Community Advisory Council
October 9, 2003
Action Items/Notes

Final

These notes are in the following order:

1. Attendance
2. Correspondence and handouts
3. Administrative Items
4. CAC discussion on Magothy, working to arrive at a consensus recommendation to the Director
5. Update/responses to questions on Peconic River cleanup, Les Hill
6. Frank Anastasi, TAG consultant
7. Community Comments
8. CAC discussion on Peconic River alternatives, work toward arriving at consensus.
9. Agenda Setting

1. Attendance

Members/Alternates Present:

See Attached Sheets.

Others Present:
F. Anastasi, M. Bebon, P. Bond, H. Carrano, A. Carsten, J. Carter, T. Daniels, J. D'Ascoli, M. Duke, N. Essel, G. Goode, K. Grigoletto, Lauren Hill, L. Hill, R. Hodgin, M. Holland, B. Howe, S. Johnson, T. Kneitel, S. Kumar, M. Lynch, S. Medeiros, L. Nelson, A. Rapiejko, S. Robbins, K. White, Zabby

2. Correspondence and Handouts

Items 1 through 3 were mailed with a cover letter dated October 3, 2003, item 4 was placed in the members' folders, and items 5, 6, and 7 were available at the meeting as handouts.

1. Draft agenda for September.
2. Draft September 11 notes
3. Final July notes
4. Revised draft agenda
5. Response to Commonly Asked Questions on the Peconic River Cleanup
6. Response to Michael Giacomaro's questions dated July
7. Copy of presentation on Peconic River Cleanup Plan, Les Hill, Director, Environmental Management

3. Administrative

The meeting began at 5:18 p.m., Reed went over the ground rules and the draft agenda. The CAC decided to move the discussion on opening the CAC meetings to include the Working Groups until the end of the agenda. Member Sprintzen announced that Adrienne Esposito was to be honored at the Long Island Environmental Leadership Awards dinner on October 23, 2003.

Mike Bebon, as the Interim Deputy Director for Operations, told the CAC about the theft of copper cable from the Collider-Accelerator Division that was discovered on September 17. He said that a walk down of all areas took place and copper lugs and bars were also discovered to be missing. The FBI is conducting an investigation.

Bebon also told the CAC that the Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Science has been directed by Congress to have the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) conduct compliance audits at the ten DOE Science Laboratories. They are to determine what the cost would be to bring the Labs into compliance with their regulations. On October 21, twenty-five OSHA inspectors will be at the Lab for a month to complete a wall-to-wall comprehensive inspection and they will write up all deficiencies that they find. This has been done at Argonne and Oak Ridge Laboratories where 1400 and 1600 findings were identified. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission will come in during the final week to inspect the accelerator facilities and other facilities with nuclear sources.

A CAC member asked what the rationale was. Bebon said that DOE has always regulated its own sites. Congress is exploring whether or not that should continue, or if agencies that are in the business of regulating the rest of American industry should also regulate the DOE facilities. It's basically an exploratory study. There was concern about adding another layer of regulation. Bebon said it wouldn't be duplicative; it would be in place of what exists currently.

The notes from the September meeting were approved with no additions, or changes. There was one abstention.

Jeanne D'Ascoli reported to the CAC that she had received a call from Member Ron Clipperton and that he has resigned. She will follow up with the Ridge Civic to see if they will assign another person to represent their organization.

4. Discussion on Magothy aquifer, working to arrive at a consensus recommendation to the Director.

Reed said that Mike Giacomaro was unable to attend the meeting but that he knows that the CAC will be going to closure on a cleanup recommendation for the Magothy aquifer. Reed further reported that Giacomaro had received a letter from Bob Howe that made a big difference in the way he was thinking about the Magothy. Mike requested that copies of the letter be distributed to the CAC for review before a recommendation was made. The letter was distributed to the members.

Reed reminded the CAC that at the September meeting the Laboratory presented them with a proposal to address contamination in the Magothy aquifer. The CAC moved to support the proposal, however, during the discussion the CAC determined they did not have consensus. The CAC tabled the issue so that more time could be devoted to the attempt to achieve consensus at this October meeting.

