluon plasma and particles that slow down. The spectrum of energy is measured and if you do this enough a profile can be made.

Member Sprintzen asked for clarification on the significance of the critical point; is it certain that there will be a critical point, or could it be a continued slow down. He asked what takes place during a phased transition.

Ludlam responded that it could be a continued slow down. We are trying to understand the hydrodynamics of all this. There are models based on the theories and those models say there should be a critical point somewhere. If there isn't, then we are way off base. If there is, then we know we have to be aware of that critical point. The phased transition is just like water to ice. When you melt ice, the molecular forces that hold it together into a solid suddenly are overwhelmed by the kinetic energy of the heat and it melts.

Member Jordan-Sweet asked about different types of collisions.

Ludlam said basically the trigger requirements are changed, different trigger detectors are used.

5. Report on Nano Committee meeting, March 31, 2008

Member Heil reported that the committee discussed a broad program for the year, essentially an agenda framework. He explained that the committee recommended that two or three presentations be made by BNL scientists including representatives of the Nanoscience Safety Committee; a presentation by Debbie Bauer be made on nano in the outside world; a representative from a local manufacturer that uses nano make a presentation, that Vicki Colvin, Rice University be invited to speak; and that a professor from SUNY SB be invited to speak about their program.

Heil reported that Member Kaplan provided articles on nano issues that were included in this month's mailing. It was recommended that appropriate hard copy articles be included in the CAC's meeting packets and that the CAC members provide articles about their fields of interest as they encounter them.

Member Henagan commented that he has many articles that he could bring in for the CAC's consideration.

D'Ascoli told the CAC that Member Kaplan had sent in four articles and the decision was made to include two of those articles this month and the other two next month. Two articles per month is manageable for everyone to read.

Member Sprintzen commented that he has an article that came from Rachel's newsletter. It is a very clear and accessible analysis and he also said he had a detailed report from Swiss Re, which is the second major insurance company in the world, discussing the dangers and concerns that they have on nanotechnology. He thought they would fit in quite well with the kind of discussions the CAC is having. The report is written for the general public rather than a technical article. It is very clear and very well written. .

Member Mannhaupt said that DuPont and the Environmental Defense created the first nano risk framework. She had downloaded the information and put it all into a packet which she submitted for the CAC's "Nano Library."

Member Shea said she would like a list of products that are already on the market that contain nanomaterials.

Member Sprintzen said that the article he has lists a lot of them.

Member Shea asked if it mentions any food items.

Member Sprintzen replied said he didn't know, but the list is quite comprehensive.

D'Ascoli said that she would like everyone to think about the scope of what the CAC can do. The challenge is going to be to keep focused on something that is manageable and something that will help to educate everyone on what is happening in the field. She encouraged the CAC to think about what they can really focus on in regard to ES&H.

Member Mannhaupt told Member Shea that the website, www.nanowerk.com, is very informative. There are more than 500 articles on nanotechnology that can be accessed from their website.

Member Shea said that she has a lot of articles that she would like to submit. There are so many products already on the market that the Lab's information on how to dispose of it seems bizarre since it is already out there.

D'Ascoli said that next month Debbie Bauer will come back to present and she is very much in touch with what is going on externally in the world of nano. She asked the CAC if that was something they would like to hear more about?

The CAC indicated they would.

Member Proios commented that he would like to contact the other four Nano Centers to find out if their advisory groups are working on this. He said if this is an issue it isn't fair to put the entire burden on BNL's shoulders when there are five centers that have been designated plus the private sector where there is a lot less control because they are looking for the dollar sign. Are we the only CAC in the whole country that is concerned about this?

D'Ascoli asked if this is something that he would like the Laboratory to do, or is he going to do it.

Member Proios said I know the other laboratories have individual advisory committees and then there is a person who is appointed to the Department of Energy's single advisory group, which we don't have a voice on.

D'Ascoli said that we can do some research. BNL has been taking the lead on the ES&H part of it. You are specifically looking at the community groups?

Member Proios said, yes, is anyone else doing the same things that we are? Are we the first ones to raise this issue within the five centers?

D'Ascoli said she will make some phone calls.

ACTION ITEM: Research what the other advisory groups are doing at the other four Nano Centers.

Member Proios said that it is the pressure from a citizen's group that says there needs to be some guidelines. Right now, some of the other agencies should be paying attention.

D'Ascoli responded that after next month's presentation they might have more information.

D'Ascoli said that the CAC needs to think about what they are going to do with all the nano articles that they receive. Are they just going to read them and put them aside or will a meeting be set aside to talk about them. She would prefer that the CAC waits to address this because a lot of things have been set in motion for the future. But, she said, it is one thing to put them in the packages, and another thing to evaluate and discuss them.

