

**Community Advisory Council
December 13, 2001
Action Items/Notes**

FINAL

These notes are in the following order:

1. Attendance
2. Correspondence and handouts
3. Quorum
4. Administrative
5. Update on monitoring at g-2, Michael Hauptmann, Project Manager
6. Update on grant request from SCDHS, Michael Holland, Manager, DOE Brookhaven Area Office
7. Peconic River subcommittee report
8. Update on Peconic River, including input on decision to conduct electrochemical pilot project. Skip Medeiros, Group Manager
9. Update on Accelerated Cleanup Grant from the Rauch Foundation
10. Community Comment
11. Budget Options and Impacts for FY03 – Science and Environmental Management, Peter Bond, Sr. Scientist, Special Assistant to the Director and Les Hill, Director, Environmental Management
12. Discussion on the *Newsday* article and path forward for the Council
13. Community Comment
14. January Agenda

1. Attendance:

Present:

Members- G. Campbell, A. Capozzi, R. Clipperton, B. Conklin, S. Cullen, A. Esposito, M. Giacomaro, H. Guthy, J. Heil, A. Jones, J. Jordon-Sweet, J. Mannhaupt, G. Proios, M. Shea, D. Sprintzen, T. Talbot, M. Walker.

Alternates- R. Biss, A. Graves, J. Grindrod, B. Henigin, J. McLoughlin, B. Martin, K. Timmins

Others- M. Bebon, P. Bond, J. Carter, J. Clodius, F. Crescenzo, L. Cunniff, J. D'Ascoli, K. Geiger, P. Genzer, A. Givens, K. Grigoletto, L. Hill, M. Holland, B. Kinkead, S. Kumar, M. Lynch, S. Medeiros, S. Musolino, L. Nelson, R. Paulsen, G. Penny, A. Rapiejko, K. Shaw, K. White.

Absent:

Members- R. Amper, M. Barrett, M. Cohn, J. Corrarino, A. Drake, N. Essel, D. Fischler, J. Gibbons, J. Kassner, C. Kepert, P. Martino, C. Swenson, F. Towle, J. Tripp.

Alternates- S. Bail, S. Carlin, A. Cooley, K. Crowley, W. Evanzia, T. Guglielmo, L. Jacobson, R. Johannesen, G. Miglino, J. Pannullo, P. Pizzo, W. Prospect, K. Skinner, L. Snead, P. Stephens

2. Correspondence and Handouts

(Items 1 – 5 were mailed with a cover letter dated December 7, 2001. Items 6 –7 were included in the folders and items 8 through 10 were available as a handout.)

1. Draft agenda for December.

2. Draft November notes.
3. Copies of final October and July notes.
4. Copy of *Newsday* article
5. Copy of email from Minna Barrett to Jeanne D'Ascoli regarding membership
6. Revised draft agenda.
7. Copy of Peter Bond's viewgraphs
8. Copies of correspondence and notes compiled by Bob Conklin
9. Presentation on Peconic River Update, Skip Medeiros, Group Manager, Peconic River.
10. Presentation on Environmental Management budget, Les Hill

3. Quorum

The meeting began at 6:35 p.m. A quorum was established when 17 of the 31 member organizations were present.

4. Administrative

Reed announced that CAC member Joe Gibbons recently had by-pass surgery. He mentioned that a reporter from *Newsday* was expected and he went over the agenda. The notes from the November meeting were approved with no additions, changes, or corrections.

Jeanne gave an update on the correspondence sent to members regarding their attendance. Leg. Towle expects to have a representative attend meetings in the future, Minna Barrett wishes to remain on the CAC. Responses have not yet been received from ABCO, EDF, or the Long Island Builders Institute.

On the matter of issuing members Guest Badges, general employee training is required. It was decided that GET training would be given at 6 p.m., before the February meeting, for those interested.