Bob Howe stated that the recommendation was to install two additional extraction wells at offsite locations to address contamination that is at the interface of the Upper Glacial aquifer and the Magothy aquifer. The concentrations are approximately 7000 ppb and 600 ppb in the two locations. The recommendation will prevent further migration of the high concentrations of VOCs. The water will be pumped to two treatments systems currently being constructed in the OU III area.

Reed asked if there was any member of the CAC who could not support a consensus decision to support the Lab's recommendation? There was no one present who could not support the recommendation, therefore, Reed declared that the CAC had reached consensus.

5. Update/responses to questions on Peconic River cleanup, Les Hill.

Member Esposito asked if tonight's update contained new information, or if it was a recap. Les Hill said that he wanted to set the stage for the CAC's discussion on the river. He went over the Action Memorandum and how it fits into the process. He said back in July the Laboratory presented the cleanup plan for the entire river. Shortly thereafter, there were questions raised about sediment in the downstream areas offsite. The decision was made to start the cleanup onsite under an Action Memorandum. This is an interim step, not the final decision. He emphasized that the final decision will have another public comment period and that it will be a process where the offsite regions, and the entire cleanup, onsite and offsite, will be described in one Record of Decision (ROD) for the entire river.

Comments on the Action Memorandum and the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis are due by October 21. Comments will be evaluated and a response issued. Plans are to commence the field activities for the actual cleanup during November of this year. Concurrent with that and during the winter months, the issues and questions will be worked through regarding the downstream reaches of the river. The Lab will issue a Proposed Remedial Action Plan (PRAP) and a Feasibility Study for public comment for the entire river. All of the subsequent activities, evaluation of public comments and issuing the ROD, will happen during the spring of next year. The IAG regulators and DOE will evaluate public input when the draft PRAP and Feasibility Study go out for comment. All comments will be considered and the final decision will be documented in the ROD. The river will be cleaned up in accordance with the ROD.

Hill reported that the DOE and the Lab believe that Alternative Four protects people and that it minimizes unnecessary disruption and damage to the ecosystem. Alternative Four sets an average limit of 1ppm mercury that will be left behind and it may end up being less. Hill said that the PCBs left behind would be barely detectable. Member Esposito expressed concern that those statements contradicted the information in the EE/CA. Skip Medeiros said that the PCBs would be in a range of non-detect to .05. The mercury levels would be approximately half a part per million as the average onsite. There will be residuals left behind, but the average across the site will be less than one part per million.

Hill talked about achieving milestones such as the pilot studies and about the data gaps that had been filled. He said that a lot of work had been done to get to this stage. He asked for consensus on the onsite cleanup plan from the CAC.

Member Guthy asked about the differences between Alternative Two and Four and the refuge areas that will be left. Skip said that because Alternative Four's excavation does not start at the STP and does not extend all the way to site perimeter, there are approximately two acres that will not be excavated. They are above Area B and in the C, E area, including some low marsh, high marsh, and channel areas. He said those areas could serve as a source of recruitment of native vegetation back into the community that was restored after the cleanup.

Adrienne asked where that information came from. Skip said it came from a recently completed vegetation study.

Member Guthy asked if the area was important enough to leave undisturbed. Skip said this is only one of the differences. An extremely important difference is that there is a relatively minor variation in the amount of contamination that is removed between Alternative Two and Alternative Four.

There was also some discussion on the haul roads. Information was given that, based on preliminary bids, there may be far less difference in the length of roads for the two alternatives. Skip said that it was clear that the haul roads would cause upland damage.

Member Esposito expressed concern about new information being introduced at the eleventh hour that contradicted existing information on whether or not seeding was occurring from topsoil or uplands and whether that was good or bad, as well as new information on the roads. Hill said that with Alternative Four one of the biggest differences is that there are two less acres that will be disrupted and that is being looked at as helping to accelerate the restoration process.

Member Mannhaupt also expressed great concern about new information on re-vegetation and the fact that the Lab was bringing it up in this way at this meeting. She requested a copy of the vegetation study, which Skip said was not email-able but could be sent out.