6. Agenda Setting

D'Ascoli said that next month there will be a presentation by Debbie Bauer and one by Steve Schwartz on his global warming research. There's a bit of a dilemma for June, the Peconic River report will be ready, but we also have an agreement to visit the Emergency Operations Center which is something you asked to do several months ago. Please think about that and we can decide next month.

May Agenda

Global Warming – Steve Schwartz
Nano presentation – Deborah Bauer
Membership

June Agenda

Peconic River Report or
Emergency Operations Center tour

7. Community Comment

There were no comments from members of the community.

8. Deer Management, Tim Green

Tim Green, Natural Resource Manager, spoke to the CAC about the management of deer at the Lab. He explained that the objective tonight was to present information on deer populations, ecological and safety impacts, and options for managing the deer at BNL. He said that he would like to obtain community input on whether active management is needed, what management options are preferred, and other issues important to the community.

He explained that current estimates have the deer population at about 394. The peak population was reached in 2001 when there were approximately 1,200 deer at the Lab. The optimal population is around 80 to 250 animals. He said the effects on the ecosystem are loss of rare plants and lack of forest regeneration (seedlings -> no saplings). That the deer have an effect on forest nesting birds, on their own health, and that over browsing has a visual impact on the forest.

Green explained that the deer population affects the tick population. The majority of adult ticks feed on deer. Dense tick populations correlated with dense deer populations. An increase in the deer population also increases car/deer accidents with estimated costs being around \$2,500 per accident.

Any alternative for management must meet BNL requirements for safety, security, regulatory compliance, effectiveness, community acceptance, and cost. Green outlined several management options that included no action, hunting (archery only), culling, culling with hunting, contraception, hunting with contraception, and culling with contraception. He discussed the cost and effectiveness of each option.

Green told the CAC that to be most effective deer management needs to be conducted on a regional basis. The Laboratory plans on holding public meetings to gather input, to review the recommendations, and to inform the public of the decisions made.

Member Krsnak said that there is already an active archery club onsite and most of the members are licensed hunters. That would solve the security problems.

Green said that they are considering that as a possibility, but would still have the efficiency requirements.

Member Krsnak said that according to your numbers it seems that you would like to reduce the herd by 150 deer. He said twenty-five guys should be able to take care of that in the short-term.

Member Sweet asked what the population density was outside the Lab.

Green responded that he doesn't really know. The DEC estimates population based on hunter success, which is a very rough estimate of about 20,000. He said that he would have to figure out the square miles. Onsite, there are about 50 per square mile. The other part of the question is, would the deer just move on site. Green said that deer tend to be territorial so he doesn't think they'd migrate.

Member Henagan asked if more shouldn't be targeted than you'd like to take so they don't rebound.

Green said there would be benefits from the ecosystem standpoint, but the lower the numbers, the harder it is to get them. The last few are the hardest ones to get.

Member Henagan asked if they would use bait and shoot.

Green said that is an option.

Member Graves asked if chiggers have been documented.

Green responded that what we see are the larvae of lone star ticks, which have the same effect as chiggers.

Member Graves said that farmers use deer fencing. He asked if the Lab could create an enclosure to keep them out of certain areas.

Green responded that they have not considered that.

Member Chaudhry asked why there is such a large range in the optimal population and if there were any natural predators. .

Green explained that there is a lot of controversy among ecologists as to what the optimal population is and the 80 and the 250 are the two extremes. He said there are no natural predators here.

Member Shea asked what the range of Cs-137 is in the deer they have found and if there is an allowable limit.

Green said that several years ago the NYSDOH established a recommendation on edible portions. The number was 6.9 pCi/g and the consumption was up to 64 pounds of that

concentration of meat in a year safely. The range has changed over the years. Before the cleanup in 2000, the average was around 2.5 or 3 pCi and it is now down to around 1.5 pCi/g. We still occasionally get a deer that has Cesium in the range of 8 to 9 pCi.

Member Garber said that he wanted to thank the Lab for putting these options on the table. This is a severe ecological problem that needs to be addressed. He would like to see a solution that could be used offsite as well. Many of those solutions are good in the woods, but would drive the herds closer to the buildings and present problems. He was impressed with the helicopter infrared scanning and how the deer could be seen. He wondered if perhaps someone with a dart gun could get the deer from a helicopter. Either dart them with a birth control contraceptive or cull them. He asked if that could be a solution.

Member Guthy said she doesn't understand the practicality of doing archery over culling. Using archery, the reduction would take 10 to 15 years compared to culling which is only four years. There is an analytical cost difference. She thought most people would accept culling, especially if the meat is going to be donated to shelters.

Green responded that across the country the wildlife managers are desperately calling for hunters because that is the most available method for managing wildlife populations. The other thing is what the public will accept.

Member Schneider said that he would like to volunteer the services of the Peconic River Sportsman's Club. They have 800 members and would be able to pass any security clearance.