5. Update on monitoring at g-2, Michael Hauptmann, Project Manager

Mike Hauptmann gave a brief history of the contamination and remediation at the g-2 experiment at the AGS facility which is being monitored as part of the cleanup program. Recent sampling results have come back at the same level that had been originally found in 1999. These results were unexpected. The Lab thought the concentrations would continue to decline as they had in the spring round of sampling. In trying to determine a reason for the increased levels, coolant lines were checked along with the integrity of the cap and other experiment stations. They have come to the tentative conclusion that a 2-foot rise in the watertable has allowed contaminants previously sitting in dry soil to move to the monitoring wells. The period of time, direction of travel, and the presence of sodium-22 support the theory. Hauptmann reported that the path forward included continuing to monitor, execute the work plan, and develop remedial cleanup alternatives with the opportunity to comment on them in the early fall. There was some discussion about whether or not the soil should have been remediated prior to installation of the cap. Reed asked that Mike Hauptmann report back to the group with an update in the early fall.

6. Update on grant request from SCDHS, Michael Holland, Manager, DOE Brookhaven Area Office

Mike Holland gave an update on the request from the SC Department of Health Services for \$35,000 to fund an independent review of the Peconic River cleanup plan. A decision was made to make the money available. DOE and the Lab thought there was value, that it was important that the County be able to bring in experts to resolve any questions. A contract will be

set up with a third party and the County has agreed to have the expert panel conduct the work in conjunction with the project schedule.

7. Peconic River subcommittee report

Bob Conklin gave the subcommittee report. Notes from the meetings were distributed. He noted that DOE does meet with the regulators and gets verbal feedback. Draft copies of various reports are provided to the regulators, written comments and strong feedback is received. Conklin stated that it is very early in the process to make any decisions or recommendations to the CAC. Member Sprintzen asked if there were specific concerns that the committee feels are not being addressed fairly and adequately. Conklin said that there was concern regarding the DEC letter and some of the materials in the IT report. One out of six concerns has been addressed. Member Esposito said that the cleanup standards were going to change shortly, so the issue is less important at this time. She also said typographical errors in the IT report had been a source of confusion. She said that the committee went through a lengthy process of understanding the relationship and roles of all the agencies involved. Conklin noted the subcommittee was part of the Working Group and the Working Group will be reviewing cleanup goals. The four cleanup options will be reviewed, but to date the committee has only reviewed electrochemical. Member Esposito said that they went over in detail the supplemental results and that took a lot of time. Additional sampling has been completed and the cleanup area has been expanded. Member Biss inquired why the levels of mercury and PCB's were higher than expected in the fish. The response was that it is believed that PCBs are accumulating in the sediment. Member Conklin speculated that the invertebrates pick up the contaminants and then they in turn are eaten by the fish. Mannhaupt pointed out that a timetable couldn't be put together because the definitions and characterizations for the risk assessment have to be done first. The question of the change in water table impacting the concentration levels of contaminants and their location was also raised.

8. Update on Peconic River, including input on decision to conduct electrochemical pilot project. Skip Medeiros, Group Manager

Skip said all the sampling data is in and has begun to be shared. Maps showing the distribution of cesium and mercury were given to the Working Group. Both old and new data is being combined for a total synopsis picture of the Peconic River and how it may have changed in the last couple of years. The risk assessment will be undertaken.

The previous cleanup goal for mercury that was proposed was 9.8 ppm and that is being reevaluated. Area A is the area closest to the Sewage Treatment Plant, it is a ponded area held back by the stream gauging station. A very extensive cleanup had been proposed and there will most probably not be any change. Area B is down stream from the first gauging station and is a complex wetland. It's the area that was proposed for the pilot study on electrochemical remediation. This area has several contaminants, mercury, silver, copper, PCBs, and Cesium 137. The new sampling indicates an approximate three-fold increase in the cleanup area size, from .4 to 1.5 acres. Area E will grow down river a bit and Area D will grow up river a bit. The exact extent of the down river area requires another couple of samples and those samples will be taken as the cleanup process gets underway. A new area referred to as Area P is in the Suffolk County parkland that extends beyond Area E which is also part of the SC parkland. Originally, no cleanup was proposed in this area. Subject to new cleanup goals there will be a better understanding of whether or not there will be cleanup required in this area. Member Proios stated that besides the cleanup goals, the CAC hasn't really discussed what other type of mechanisms were going to be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the four pilots. He wanted to know the pluses, the minuses, and the uncertainties. Member Esposito wants to ensure all aspects of each technology – positive and negative – are looked at. Regarding the pilot studies: all of the work plans are out and under review by the regulatory agencies. The Lab has

received feedback from several of the regulatory agencies. The Lab also distributed to the CAC subcommittee and the Working Group a copy of each of the draft work plans - feedback is valued. The sediment trap is still scheduled for installation by February. Vacuum guzzling will start in early spring because lowering the pressure of the vacuum raises the temperature at which water will freeze.