Member Proios asked about the amount of sediment that was to be removed and if it would be replaced with the same amount of material. Skip said the areas would be re-graded to approximately the same dimensions that exist now. When questioned where the soil would come from. Skip said it was difficult to answer now. These are issues that will be in the proposals received from the contractor once one is selected. Member Proios reiterated his concerns about the difficulty in re-vegetating the impacted areas.

ACTION ITEM: Send copy of Revegetation Study to Jean Mannhaupt and Adrienne Esposito.

Member Kaplan said that he had a problem with the table in the fact sheet. He questioned how the numbers were arrived at and asked about the uncertainty of the assumptions and what the overlap was between Alternatives Two and Four.

Member Garber said that he was most concerned about environmental impacts. There are some ecologically beautiful areas on the Peconic and he applauded the Lab for being sensitive to reducing the number of haul roads. But at the last meeting he had asked for details on the ecological difference between Alternatives Two and Four and he was hoping to have an overlay map that would show what is being saved and what is going to be preserved.

Skip said that there was a broad range of habitats within the two acres. Based on discussions at a public information session the previous Tuesday, Skip put together a slide that addressed member Kaplan's questions. He displayed an overlay map and went over the areas that would be cleaned up and those that would be left under Alternative Two and Alternative Four.

CAC members asked questions about the haul roads and the contractor bids. Member Proios asked if there was a direct linear effect; if the levels of contamination are reduced by a certain percentage, does the risk go down that same percentage? Andy Rapiejko spoke about the County Health Department's position and the reasons they have adopted their position on Alternative Two, which he said would remove two more acres of contamination from the system. There was discussion on methyl mercury. It was suggested that additional comments be gotten from the regulators on the EE/CA. There was no support from the CAC for postponing the discussion until comments could be obtained.

6. Frank Anastasi, TAG consultant observations on the Peconic River cleanup.

Mr. Anastasi said that NEAR had asked him to look at the proposed plan and EE/CA to help them make their decision. He told the CAC that there were a couple of basic questions. Try to focus on what matters, what's significant. First – what is NEAR's goal and how do the Alternatives meet that goal. He said that NEAR wanted to protect human health and the environment, as well as protect the wetlands ecosystem of the Peconic River.

He noted there is little difference in the length of the haul roads and that he didn't want to put too much weight on cost, so he looked at reducing real risk. He said that potential risks could be estimated and that actions could be taken to reduce them, but the real risks are unknown. He said that there are significant uncertainties.

Another factor to consider was the quality of ecological habitat that is being saved or lost depending on the alternatives. There was a discussion on whether or not people eat the fish and how much fish they do consume.

Anastasi recommended to NEAR Alternative Four be selected.

Member Jordan-Sweet asked how the areas in Alternative Two were chosen. Les Hill said that Alternative Two focuses the areas of excavation on the areas that have sampled at mercury levels greater than 1.06 ppm. Alternative Four focused on areas that were deemed to be depositional areas.

Member Biss asked Skip about the offsite sampling results that didn't match the County's results and if it had been determined why the results were different. Skip said they agreed on a sampling program with the County and collected samples. The samples were split and they are waiting for the results to come in and be QA'd.

7. Community Comment

Andy Rapiejko clarified that the County is not part of the Core Team; they attend the meetings and participate in the discussions, but are not members. He said that the County made its position adamantly clear during the discussions on the Peconic River.

Zabby from public, educational, and governmental access television suggested that the CAC meetings be taped for broadcast on Channel 18.

8. CAC discussion on the Peconic River Alternatives; working to arrive at a consensus recommendation.

Reed reminded the CAC that the Peconic River story would not be over tonight; that the objective for the evening was to get input into the Laboratory. He said that he wanted to capture the members' key perspectives. Member Sprintzen said the CAC has been working on this issue for a long time and he thought that the time and effort already put in was in itself an accomplishment. Reed asked the members around the table to give their perspectives on the cleanup plan prior to working on a consensus recommendation. Reed told the CAC they could select an alternative, say either alternative is ok, or they could pass if they wanted to and at a later point give their input.

Member Henigin said that she preferred Alternative Four because it's going to disturb less of the habitat and the wetlands. She doesn't see enough return for disturbances that would be imposed by going with Alternative Two.

Member Talbot also preferred Alternative Four. Adding to what was previously said, because of the difference in cleanup between Four and Two, he said "I think Four is much more efficient and it's better science."

