Community Advisory Council
December 11, 2003
Action Items/Notes

Final

These notes are in the following order:

1. Attendance
2. Correspondence and handouts
3. Administrative Items
4. P2 Workshop for Fleet Maintenance Update, George Goode
5. BGRR, Informational Update and Questions, Fred Petschauer, Project Manager
6. Community Comment
7. Peconic River Update and Questions, Tom Daniels, Group Manager
8. Strontium-90 Update and Questions, Tom Burke, Groundwater Project Manager
9. Agenda Setting

1. Attendance

Members/Alternates Present:

See Attached Sheets.

Others Present:
C. Adey, M. Bebon, D. Bennett, P. Bond, H. Carrano, A. Carsten, J. Carter, J. Clodius, T. Daniels, J. D'Ascoli, M. Duke, G. Fess, K. Geiger, P. Genzer, G. Goode, M. Holland, S. Johnson, A. Juchatz, S. Kumar, M. Lynch, S. Medeiros, A. Occhiogrosso, P. Occhiogrosso, M. Parsons, F. Petschauer, A. Rapiejko, J. Tarpinian, K. White

2. Correspondence and Handouts

Items one through three were mailed with a cover letter dated December 3, 2003. Items four through eight were placed in the members' folders, and item nine was available at the meeting as a handout.

1. Draft agenda for December.
2. Draft November 13 notes
3. Final October 9 notes
4. Comments on the Risk-Based End State Vision by Ed Kaplan
5. Presentation on the P2 Workshop, by George Goode
6. Presentation on the BGRR by Fred Petschauer
7. Presentation on Strontium-90 by Tom Burke
8. Sr-90 Maps
9. Presentation on the Peconic River Cleanup by Tom Daniels

3. Administrative

The meeting began at 6:34 p.m. Reed went over the ground rules and the draft agenda. He said that most of December and January would be spent on the draft Risk-Based End State Vision and the CAC's input into the appendix to that document. Dr. Chaudhari welcomed the CAC members and all in attendance introduced themselves. Since a quorum (14) was present, the notes from the November meeting were approved with the addition under Administrative that

it be noted that Mary Joan Shea sent in written comments in October on the Peconic River. There were four abstentions.

Anthony Graves disclosed that he helped found an environmental consulting company in 2001. The company has agreed to partner with an engineering firm to submit a proposal on the cleanup of the Peconic River. He has notified BNL and DOE and has asked for a decision from the Brookhaven Town Ethics Committee. He said he would be happy to answer any questions during the break.

4. P2 Workshop, George Goode, Manager, Environmental & Waste Management Services

George Goode reported he had been working with CAC committee members and Chris Smith from the Cornell Cooperative Extension on the workshop. The workshop is scheduled to be held on Friday, April 23 at Brookhaven and would coincide with Earth Day events at the Lab. The target audience is fleet maintenance employees. George went over the format, which included having a CAC member welcome the attendees, presentations on Lab pollution prevention technologies, vendor displays, and tours of key BNL facilities utilizing P2 practices. Goode reported that two NYSDEC staff members and possibly a private business were interested in presenting in addition to the Lab employees.

Invitations will be sent to government agencies who maintain fleets, utilities such SCWA and KeySpan, school districts, and private businesses (UPS, FedEx, etc.). Goode explained some of the projects and practices that would be shared and went over a tentative agenda.

CAC members suggested that cost savings should be part of marketing the workshop as well as in the presentations and that the workshop should be taken out to offsite venues. The committee members agreed to pick a spokesperson to represent the CAC and give opening comments at the workshop. The CAC thanked Goode for his effort in pulling the workshop together.

5. Risk-Based End State (RBES) Vision Update, Michael Holland, DOE BAO Manager

Michael Holland pointed out to the CAC that the draft RBES document was an inventory of work that has been completed at the Lab and is covered by Records of Decision (RODs). The Variance report includes an inventory of work that remains to be done at the Lab. Holland said that this is the Department of Energy's thinking at this point. It doesn't reflect input from the regulators or the community. The RBES is not a decision document. The cleanup work at the Lab goes through the CERCLA process and that input from the community, regulators, and elected officials is part of that process.

Nevertheless, the RBES will be sent to Headquarters where it will be reviewed. The comments provided by the CAC will be appended to it when it is sent to Headquarters. The Variance report has information on the offsite cleanup of the Peconic River sediments, the disposition of the graphite pile at the Graphite Reactor, and the treatment of groundwater for Strontium-90 contamination. The High Flux Beam Reactor (HFBR) is not covered in this document. The RBES document includes the work covered under the CERCLA process that is planned for completion by October of FY05. The HFBR, which remains an EM Office responsibility, is not scheduled to begin until FY06 and is expected to be completed in FY08.