Regarding electrochemical, there are many questions in terms of the environmental impact. The pros are - it has the potential to remove metals and breakdown organic chemicals with minimal wetland damage. The cons - Cesium will not be plated, that means it will not be removed from the environment. Member Esposito wanted to know if other radionuclides can be plated?

Skip said if electrochemical is adopted the Lab will be the first site at which radionuclides have been tested. The Bellingham Bay Washington project addresses some of the same contaminants as the Lab but no radionuclides. Additionally, this is the first project in the United States that the EPA is acting as a referee on.

Skip stated that the contractor said everything to the left of aluminum was said to not plate. Cesium is to the left. Everything to the right was said to plate, mercury and silver are to the right. The Lab's electrochemist said that that's a rather simplistic explanation. Additional information is being requested from the contractor. The principal issue, Skip said, is whether the cesium will migrate.

If it's mobilized it's likely to be attracted to the electrode. If it's attracted to the electrode, it's likely to be accumulated in higher concentrations close to the electrodes. The effect of that is to take something which may be at 4 or 8 or 15 pico curies per gram and increase the concentration to something higher. But the benefit would be that there's a large area from which the Cesium will be removed. The natural follow-up question is what to do with what's accumulated? That's the issue.

Question - What happens when you run an electric charge to mercury, can you volatilize it?

Answer - My understanding is it is not volatilized. The contractor told us that that was not an issue.

Question - Is it temperature dependent?

Answer - Yes.

Question - The electrodes are lined up. Is there any water circulation in between?

Answer - A good bit of this is wetland area in which there is not actual flowing or standing water. It's necessary that there be moisture present in order to allow the metals to move. Down the center is a channel. At periods of high precipitation and high water table there is water within the area covering the marsh or portions of the marsh.

Question - Is there a concern about some of the mammals in the area or people accidentally touching a wire and getting zapped from the dc power?

Answer - As part of the work plan, health and safety issues are included.

Question - How many volts are there - 480?

Answer - Yes. The only exposed part is the electrode itself (which is in fact not exposed) is below the surface. What attracts the materials is the electro fields set up between the two, it's not actual flow of electricity.

Question - Has anyone done it on a benchtop using just some material – 2 pieces of copper and cesium?

Answer - I'm not aware that this has been done on a benchtop.

Question - How deep will the electrodes be in the sediment?

Answer - A foot to two feet.

Question - Is there any chance that as these things are pulled out of the sediment you might lose pieces of material that have accumulated on it?

Answer - That's a possibility. My understanding is that it is dependent very much on the chemistry of the area in which it's done. We don't have that answer.

Question - Are these electrodes alternate in charge? One positive and one negative?

Answer - That's my understanding.

Question - Again, is a smaller pilot project a possibility? Is there an area that's more accessible, less expensive to get to? Also, what is the difference from an ecological standpoint of the electrodes versus the dredging? When I look at that graphic with all of those electrodes I think someone's got to bring them back in, and that's not something that can be done without having some kind of impact. I'd be interested in some kind of ecological study to compare the different technologies before the implementation.

Answer - That step will be taken.

Question - Does the Cesium have to be cleaned up by some other method if it is left undisturbed?

Answer - At this point cesium has not been proposed for cleanup. Pending the results of the risk assessment and the decision on cleanup goals, it may or not be included as something that should be removed.

Question - Is that decision far off?

Answer - About a month

Question - Since one of the largest questions seems to be whether or not the cesium will migrate and concentrate, would a small pilot program answer the question? Would there be enough data from a small pilot test of this technology to answer that question?

Answer - I'm not sure that from a small pilot we can gain good information about the efficiency of removing the metals and breaking down the PCBs. I'll have to go back to the vendor.

Question - Is a small pilot one set of electrodes? What would the small pilot be compared to the other things we've got up here?

Answer - The vendor suggests a pilot study 8 meters apart and 66 feet long. I don't know how much smaller would be effective.