Member Shea asked which method would be the least painful to the deer and asked if they die instantly.

Green answered that either hunting or culling would be about the same. It would depend on the accuracy of the shot as to whether they die instantly.

Member Shea asked if there was a way to anesthetize them as they are shot.

Green said that is an option. In a cull, they can actually be trapped and put down chemically. It is instantaneous, but that method has not been evaluated.

Member Graves said that he felt that if it is archery-only hunting, then there would be less suffering with culling.

Green agreed saying that the rate of kill would be higher because it is more accurate.

D'Ascoli asked each CAC member to express their preferred option and what they would think would be the preferred option of their neighbors. She said there may be other alternatives. If you have another one in mind, please state it and submit it in writing.

Member Graves said that he would support culling, but felt that the meat should not be offered for human consumption, but could be donated to a zoo or wildlife rehabilitation center. Not because he thought there would be harm, but because he envisioned headlines of somebody eating meat that came from BNL at a homeless shelter and then they get sick and say it was caused by deer meat that came from BNL. That could be a nightmare situation. He suggested that BNL try to find an alternative use for the meat. He said he would submit his suggestions in writing to BNL. He felt that his neighbors would have to see the presentation to understand it and make a recommendation. The deer population is a tremendous ecological problem and he doesn't want any animal to suffer unnecessarily, but he can't help thinking about the song birds and other animals that are in decline because deer have eaten the food source and reduced the

shelter that those animals need. He thinks the issue is incredibly important and gave the Lab credit for taking it on.

Member Conklin commented that he would have to do a lot more thinking before he could make a recommendation. He said he will submit in writing when he is ready.

Member Sweet said she would support culling and agrees with member Graves about the meat consumption issue. She said she would like to make sure that the density outside the Lab is not so high that the deer will just come back onto Lab property.

Member Shea said she would like to think about it a little more.

Member Garber said he would support culling. He said that there is a cost savings if the meat is not used for human consumption because then there would not be a need to test for it. He commented that possibly the automobile insurance companies might be interested in supporting this effort because it would cut down on insurance claims.

Member Sprintzen felt that he was not sufficiently informed. He said that too many times we run in fear of lawsuits, so constructive things are not done. One of the things he felt was attractive was the fact that the meat could be used to provide food. He's not supportive if it's not used for that purpose. He thinks he would prefer the contraceptive alternative, but isn't sure. Shooting animals troubles him.

Member Biss said she would support either culling or contraceptives.

Member Schneider said that he would support culling and hunting. The hunting portion would be for long term control. He would definitely support the meat going to a food bank or some sort of organization to help people.

Member Campbell said his priority is the speed of getting it done and the cost of doing it. He would argue in favor of culling or culling with the hunting option. In the neighborhood that he lives in, deer have become a problem over the past two years. Enough people regard them as a problem so he thought any method of getting rid of them would no longer be as distasteful as it used to be.

Member Heil said he supported culling but didn't think that he could speak for his neighbors.

Member Krsnak said that he is in favor of hunting and donating the meat. If there is a survey system in place there is no reason contaminated meat should leave the site. He believes hunting is the most humane and cost effective way to go.

Member Henagan said deer are definitely a problem where he lives. He would support culling or culling with hunting. In all likelihood the meat, if donated to a program like Hunters for the Homeless, would be mixed in with other donations and there would not be any way to trace it back to BNL. That would take care of the psychological issue.

Member Guthy said she would go with culling by professionals. She lives in Wading River and there is a real problem with ticks and Lyme disease and the other tick borne illnesses.

Member Chaudhry asked if disclaimers or waivers could be gotten in regard to donating the meat that would release BNL from liability. He also asked if the deer could be relocated to some place that doesn't have them.

Member Guthy asked how you would know if the other deer offsite are contaminated or not when they are not even tested like the ones onsite are.

Member Graves said it is a psychological thing, it has nothing to do with facts or reason or logic or testing. It is that they make a connection as soon as they hear BNL.

D'Ascoli told the CAC that they still had to have a discussion on membership which will not take place tonight. There is a tenth anniversary committee that will be meeting at 5:00 p.m. prior to the next CAC meeting in the Brookhaven Center. They will come up with recommendations.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:23 p.m.