At the last CAC meeting December 15 was given as a deadline for comments. The schedule has changed so there is further opportunity to provide input through the January CAC meeting. The draft RBES is now due in February and will be finalized by the end of March.

Holland noted that there was a mistake in the document. It identifies the poll of the CAC for their comments on the Peconic River in October as a vote. That will be changed to correctly reflect that it was a poll. In fact, Holland said that the minutes from that meeting would be included in the appendix so that each individual member's perspectives will be included.

6. Risk-Based End State Vision, BGRR – Informational Update and Questions, Fred Petschauer, Project Manager

Reed restated that the RBES process represents the beginning of the discussion in the CAC and in the community on the BGRR, Sr-90, and offsite cleanup of the Peconic. It is the DOE and Lab's expectation that these three issues are high priorities for the community, but that these issues will not be fully vented during the December and January CAC meetings. These topics will take several months of discussion. Nevertheless, the draft RBES that is being sent to DOE HQ's represents an opportunity for the CAC to have early input in the decision-making process. Reed urged the CAC to take full advantage of this opportunity to write an addendum, which could be as much as proposals on specific questions or, if there is consensus on specific issues, their input could go forward as consensus statements.

Fred Petschauer noted that the staff working on the filter removal had enjoyed explaining and demonstrating the project to the visitors who came to the BGRR. If anyone else wants to visit to see the filter removal process in progress, they are welcome.

Petschauer described the BGRR facility and its operation. The status of the contaminants remaining was given as 8,100 curies in the bio-shield and pile and 3 curies in the underground structures and soils. Petschauer discussed several early alternatives under consideration including removal of the pile and bio-shield; removal of the pile, bio-shield, soils and underground structures; and long-term institutional control. DOE's current planning case is to leave the pile and bio-shield and have long-term institutional control. The pile and bio-shield would be protected by Building 701and would be monitored. The canal and below ground ducts would also remain in place. The footprint would be capped to prevent rainwater leaching. Risk would be managed with monitoring and institutional control in place at the Lab for the next 100 years.

The Core Team approach is continuing and the regulators and DOE are working to resolve key issues relating to points of risk and developing other alternatives for consideration. The questions for the CAC include: are there any additional early alternatives that should be listed in an addendum; is there a different End State Vision for the BGRR that should be listed; and what additional issues will be important to address in reaching a final decision on the BGRR?

Reed noted that these questions were suggested by the Lab to form the basis for its addendum; however other questions and issues may be included by the CAC.

Member Sprintzen asked about the relationship between the Greenfield alternative and leaving the reactor pile in place indefinitely and the one curie left in the Greenfield alternative. Petschauer explained that the Greenfield option would remove everything for $96 million and less than one curie would remain.

Member Garber suggested leaving Building 701 as a museum and visitor's center. Member Graves asked about the legal implications in New York State for the storage of low level waste and asked about the differences between low level and high level waste. Petschauer said high-level waste essentially is spent fuel, everything else is considered low level. Graves asked if treatment meant storage and entombment? Petschauer agreed, but said it would be unlikely that it would be taken somewhere else to be entombed; it would be buried.

Member Esposito asked, “What happens after 100 years? The RBES assumes that the Lab will be here for 100 years and that the contamination will be here for 87,000 years. So in effect the problem is being pushed off for 100 years, what happens after that?” Petschauer replied that the decision would be revisited. It is assumed that the federal government will not go away. There are CERCLA requirements that the decision be looked at every five years. Member Esposito said that ignoring the problem doesn’t solve the problem. There was also discussion on using the 100-year time frame and whether or not that was appropriate.

Member Guthy was concerned about giving the problem to someone else to worry about. Moving it around isn’t going to make it any better.

Member Jordan-Sweet said that the document states that the end of the Superfund Cleanup program is supposed to be September 2005 and it seems that all of the alternatives for the BGRR will take longer than that. She wanted to know why it was included since it was going to take longer and she asked who would pay for it. Petschauer said that the Institutional Control alternative would have the project completed at the end of September 05. If the Lab removes the pile and bio-shield it will take another two to three years and if the Greenfield alternative is selected it will be still longer, but that hasn’t been engineered. DOE would determine the funding.

Member Conklin asked how Building 701was currently being used and how it would be used in the future if it remained. Petschauer said the offices are being used and it protects the pile and bio-shield from the elements. The building has been surveyed and there is very little residual contamination within it. Under the Institutional Control alternative some mitigation of asbestos would be done, some small low-level hazards that still remain would be taken care of, and some areas would be sealed off. There would be a surveillance-maintenance program put in place.