Member Biss said to just make sure the electrodes are at least 4 or 5 times as long as the space between the electrodes. Don't make short electrodes and a big space or you will have nothing.

Question - How much was the pilot?

Answer - \$620,000.

Question - There's a lot of iron in the peat bogs in this area. How will you avoid plating that as well? At some point, we may have to say, after you're all done spending time and money, you're going to probably be vacuuming the sediment out. Should we be wasting more money on something that may have many more questions as opposed to something that we know works, is easy, and it has less of an impact?

Answer - This issue has many unanswered scientific questions. Perhaps more pilot studies, more benchtop studies, and several other things have to be done before we can have confidence that it could be successful in the Peconic.

Reed - When do you need a recommendation from this group?

Skip said that the contracting process could begin in January if there are no outstanding questions. Discussing this again in January gives me an opportunity to do some work to answer the questions and you an opportunity to give input.

The questions that need to be answered in order to have a discussion in January:

- What are the other contaminants in the water? Are there questions about ionizing other contaminants?
- Does the process plate any other radionuclides?
- What are the ecological impacts of electrochemical vs. other approaches? Could an ecologist do a study and compare technologies before electrochemical is done?
- How can the size of the project be scaled down to make it smaller, and more feasible?
- Will the cesium migrate and what will be done with it? Will it need to be excavated?
- Will increased concentrations of the cesium be a benefit?
- Will there be corrosion from the plates? Will something be left behind when the electrodes are removed?
- What percent efficiency is electrochemical as opposed to other methods as far as cleaning up that particular area? In other words, is this 90% efficient in cleaning up metals and compounds and radionuclides and the other ones are only 70%? Or is it 70 and 70?

- How small and inexpensive a project can be crafted that will really answer the questions?

Member Esposito commented she encouraged members to consider the expense but that was not the total factor. She said with g-2 it was originally suggested to remediate the soil so that there wouldn't be more groundwater contamination. They put a cap on it instead. That obviously resulted in more groundwater contamination. The reason the soil wasn't remediated, if you recall, was because it was expensive. Now we have a cap that leaks, we have soil that's contaminated, and we have groundwater that's contaminated. The bottom line is that I'd just like the people to consider the expense but not make it the only thing that you consider because it's not the only thing to consider.

9. Update on Accelerated Cleanup Grant from the Rauch Foundation

Dick Amper was not at the meeting therefore questions re Rauch funding were not answered. Member Sprintzen said there was lots of discussion early on about who can represent the CAC and under what conditions. Whatever individual views on specific issues he thought it was unanimous that no person or organization could speak on behalf of the CAC without explicit authorization from the organization. He stated in the invitation received from the Rauch Foundation, the Pine Barrens Society received a grant of \$25,000 to carry out the work of the Accelerated Cleanup Committee, which Richard was carrying out as chairperson.

Sprintzen said he thought the CAC needed to take a clear position that says the CAC is concerned by the impression that a position on the CAC was used as a vehicle to raise money for a separate organization, and the CAC wants it clear that no individual person is to act on behalf of, or to represent itself as speaking on behalf of the CAC without its explicit authorization.

A motion was made and passed stating "no individual or organization will state representation of the CAC without explicit approval to represent the CAC on an issue."

Action Items:

1. Request a copy of the grant application to Rauch.
2. Request a copy of the letter that went out to the CAC members.
3. Ask Dick Amper to provide additional information about it.

10. Community Comment

There were no comments from members of the audience.

11. Budget Options and Impacts – Science and Environmental Management, Peter Bond, Sr. Scientist, Special Assistant to the Director and Les Hill, Director, Environmental Management

Peter Bond gave some background information on the budgets for the Department of Energy and for Brookhaven. He stated that the DOE budget was complicated because portions come from two different bills - the Energy and Water and the Interior Appropriations Bills. Bond showed the breakdown of the entire DOE budget and then spoke about the funding for FY01 and the projected 2002 budgets. He explained that even after the budget is passed, the final amount is unknown because it isn't distributed all at once. He pointed out a decrease in funding for Basic Energy Sciences, which is due to the HFBR. There is funding for the HFBR to remain in a stable state this year, however, he said that \$18 million was lost in '02 when it goes to the

surveillance and maintenance status. The environmental restoration money included \$10 million from last year. He said that while the budget has been flat over the past years, this year it is down \$32 million. Totals could go up or down, the figures are a guess. He said that a \$30 million shortfall this year is anticipated.