Member Guthy preferred Alternative Four for the same reasons, it disturbs less of the habitat, the roadways, need to remove less sediment. "I really just learned how important Area B is. I wish there was a way to leave part of that alone. I've been told that the sediment could be trapped on the way down the river, that the sediment could be cleaned up before it got too far,

but that part is important to remain intact. Alternative Four, but do something about Area B so that it doesn't have to be disturbed."

Member Esposito preferred Alternative Two. She said that she believes that it is based on good science, that it offers a better public health protection plan. "The reason I say that is because there is migration from onsite to offsite, people do eat the fish, if any of us here believes that people don't eat the fish, I think it's because we want to believe that not because it's reality and even if people don't currently eat the fish because they know they're contaminated, our goal should be that people can eat the fish 30 years from now. One other point, the cleanup here, the cleanup goal of 1.06 is also consistent with the other standards for mercury."

Member Proios said that we know the potential impacts to the environment, but have very little concrete data on health other than possibilities and perceptions. "I agree with Adrienne that sediment has traveled. I've been getting the Site Annual Reports for 15 or 20 years and in all those reports if you look at them over time the levels of mercury, the levels of silver, the levels of PCBs have been tremendously higher. At the times when they were at the highest, none of the regulatory agencies raised an issue. Now that they are at their lowest point, now there's a major cleanup going on. Where have we seen the deposition from the things that happened way in the past? Now, I'm positive based on geology and what happens with that river that most of the depositions that have occurred have not been from the day-to-day operations of the treatment plant, but probably episodic events when you have major storms or hurricanes. When the sediment is moved with great force and dumped in places that you wouldn't even think of looking today. There are probably pockets of stuff in some other areas that we would never even find. So to think that we're going to get more material out by doing more dredging I think is just not real science. So by looking at what we know, there would be more damage to the environment. As far as I know - and I've been with the County for more than 10 years - at the County we have never restored one acre of wetland. People say it can be done, thing is we've never done it. So I don't feel confident to say we can take on nature that's taken thousands of years to develop a system... On the health risk assessment, there are just so many suppositions, that if the water flows at a higher level, if the fish grow to edible size, if you eat the whole fish with the bones and the head, and you kill a deer…."

Reed said "George, I'm having trouble capturing this….can you help me with the short version."

Member Proios said, "The real threat of the destruction of an area versus a possibility of a health threat (that I don't feel in all good conscience has any reality of ever happening),…I think even Alternative Four goes too far, but Four is the least damaging of the Alternatives you're considering."

Member Campbell stated that his attitude was similar to Member Sprintzen's. "I think both Two and Four are good solutions. I don't see enough difference between the two that would make me object to either one being selected. One other comment that I'd make about the numbers that are in here. The numbers 95% and 5% should be interpreted as very big and very small, not much more precise than that. It's somebody's attempt to give a numeric interpretation of those terms."

Member Biss said that she was voting for Alternative Four, but encouraged the Lab to do it with their heads up. "If you find a lot of pollution of any kind then you should go for a little bit more in that area. So in other words, do Four but don't do it blindly. Keep your eyes open to see if there is any problem. Also stay away from as much of the ecological niceties that we have out there. Try not to destroy the river."

Member Sprintzen leans toward Four for the reasons that Barbara expressed.

Member Mannhaupt supports Alternative Four because since 1998 the comments of the CAC have been taken into consideration to present an alternative for the Peconic. "It is because of

the July meeting, the EPA, the DOE, the DEC, and SCDHS all stated that Alternative Four was proactive. And put on the record that it was protective of health, even though the Suffolk County prefers Alternative Two, they committed that Alternative Four was proactive to our health."

Member Garber also leaned towards Alternative Four. Even though he agrees with George that the health risk is not very severe, the difference between Two and Four, really has to do with the environmental degradation differences between them. What also comes into the picture is the quality of the environment that is, in fact, being destroyed in option Two. "If Alternative Two was really of trivial environmental value, then I might be convinced that there might be a greater good for Two. I think that not because of health, but because of the political reality--there must be a major cleanup for the Lab and for the regulatory agencies. Right now I lean towards Four."