| Agenda Topics | Votes |
|--|--------------|
| Global Warming, Stony Brook, Pine Barrens (1-10-08) | 15 |
| CAC as a conduit/resource to the community | 13 |
| Emergency Operations Center tour and drill | 12 |
| Nano technology | 11 |
| CERN – problems and implications (4-10-08) | 11 |
| Site Environment Report – good and bad (11-8-07) | 11 |
| Nano safety (3-13-08) | 10 |
| Regulator presentations on areas they oversee | 10 |
| Energy | 9 |
| Overview of programs | 9 |
| Deer Management (4-10-08) | 8 |
| Anti-terrorism update | 7 |
| NSLS-II briefing | 7 |
| Nuclear power plant safety | 6 |
| Education Programs | 6 |
| Energy efficiencies (9-13-07) | 6 |
| Sustainable transportation | 4 |
| Natural Resources management | 4 |
| Nano ES & H (October 11, 2007) | 3 |
| Safety and Security | 3 |
| Experimental Review Process | 3 |
| Latest RHIC findings | 2 |
| How the Lab supports nuclear facilities in the N/E region | 2 |
| Status of P-2 road show | 2 |
| Heating plant and efficiency research | 2 |
| Lyme Disease | 2 |
| CAC process | 2 |
| Alternative fuels | 2 |
| Update on phyto/bacterial contamination remediation research | 1 |
| Deforestation | 0 |
| Work planning process | 0 |

New Topics Added After September 2007 Vote

Global warming – BNL research
 Nano toxicology
 Nano ES&H issues at BNL and beyond
 Nanotechnology/science at BNL
 Nano management policy issues
 Nano panel discussion with the DOE, EPA, and FDA
 Renewable energy research at the Lab
 BNL/CSHarbor/Stony Brook collaboration

| P = Present | | | First Name | Last Name | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
|---|---------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 2008 | Affiliation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ABCO | (Garber added on 4/10/02) | Member | Don | Garber | P | P | P | P | | | | | | | | |
| ABCO | | Alternate | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Brookhaven Retired Employees Association | | Member | Graham | Campbell | P | P | P | P | | | | | | | | |
| Brookhaven Retired Employees Association (L. Jacobson new alternate as of 4/99)(A. Peskin 5/04) | | Alternate | Arnie | Peskin | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CHCC (Community Health & Environment Coalition (added 10/04) | | Member | Sarah | Anker | | P | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Ann Marie | Reed | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Citizens Campaign for the Environment | | Member | Adrienne | Esposito | P | P | P | | | | | | | | | |
| Citizens Campaign for the Environment (Ottney added 4/02-takenoff 1/05 Mahoney put on)(7/06 add Kasey Jacobs) | | Alternate | Kasey | Jacobs | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Educator (B. Martin - 9/01) | | Alternate | Bruce | Martin | | | P | | | | | | | | | |
| Educator (A. Martin new alternate 2/00) (Adam to college 8/01)(add. alternate 9/02) (changed 7/2006) | | Alternate | Audrey | Capozzi | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Environmental Economic Roundtable (Berger resigned, Proios became member 1/01) | | Member | George | Proios | P | | | P | | | | | | | | |
| Environmental Economic Roundtable (3/99, L. Snead changed to be alternate for EDF) | | Alternate | None | None | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fire Rescue and Emergency Services | | Member | Joe | Williams | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fire Rescue and Emergency Services | | Alternate | Don | Lynch | P | P | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fire Rescue and Emergency Services | | Alternate | James | McLoughlin | | | P | | | | | | | | | |
| Friends of Brookhaven (E.Kaplan changed to become member 7/1/01) | | Member | Ed | Kaplan | | P | P | | | | | | | | | |
| Friends of Brookhaven (E.Kaplan changed to become member 7/1/01)(Schwartz added 11/18/02) | | Alternate | Steve | Schwartz | P | 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| P = Present | | | First Name | Last Name | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
|-------------|--|-----------|------------|--------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 2008 | Affiliation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Intl. Brotherhood of Electrical Workers/Local 2230 (S.Krsnak replaced M. Walker 1/11/07) | Member | Scott | Krsnak | P | P | | P | | | | | | | | |
| | IBEW/Local 2230 | Alternate | Philip | Pizzo | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | L.I. Pine Barrens Society | Member | Richard | Amper | | P | P | | | | | | | | | |
| | L.I. Pine Barrens Society (added P. Loris 6/05) | Alternate | Elina | Alayeva | P | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | L.I. Pine Barrens Society | Alternate | Susie | Husted | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | L.I. Progressive Coalition | Member | David | Sprintzen | P | P | P | P | | | | | | | | |
| | L.I. Progressive Coalition | Alternate | None | None | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Lake Panamoka Civic Association (Biss as of 4/02) | Member | Rita | Biss | P | P | 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 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 | Karen | Blumer | P | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 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 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Peconic River Sportsmen's Club | Alternate | Jeff | Schneider | | | | P | | | | | | | | |
| | Ridge Civic Association | Member | Pat | Henagan | P | | P | P | | | | | | | | |
| | Science & Technology (added 1/13/05) | Member | Iqbal | Chaudhry | P | P | P | P | | | | | | | | |
| | Town of Brookhaven (Graves made member 6/06) | Member | Anthony | Graves | P | | 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 | | P | | | | | | | | |
| | Wading River Civic Association | Alternate | Sid | Bail | | | | | | | | | | | | |