Bond discussed near-term projects that are expected to be funded. He mentioned anti-terrorism detection/prevention, the Nanoscience Center, the Cyclotron Isotope Research Center, and rare symmetry violating processes (high energy physics-understanding the most basic building blocks of matter). He also said the Tropospheric Aerosol Program is a big issue around cities because it studies air pollution released from cars and human processes that cause smog. Bond explained the relationship of these programs to Brookhaven stating that the cyclotron and rare symmetry violating processes were unique to Brookhaven while the others could also be done elsewhere.

Bond explained that December and January is when the Office of Management and Budget puts together the proposal for the next fiscal year after receiving input from the agencies and guidance from the President. The budget becomes public information in February after being formally proposed by the President.

Les Hill spoke about the funding for environmental management. He talked about the current baseline, the funding profile, what the forecast for funding looks like, and what the impacts are. Hill explained the current baseline cost profile and funding needed. He stated projections indicated funding may be flat for 2002 through 2009. He that the impacts of a shortfall would be that some programs would have to wait and long-term planning would be difficult. He said that if the funding is flat, it would jeopardize the accelerated cleanup schedule. Hill talked about rebaselining and the costs involved with that. Definite information will be available after the President issues his FY03 budget in February. Hill stated if things needed to be put off, there may be ways to work around it comprehensively. He said the groundwater schedule would be maintained.

Hill stated the new funding projections would not support the FY05 completion of the cleanup program. CAC members questioned the rationale for the budget changes and whether or not Senatorial and Congressional representatives should be reengaged. Member Proios requested the specifics could be put in a graph with the operable units and some of the key programs, shown as cost time-lines, where they are supposed to be in terms of starting and finishing.

Action Item

Put the operable units and some of the key programs in a graph. Show as cost time-lines, where they are supposed to start and finish.

Action Item – Invite legislative representatives to February meeting.

12. Discussion on the *Newsday* article and path forward for the Council

Marge Lynch commented on the value that Lab senior management places on the CAC. She stated that direct and indirect input from the CAC is used at almost every level in big and small decisions. She asked for feedback on ways to improve some areas, what is working, what isn't, and how the group is working/operating.

Member Sprintzen asked for some discussion on the *Newsday* article. Members made comments about who had input, whether or not they were interviewed, and about the content of the article. Some members thought the media did a disservice by not reporting more fully on the CAC and talked about sending letters to the editor.

Members of the CAC responded to the following:

What is the degree of value of the CAC to you as a participant?

Do you have anything to suggest for how we ought to be operating differently?

What is the key thing you would suggest for how the CAC ought to be operating to be more effective?

Walker – I've been able to go back to my group which happens to be the Local Unions and give reports on the CAC. I've invited them down, (very few have come), but still I feel that it's a wonderful opportunity to learn about what exactly goes on around this place. Anybody who thinks that I'm a Lab lackey is sadly mistaken. I've been a union activist for 17 years.

Giacomaro - I've been involved with the Laboratory long before there was a CAC. For me, I think the value has decreased not increased. My alternate discussed dropping out, but the final consensus in my organization is that somebody should be here. I don't always get the idea that we're actually advising the Laboratory. And that's one thing that has always bothered me. If we're advising the Laboratory then I think we should have a chairperson who would state what the CAC recommends or doesn't recommend and give that to the Director of the Laboratory. Some of the issues that we have are our own personal issues for our organizations and we have a tendency to want to pursue those. And that's what has distorted my perspective on what we are here for.

McLoughin – Well, do we have value? Yes, I think we have a tremendous value because we don't always agree on a lot of things but when we do you have all representatives of the community agreeing with each other's opinion from environmental to civic organizations to labor organizations. And I think when you come out with a consensus opinion it carries a lot of weight. I don't think that's something that people can ignore, or at least not look at. As far as where we should go from here, I think part of the problem with the *Newsday* article is that we don't have a spokesperson. We never elected a chairman, never elected someone to speak for the group, so the media has no option but to contact everyone individually. I think maybe it's time we should look into that.