Conklin asked if the pile and bio-shield could be removed and leave the building intact? Petschauer said yes, they’ve done some preliminary conceptual engineering to see how the pile and shield would be removed. There would be some additional containment and ventilation needed but the building would help during the dismantling.

Member Biss asked about the status of the below ground ducts after the filters were removed. Petschauer said that the primary liner still had to be removed, than over 99% of the radioactivity would have been removed.

Member Heil asked if there was an estimated cost for monitoring the building under the surveillance maintenance program. Petschauer said he didn’t have the exact figure but thought that it was in the order of $275,000 per year and then every 20 years the roof would be replaced at a cost of $700,000 assuming no occupancy of the building.

Member Amper said that he liked the CAC meetings as well as the next person but he didn’t expect to come to them for 80,000 years. If the job is to resolve the problem then the closest thing to saying it isn’t going to be solved is to say that it will take care of itself over 87,000 years. In answer to question number two, the reactor pile and bio-shield have to go!

Member Minasi inquired if the pile could be removed without contaminating the rest of the building, and if it stayed, could the building still be used. The bio-shield could help to build a curtain to help with containment and the Brokk robot could be used remove the blocks. The building could still be used if the pile were entombed.

Member Shea commented about the meetings of the BGRR committee and how much time they had spent talking about cleanup. She doesn’t feel that Institutional Control is cleanup and she’s disappointed because she felt the Lab was going in a new direction and really cleaning up. She feels now that she has wasted her time going to the meetings and thinks the Lab will lose

the confidence of the community. The scenario chosen might save money but it will not be the best one for the community.

Dr. Chaudhari clarified that the position being presented was the position of DOE. This is not the Laboratory's position.

Member Jordan-Sweet asked if there was any use for Carbon-13. Petschauer said that reuse had been explored, but they didn't find any need.

Member Graves said it appears that there is no cleanup. The issue is where the pile and bio-shield will be stored for 87,000 years-- either at the Lab or somewhere else. At the Lab, it's on top of a sole source aquifer, somewhere else there's a different community with different concerns. He is interested in risk analyses of the movement and transport of the materials since there is no way to make this material go away. Petschauer said that there are very strict design parameters for siting low-level burial sites. Those facilities are designed and built to store the type of waste that has a long half-life.

Member Campbell said for a strategy based on institutional controls, the thing that's missing is how long the institutional controls would be in place. He thought that should be defined and wanted to know if after 100 years it was assumed that the institutional controls would no longer be effective. For a strategy that's depending upon decay over time, he said you've got to talk about how long you can maintain those controls. Once that is defined, you've got to talk about end state vision that was mentioned earlier, what is the status at the end of this period of institutional controls? What is the vision of what the site will be like at that point? Neither of those issues are discussed in this proposal. Petschauer said that the assumption is at the end of the 100 years the federal government still owns the facility and won't walk away. The pile and bio-shield and the entire facility would be re-looked at. Campbell asked if they were looking at 87,000 years? He said given the time frame, they should be more realistic than 100 years.

Reed noted that since institutional controls are key to the alternative, the time for institutional control is important. The vision must include what the expectations and basis and backup for how long Institutional Control lasts and what happens when Institutional Control is no longer reasonable to assume.

Member Guthy said that it is possible that in the future there may be a way to use this stuff up or get rid of it or doing something else with it that would be safer then moving it. She said that she couldn't, in good conscience, send this to some other place.

Member Amper said that understanding that the Lab is not advocating this position, and that we're reacting to a proposal by the Dept. of Energy, the Dept. of Energy needs to know that his organization views this as insulting, compromising the credibility of this process, and personally offensive. The notion that we are being asked to entertain this undermines everything that the CAC has tried to do. He said it's not merely preposterous, it's insulting. The DOE needed to understand that at least from his organization, they would not allow him to participate. Rather, he would be very surprised if they did not charge him with directly assaulting this process as invalid and bogus. He thinks the DOE has completely undercut its credibility and their strategy in dealing with it is likely to very seriously change until this preposterous notion is taken off the table.

Member Esposito questioned the reasonableness of leaving the contamination in place for 87,000 years, whether or not the CAC should actually vote on that, and the appropriateness of hoping that someone would come up with a method of disposing of the contamination in the next 10 to 20 years. Esposito also said that it looks like DOE has put forth this alternative for economic reasons. She said that the recommended approach for Strontium-90 is also natural attenuation or "do nothing" and expressed concern that the motivating factor was cost control.