Member Martin said that each of the plans had merit, or no merit, including do nothing. The merit to doing nothing is money saved. Martin said he was leaning towards Four, based on some of the very educated opinions of the people who put together Alternative Four, and for the reasons stated by others at the meeting who supported Alternative Four. He believes that if the Lab needs to do more (as in Alternative Two), they can.

Member McLoughlin stated that he is leaning toward Alternative Two. He said he missed the last meeting and a lot of the discussion, but from what he heard tonight, there are more uncertainties than certainties as to the benefit of the cleanup and the amount of damage that is caused. He prefers to err on the side of caution and have more cleanup than would be appropriate. "I would rather find out in 10 or 15 years down the road that we cleaned up too much, and that we didn't need to do that, than to find out we made a mistake and we should have cleaned it all up to begin with."

Member Jordan-Sweet said that she was undecided between Alternatives Three and Four. "The error bars on most of these numbers are bigger than the numbers themselves. One piece of information that I don't have that I'd like to have is the areas that will be treated in Alternative Three and whether that saves some more of Area B. Alternative Three still reduces the mercury below the cleanup goal for the EPA and the DEC, which is 2 ppm for groundwater. The treatment of PCBs is about the same between Two, Three and Four. The other thing is that I believe probably that the hauling road is going to essentially be the same for all three alternatives and I think since the ROD is coming up in less than a year, those roads are still going to be open and usable and hopefully by that time there will be harder numbers. We can make a more educated decision on whether we want to increase the amount of cleanup, but you can't decrease it."

Member Kaplan seconded Jean Jordan-Sweet's recommendation. "I think that there is so much uncertainty here that you can go with Three and test to see what's left and if you need to cleanup more, you can. The removal action is at the risk of the Lab anyway. It's not been approved by anybody in terms of a ROD; that's the driver. So I don't see jumping whole hog into this. I don't see much difference between Three and Four actually.

Member Conklin said that as a member of the Upton Preserve Committee he is leaning toward the least environmental damage that can be done to preserve an environmentally sensitive area. He said that's why the Upton Preserve was put into place. He stated he is with George 100% as far as the health issue – that he does not feel there is much of a health risk at all. He noted there was a study by the Lab five or six years ago – it was stated that the danger was to the environment. Conklin said no one has come up with dead birds and eggs…"Initially in my heart I go back to Alternative One where I'm saying let's take a look at this thing and clean it up if it's necessary for parts. But as time has progressed during these six years I've come to the political reality…that a cleanup is necessary at this point. The Lab is in the position that they've got to do something. My one concern is that Area B is fairly highly contaminated, one of the most contaminated areas, yet as you walk the river when you come to B you realize that of the Upton Preserve wetlands areas, that area is probably a little spot in heaven. The idea of taking

a bulldozer in there makes my hair stand on end, he said." Conklin would love to see an alternative that preserves the northern section of Area B. He realizes what an impossible situation it is, to dig through cattails roots and phragmities roots and to actually get the sediment out is near impossible. They'd have to be left if the area is to be preserved, he said. His only answer is to put a sediment trap downstream, leave the area alone, and understanding that it's a highly contaminated area, collect the sediments from that area in the trap. The rest of the river has been disturbed over the years, and he doesn't find that much value in those other areas. Conklin said he would like to see Alternative Four with an attempt at finding some means of leaving Area B alone and protecting the environment so there isn't the movement downstream. "I would go for Alternative One for Area B and for Alternative Four for the rest of the mile and a half."

Member Walker said that he was leaning toward Alternative Two, but his feeling isn't strong enough to have it stand in the way of coming to consensus. He does think it removes the highest amount of contamination and he thinks that's the main purpose of the work that's being done on the Peconic River to begin with. " I have a really hard time getting my mind around an idea that an area is so unique that it couldn't be torn down for the good of removing as much contamination as possible. I haven't heard anyone step forward and say that this is the last stand of Princess pine or the only habitat for any kind of specialized bug or something like that." He thinks the results of the pilot studies will show just how good the restoration is; he thinks that a good job can be done restoring habitat and wetlands.