Conklin - This is a scientific organization, there is science done here. If you're not interested in science and that's not your thing then you probably don't belong sitting around this table. Security at Brookhaven Lab, anti-terrorism situation, structural studies of anthrax, absolutely up-to-date, pertinent, information. This scientific organization is doing the best that they can to inform us. Updates on the BGRR, the Peconic River, the Lab is providing a tremendous service to us. That's personally the way I look at it.

Shea – I think the group has tremendous value and I think the past history of the Lab was that they wouldn't communicate with the community. We had no idea what was going on here and I think that the new management of the Lab has made tremendous strides in communicating with the public and opening up the Lab to various groups so that we could find out what's going on. I think that's tremendous value - you get out what you put into it. It isn't a perfect situation and there are those of us who have different opinions and ideas about things, but I think it's been extremely valuable. The fact that those of us who are still here have stayed together in spite of all the differences is important. We can gain a lot by working with each other and discussing things. In this article for instance, of the 33 members it doesn't seem as though even half of them were contacted. How could this speak for any of us? As far as having a spokesperson for the group, I don't think that's really the answer because, there again, one person can't speak for the group but I think maybe we should all write letters to the editor. I think that would have tremendous impact if 33 of us or even half of us wrote our own opinions to the editor. We shouldn't be discouraged by something like this, but we definitely should respond to let people know what's really going on.

Sweet – I think the CAC has real value to its members and to the Lab. I think it really is a two way conduit. I've learned a lot being here. Personally, I found it more valuable for myself in the beginning when there were really big issues. So I find it a little more tiresome now, but I still feel very strongly most of the committee's strength is from the diversity of the groups represented and the diversity of opinions so I'm sticking it out.

Proios - As a number of people pointed out I've been here a long time. I've gotten three degrees, I go to four committee meetings at the Lab and I'm always amazed at how much I don't know. That's one of the values. Sometimes I've heard the same discussion three times in different venues, like the talk on anthrax. Each time I picked up something new that I didn't hear the first time. Some of the issues are extremely complex and there's no easy answer to all of these issues that we're dealing with. I think we're going through another transition. We put in motion the wheels to get the major job done for the Lab to clean up legacy wastes. In the future, I'd like to see us start to focus on prevention. The ISO 14001 is something I pushed years ago when Dean Helms was here. I think the Lab can be used as a model and I'd like to see us put more into how many good preventative things are going on here or how we can enhance them and then get that information out to the rest of the County, the rest of the Island - where there are many, many more waste streams with far more and heavier concentrations. This is why I look at some of these issues and I say we're not looking at risk assessment. I get a report every month that shows concentrations that are a hundred times worse than what the Lab has being dumped over our sole source aquifer in close proximity to public wells which to me is more of a threat. So what I'd like to see us do is start to slowly, maybe during part of the meeting be able to get into new areas where we're more productive in terms of making some serious contributions.

Cappozzi – I joined knowing that government was the largest polluter in the country. I thought that this was a secretive organization. I was pleasantly surprised that Jack Marburger was present all the time. I think the acting Lab Director ought to be encouraged and invited to start making an appearance here. In the beginning, I had felt there was a lot of filibustering going on, there was a lot of attention to self-interests. I feel that's been put aside and the group is working in a positive vein. It's very valuable.

Sprintzen – I think this is an astounding organization and the key to it, in part, is the diversity. I hate to see any lack of diversity so I'd hate to see people leave, and if they leave, I hope that their interests are represented by other like organizations. It's extremely important to maintain a diversity that's responsive and is an expression of as many stakeholders as possible. There's been a significant transformation in the relationship with the Lab and the community. The past history was not always very good in a lot of ways - environmentally, community respect. The transformation has been fantastic and I believe that the CAC has played a role in that. The CAC provides the basis for a constructive relationship that continues to build. We could pick up some of the ideas that George and Bob talked about. We just need to figure out how to take the energy and information and move it in constructive way so that we can contribute to or support or learn from the great science that is being done here and make sure the Lab is a constructive contributor to the health and safety of the people of Long Island.