Member Henigin she didn't think it was a do nothing position, it's a containment action so that it does not go into the environment. She thinks the problem is not knowing how long the state will remain and what might happen.

Member Walker said you have to look at all the different scenarios but he doesn't think it is a good idea to leave the pile teetering on top of the sole source aquifer. He thinks there are places that are setup to handle the contamination better than the Lab is.

Member Biss asked about the cement floor in the facility and how stable it would be over the period of years being discussed. Petschauer said that they had an engineering firm complete a structural analysis of the pile and its foundation. The conclusion was that it was stable and would remain so for several hundred years.

7. Community Comments

There were no comments from members of the public.

8. Peconic River Informational Update and Questions, Tom Daniels, Group Manager.

Tom Daniels said that he would give the status of where the Lab is with the on and offsite cleanups, how that fits into the DOE vision for the Risk-Based End State, and the changes to the document. He reminded the CAC that on and offsite cleanup are being addressed separately. The offsite cleanup scope is still under evaluation.

The onsite cleanup is described in the Action Memorandum. The sediment cleanup in some areas was expanded after talking with regulators and taking into consideration CAC comments. He said that what is done under the Action Memorandum becomes final only after it is incorporated into the Feasibility Plan, PRAP, and ROD. The work has been delayed because the contract had to go out to be re-bid. Work is now expected to start in February of 04.

For offsite sediments, the DOE vision originally proposed in July has not changed. The sediment is to be cleaned up to Schultz Road. The goal is that an average of .75 ppm of mercury will be left. Additional samples were taken east of Manorville Road and more characterization is needed before a final remedy can be developed. After the results are received in January, the Lab will meet with the regulators and determine what the final proposed remedy will be.

Daniels said that there were a few errors in the RBES. On page 37, the statement that the Lab will have a signed ROD by 2004 is to be clarified so that no one believes there will be a ROD before 2004 and information will be included that identifies the onsite cleanup as occurring under an Action Memorandum. The variance table will include the statement that a public comment period will be conducted on the ROD.

Reed said that the minutes from the October CAC meeting will go into the RBES as an addendum.

Member Heil asked if any constituents were sampled for other than methyl mercury. Daniels said that methyl mercury was done in the water column and total mercury in the sediment.

Member Shea asked if there was a map that showed the amounts of contamination from mercury in the water column and the sediment. Daniels said that it's difficult to map the water column, but they have a map of the locations where the samples were taken. Shea asked if it was with the amounts. Daniels said that they are preparing a report that summarizes the four rounds of methyl mercury sampling and the regulators thought that it would be important to get

that in the Administrative Record. They anticipate the report being done sometime in January and then it will be given to the CAC. Shea asked with a graphic? Daniels said it would be graphic, it'll describe the results, there will be a full description.

ACTION ITEM: Copies of sampling report to CAC in January.

Member Walker asked how they were going to transport the soils in the offsite locations. Daniels said that it was going to be very difficult. They are looking for things like that in the bid proposals.

Member Guthy asked if the river would be diverted in the offsite cleanup. Daniels said they anticipate also seeing that in the proposals.

Member Esposito asked how far east the offsite cleanup extended. Daniels said the current vision went to Schultz Road, however, sampling is being conducted to Connecticut Avenue. When asked if the area would be extended, he indicated it would depend on where the process takes them.

9. Strontium-90 Informational Update and Questions, Tom Burke, Groundwater Project Manager

Tom Burke gave some background on the project. He showed characterization maps and reported that recent geoprobe data down-gradient from the BGRR showed higher concentrations, (3150 pCi/l), than was seen previously. Past data showed a high of 540 pCi/l. He said that the evaluations were based on the lower concentrations so there will be some changes made.

CAC members questioned the increase in concentration. Burke said that the samples had been taken further down-gradient and the geoprobes are being put at a closer spacing. The contamination being found is very narrow, about 30 – 40 feet wide. It's down-gradient some years from where the previous samples were taken.

The OU III ROD called for a pump and treat system to meet the Drinking Water Standard in 30 years. The half-life of Sr-90 is approximately 29 years. Sr-90 is different from VOC contamination in that it moves very slowly in groundwater as it binds with the soil. Burke said the ROD recognized the uncertainties of conventional pump and treat systems and included language that said it may be modified based on the results of the pilot study. The pilot study with high-flow pumping showed the use of much more resin than anticipated.