Reed said that all the members around the table had well thought out positions and the opinions are all valuable. He said that there are differences in what the positions are and the input just given is already good. He thought that something may be crafted that combines all the interests. He asked if there was anyone around the table who can look at those that have a different perspective and propose something that will meet each other's interests.

CAC member Garber wondered if the members supporting Alternative Two and the total cleanup would go along with leaving the beautiful parts of Area B, which he acknowledged has 27 parts per million of mercury. Reed asked if anyone supporting Alternative Two could respond to that. Member Esposito said that she couldn't agree to leaving 27 ppm's in the river. She felt that the high levels of mercury there represented a risk.

CAC members proceeded to discuss Alternative Two and Four and various ways to cleanup while leaving the sensitive areas of Area B intact. The discussion included whether or not consensus could actually be reached. The CAC struggled with how much methyl mercury actually was or would be available and how difficult it was to base a decision without that information being known. The suggestion of placing a sediment trap downstream from Area B was thoroughly discussed. It was determined that while the trap would catch particles, it would not stop methyl mercury in the water column.

There was also discussion on how the areas would be restored and what materials would be used after dredging. The CAC was reminded that there was a risk to wildlife and there was a discussion as to whether or not there have actually been any impacts to wildlife seen. Skip also said that some of the vegetation may be harvested and transplanted temporarily and then put back after the area is remediated.

Reed attempted to determine what issues the CAC agreed on. There was further discussion on how the river and wetlands in Area B would be cleaned up and restored and whether or not that was a compromise or always on the table. Reed asked if the folks supporting preserving Area B could support -

- Cleaning up the contamination
- Salvaging the vegetation
- Restoring Area B, especially the north part, to a like or better condition using native vegetation and sediment where possible.

The CAC members were skeptical that could be done and Skip could not commit to getting sediment.

There was further discussion to try and reach consensus. Finally, it was suggested that comments be sent in to Dr. Chaudhari stating how many members supported which Alternatives. Member Mannhaupt felt the recommendations were on the flip charts and suggested putting them into a letter. Member Esposito agreed that the CAC members disagreed.

The CAC agreed that the comments should be taken from the flip charts and sent in as their input on the cleanup plan. The members were urged to submit comments individually and from their organizations.

9. Discussion on opening CAC meetings to include Working Groups and other stakeholders.

The CAC did not address this issue.

10. Agenda Setting

An update on the End State Vision will be scheduled for the November meeting and possibly a presentation on the re-vegetation study.

The meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

2003 Affiliation		First Name	Last Name	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
Chart Key X = Present O = Absent															
ABCO (Garber added on 4/10/02)	Member	Don	Garber	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		
ABCO	Alternate	Richard	Johannesen	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		O	O		
Brookhaven Retired Employees Association	Member	Graham	Campbell	X	X	O	X	X	X	O		O	X		
Brookhaven Retired Employees Association (L. Jacobson new alternate as of 4/99)	Alternate	Lou	Jacobson	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		O	O		
Citizens Campaign for the Environment	Member	Adrienne	Esposito	X	X	X	O	X	X	X		X	X		
Citizens Campaign for the Environment (Ottney added 4/02)	Alternate	Jessica	Ottney	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		O	O		
E. Yaphank Civic Association	Member	Michael	Giacomaro	X	O	X	X	O	X	X		X	O		
E. Yaphank Civic Association (J. Minasi new alternate as of 3/99)	Alternate	Jerry	Minasi	O	X	X	O	O	O	O		O	O		
Educator	Member	Audrey	Capozzi	O	O	O	O	X	X	X		O	O		
Educator (began as alternate in 3/99) (A. Martin new alternate 2/00) (Adam to college 8/01)(Bruce 9/01)	Alternate	Bruce	Martin	X	X	O	O	O	X	O		X	X		
Educator	Alternate	Adam	Martin									X	X		
Environmental Economic Roundtable (Berger resigned,Proios became member 1/01)	Member	George	Proios	X	O	X	O	X	X	X		X	X		
Environmental Economic Roundtable (3/99, L. Snead changed to be alternate for EDF)	Alternate	None	None												
Fire Rescue and Emergency Services	Member	David	Fischler	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		O	O		
Fire Rescue and Emergency Services	Alternate	James	McLoughlin	X	X	X	O	X	X	X		O	X		
Friends of Brookhaven (E.Kaplan changed to become member 7/1/01)	Member	Ed	Kaplan	X	X	X	X	O	X	O		X	X		
Friends of Brookhaven (E.Kaplan changed to become member 7/1/01)(schwartz added 11/18/02)	Alternate	Steve	Schwartz	O	O	O	O	O	O	X		O	O		
Health Care	Member	Jane	Corrarino	O	X	O	O	O	O	O		O	O		
Health Care (as of 10/02 per JD)	Alternate	Mina	Barrett	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		O	O		
Huntington Breast Cancer Coalition	Member	Mary Joan	Shea	X	X	X	O	X	X	X		X	O		
Huntington Breast Cancer Coalition	Alternate	Scott	Carlin	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		O	O		
Intl. Brotherhood of Electrical Workers/Local 2230	Member	Mark	Walker	X	X	X	O	X	O	X		X	X		
IBEW/Local 2230	Alternate	Philip	Pizzo	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		O	O		
L.I. Pine Barrens Society	Member	Richard	Amper	O	O	O	O	X	X	O		O	O		
L.I. Pine Barrens Society	Alternate	Katherine	Timmins	X	X	O	O	X	O	X		O	O		
L.I. Pine Barrens Society	Alternate	Jane	Geary									X	O		