Mannhaupt – I think the CAC is a phenomenal body. I've been part of many mechanisms with BNL and worked to get the doors open. I think diversity is absolutely the reason for the phenomenon. I agree with George, we need to go on. The resources of this place, the programs of environmental management, there's no greater resource than this place when you need to find an answer for something. We're working on Operable Units cleaning up the site, we've all been to hell and back, I don't see us as a watchdog group anymore, I don't think anyone's hiding anything. There might still be some issues that come up. We have matured and BNL has as well. DOE comes kicking along, and DOE has gotten much better. We just

need to go to the next stage. Mike brought it up first, the next level is - we need a chairman. We need someone to chair the CAC.

Biss – I agree with almost everything that's been said up to now. The only thing I'd like to see is some of the old problems we haven't heard about. What's happened to OU III, is that cleaned up? Can we have 20 minutes of an old problem to discuss its state at this point?

Clipperton – I believe the CAC has been a value to me, not only from what I've learned from the presentations that we've had, but also from hearing from other people. Some have been involved in this kind of thing for many years and certainly have more of a background in community activism than I do. I feel that we've come a long way. Early on I remember going home and saying to my wife, I don't know - all we do is yell at each other for 2 hours. What did we accomplish? I don't feel it's like that anymore. I think we really do get somewhere. As far as suggestions for change, I don't know how it would be implemented but I think that more of what goes on here needs to be gotten into the community. So many in my civic association have no idea of what is going on here. If I start talking about the CAC there's little interest. I don't know what to do about that. One thing I would like to see is a visit from the Acting Director, so we could see him even if he isn't going to be Director of the Laboratory.

Campbell – Well obviously I think it would be a better organization if everybody agreed with me! (Laughter.) The meetings are essentially educating me and allowing me to bring that back to the community that I represent. The understanding of divergent points of view is to my mind, what is the essential value. About this article, I would take umbrage a little bit that the group has become weighted with retirees. This particular retiree was on the group that sent out the letter that invited everybody here to join this organization so it was not something that happened over time, that the Lab gradually stacked the organization with people that favor it. We were in there from the beginning and are actively supportive of the CAC.

Heil – As the newest member I didn't realize I was supposed to agree with you all the time. (Laughter.) I have found the meetings both informative and interesting. I'm able to take some of the information I've learned back to my area to some of the people that I run into. In my experience in waste management, in the various citizens advisory committees on solid waste issues for probably a good five to six town supervisors both in Hempstead and Brookhaven, there were many actions we didn't do because we knew what the advisory committee would say or do or react to. So it's not always a direct cause and effect, the effect of this committee and its diversity and the statements and the information that is shared and the opinions - I think they reflect back on the Lab management in so many ways and probably most of them are not very obvious. I do believe sincerely that we do have a definite effect.

Esposito – I would say I see pros and cons. The pros - I have to agree with your comments that say that this forum allows for a greater amount of informational sharing on the part of DOE and BNL to the members of the CAC. I find that very educational, very helpful. But I also have been tremendously disappointed and frustrated in many of our meetings, and of the CAC in general. In the beginning there was more of an emphasis on environmental cleanup and remediation. Over the years that has been extremely diminished and reduced. And, it's been extremely frustrating for me. When I spoke a couple of meetings ago about thinking we should take more of the soil out under the canal at the Graphite Reactor...silence...silence except for the one member that called me irrational, which I don't mind, everyone is entitled to their opinion. When the issue of the funding for the Suffolk County Community Oversight Committee that was looking for independent scientists came up here there was anger. I could go on and on, the groundwater remediation, you know I was pushing for standards on groundwater remediation, nothing, silence from the members of this Board. My organization has provided written comments on these, written comments on the Graphite Reactor along every step of the way, every process, I think we're the only members of the CAC who have done that and every time I

bring it to this Board and every single time no one has a comment or frankly its been an insulting comment or a belittling comment. I don't even mind that, that's fine. But it really strikes me as odd that then there's a *Newsday* article, and we've got to go around the room and do a warm and fuzzy thing because people feel bad that something bad was said about the CAC. I think we should increase our sensitivity levels. Everybody ought to focus way more on environmental issues, on whether you want to know BNL science issues or whatever the issues are. We should focus a lot less on the divisive things like the whole Dick Amper thing tonight. To me that is such a waste of time. It's hard for me to come here and have those kinds of conversations. I just don't think they're productive. I don't think they're constructive. When we start assuming the worse about each other, that really is bad. And the last thing is there is a danger in starting to say we should figure out a way to vote people off if we don't think they have the best intent of CAC in mind. Well, is it the best intent of CAC for diverse viewpoints? That's what I thought, that's what I was told when I joined, that we want a diverse group with diverse perspectives, not we're going to sensor you and if you don't fall in line, you're out.