2003 Affiliation		First Name	Last Name	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
L.I. Progressive Coalition	Member	David	Sprintzen	X	X	O	O	X	X	X		X	X		
L.I. Progressive Coalition	Alternate	None	None												
Lake Panamoka Civic Association (Biss as of 4/02)	Member	Rita	Biss	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		
Lake Panamoka Civic Association (Rita Biss new alternate as of 3/99)	Alternate	Joe	Gibbons	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		X	O		
Long Island Association	Member	Marion	Cohn	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		O	O		
Long Island Association	Alternate	William	Evanzia	O	O	O	O0	X	O	O		X	O		
Longwood Alliance	Member	Tom	Talbot	O	X	O	X	X	X	X		X	X		
Longwood Alliance	Alternate	Kevin	Crowley	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		O	O		
Longwood Central School Dist. (switched 11/02)	Member	Barbara	Henigin	X	O	X	X	O	X	X		X	X		
Longwood Central School Dist.	Alternate	Candee	Swenson	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		O	O		
NEAR	Member	Jean	Mannhaupt	O	O	X	O	O	X	X		O	X		
NEAR	Alternate	Wayne	Prospect	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		O	O		
NSLS User	Member	Jean	Jordan-Sweet	O	X	X	X	O	O	O		X	X		
NSLS User	Alternate	Peter	Stephens	O	O	O	O	O	O	X		O	O		
PACE Union	Member	Allen	Jones	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		O	O		
PACE Union	Alternate	Philip	Plunkett	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		O	O		
Ridge Civic Association	Member	Ron	Clipperton	X	X	O	O	X	X	X		O	O		
Ridge Civic Association	Alternate	None	None												
STAR (disbanded April 2003)	Member	Scott	Cullen	O	X	O	O	O	-	-		-			
STAR	Alternate	Terry	Guglielmo	O	O	O	O	O	-	-		-			
Town of Brookhaven	Member	Jeffrey	Kassner	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		O	O		
Town of Brookhaven	Alternate	Anthony	Graves	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		O	O		
Town of Brookhaven, Senior Citizens	Member	James	Heil	X	X	X	X	X	O	X		X	O		
Town of Brookhaven, Senior Citizens (open slot as of 4/99)	Alternate	None	None												
Town of Riverhead	Member	Robert	Conklin	X	X	X	X	X	O	O		X	X		
Town of Riverhead (K. Skinner alternate as of 4/99)	Alternate	Kim	Skinner	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		O	O		
Wading River Civic Association	Member	Helga	Guthy	X	X	O	X	X	X	X		X	X		
Wading River Civic Association	Alternate	Sid	Bail	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		O	O		
Yaphank Taxpayers & Civic Association	Member	Nanette	Essel	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		O	O		
Yaphank Taxpayers & Civic Association	Alternate	None	None										O		