Grindrod - Well, as I've been filling in for Adrian Drake for the past year and a half or so I missed out on a lot of the more exciting cleanup goals and options in the past. But I think that the CAC still has a lot of good work that it can do and that it is doing. I don't feel that my organization is one that will leave any time soon. We appreciate everyone's comments and the diversity of the group; we think it's one of the best CAC's that any of us do. We have 15 professional environmental staff at Group for the South Fork and this is one of the CAC's that we think can actually accomplish the most. So I feel that our organization has a lot invested in this CAC. I appreciate everyone's input, we're not always going to agree, but that's the point of being here.

Guthy – I have to agree with most of the people. It's been a great group, a great opportunity to learn, I've loved all the people I've met, even the one's I disagree with. I give the scientists so much credit, and for all these people that come month after month and spend hours with us giving us all this information, answering our either intelligent or dumb questions whatever the questions we have. I have to appreciate that because I know it's hard for me to come and all I do is sit here, I don't have to go through any big talk or anything. Again the group, as far as I understood it, was not a watchdog group. We started out to work with the Lab to diminish community concerns, to find out what's going on at the Lab. The Lab shares its information with us and then we bring it back to our community. If the community has any questions or hears anything that scares them, we were supposed to come back and ask to have it clarified and have things explained. This is what I thought it was. I think the diversity of the group has improved our community as a whole even though individually some of us get upset. I feel upset by being called (I believe this one referred to me), a lapdog. I thought that was rather unnecessary. Because my husband worked at the Lab many people have criticized me for that. I've been asked to get off this council, or they went to my Civic president and asked him to take me off because my husband worked at the Lab. And that had nothing to do anything here because this was my thing. No one held Hillary Clinton accountable for what Bill Clinton did. (Laughter.) The group started as stakeholders - people who worked here certainly have more of an interest in what goes on than anyone outside the Lab.

Talbot – I spent most of my career as an engineering manager in an operating nuclear plant and we had our share of problems with public perception. We were constantly dealing with the public, pickets, and politicians criticizing the power industry. The way we dealt with that, and not very successfully obviously, was that we would hold public forums and visit with community groups. I participated in that in many parts of this country, Europe, and Africa trying to sell nuclear power or give people a certain sense of security about the nuclear industry through education. It was self-serving and maybe this committee is too, but I don't find that offensive. I think the degree of value of the CAC is extremely high. The only thing that might be lacking is that maybe it's not communicating well outside the committee. I feel very good about having an

opportunity to be here. I have a much higher regard for the people that work here, for what they are trying to achieve, and the sincerity of the people here in trying to deal with the cleanup issue, which is my major issue of getting on this committee. The other thing that I suggest to the CAC is to be very careful about the people that are on the CAC. We're looking for diversity, but we also have to maintain credibility. I am extremely impressed with every person that I've ever run across on this committee, how informed they are, and how capable they are to understand the discussions and make decisions.

The CAC asked for Reed 's input.

Reed - This is by far the most diverse group I've had the opportunity to work with and I've had the opportunity to work with a number of groups around the nation. And you folks have actually produced more impact than any of the other groups that I've worked with in the situations that you're trying to influence. You also have more passion and go through more pain. But from that pain comes reward. I've seen real value that is being gained from your hard work.

I would suggest that, if you want, take your individual responses to *Newsday*. I wouldn't suggest further action tonight because it's 17 minutes before 11 o'clock.

Have a great holiday.

13. Community Comment

Left off because of the late hour.

14. January Agenda

- GET – General Employee Training (Feb)
- g-2 update (when appropriate)
- Peconic River subcommittee report
- Peconic River Risk Assessment
- Peconic River Cleanup Goals
- Recommendation re- Electrochemical Pilot
- Rauch Foundation Grant
- Funding Shortfall