The early alternative for Sr-90 remediation was to pump and recharge. After additional review, this approach is no longer being considered. Instead three new alternatives are under evaluation. They are high flow pumping, low flow pumping, and monitored natural attenuation. Burke said that the high flow pumping alternative will meet the ROD but the costs associated are high. The low flow alternative will take 10 more years (40 years) to meet the ROD but the operating and maintenance costs are lower. Natural attenuation will meet the objective of the ROD in 80 years. Burke noted that with all three alternatives the contamination stays basically in the same area in the center of the site and that all three were within the Institutional Control period of 100 years.

DOE's current planning case is monitored natural attenuation. Burke said that with the new data the original projection of cleanup in 80 years would change. Once the new data is in, the model will be re-run to identify the new time frame. CAC member Esposito asked if all the information presented was based on the old data. Burke said yes.

Burke said that last July or August, for purposes of planning in the baseline, pump and recharge was included. When work began in September on the groundwater modeling simulations, better alternatives were developed.

Burke went over the issues identified for the RBES which included that the pilot study results and updated groundwater model results need to be communicated; the community may require time to consider the issue; regulators may require more time to consider the implications of a remedy modification; and the Core Team process has just begun.

The questions for the CAC include: are there any additional early alternatives that should be listed in an addendum; is there an End State Vision for the Sr-90 groundwater plumes that should be listed; and what additional issues will be important to address in reaching a final decision on the Sr-90 groundwater plumes?

Reed asked Tom to explain how the new monitoring data is likely to change the picture of each of the alternatives.

Burke said the new data will change the picture for the years needed to achieve monitored natural attenuation. The data is still being collected and the simulations have not been run yet. Member Esposito asked if would go past 100 years. Burke could not give an answer. On the other alternatives he said that he suspected it would have very little affect on the treatment alternatives. The areas where the numbers are higher are still very localized so the extraction well will just be capturing the contamination at higher concentrations.

Member Shea asked for the new data and new maps with sections showing the radioactivity level in the groundwater for not only Sr-90 but the other contaminants too, and to show the depths.

ACTION ITEM: Provide new data and maps showing radioactivity levels for Sr-90 and other contaminants and their depths.

Burke said the contamination is fairly close to where it originated and that it isn't very deep. This contamination is for the most part within the first 10 to 15 feet of the top of the water table. Sometimes within the first 5 feet, sometimes it's 8, 10, 12 feet, so it's relatively shallow.

Member Shea asked if that made it worse and wanted to know if animals were exposed to it?

For treatment and monitoring, Burke said it made it easier because it's closer to the ground surface. He said that the Sr-90 groundwater contamination isn't accessible by anyone, no one's pumping it, no one's drinking it. It's within an area of the Lab where there are no supply wells or process wells, only monitoring wells. And for the life of the plume, 30, 40, 80 years, it will be in an area that will be controlled where people will not be allowed to go in and pump it out. The risk of exposure to Sr-90 is actually getting in contact with it.

Member Shea asked if there was surface contamination in any of the areas?

There is surface contamination in certain areas. Those areas will be remediated by the EM program under different projects that are going on. As an example, the surface soils were cleaned up at the BGRR and there are cleanups planned for the Waste Concentration Facility. So in areas of surface contamination the other sources are being addressed under other cleanup projects.

Member Shea asked for information on how that is being done for the Sr-90 surface contamination.

Burke said he didn't have all the details, but asked if Tom Daniels who is in charge of surface soils could provide the information.

ACTION ITEM: Provide information on Sr-90 contamination in surface projects.

Hill said he can provide a linkage to the OU I activities, the soil removal projects, and the sources that they represent in the groundwater plumes.

Member Heil asked what happens with the water under the high and low flow alternatives. Burke said clean water comes out of the process and goes to a recharge basin where it goes back into the ground.

Member Sprintzen said he realizes that it's not bio-available, but does pumping it out present a danger and what happens to the resins? Burke said that if contaminated water is pumped out, there is the potential risk that pipes or valves may break or leak, but it is assumed that can be controlled. The resin beds will be contaminated and will have to be disposed of. The current design is that the resin beds are not being changed out of the vessels. The vessel is disconnected and shipped out for disposal to EnviroCare.

Reed went back to Mary Joan's question to be sure she got an answer. The point of the question was: can the Sr-90 in the groundwater become available to animals and plants. Shea asked for clarification on whether or not the high concentrations were being found near the surface. Burke – they're at the top of the water table. Shea – I think that depending on conditions that might happen, couldn't these contaminants come to the surface under certain conditions?

Burke said that in the area where the plumes are, they wouldn't have the opportunity to come to the surface because they're at some depth. They are anywhere from, depending on the topography, from approximately 65 to 70 feet below the land surface to approximately 35 to 40 feet. And depending on precipitation, rain events, you'll have the top of the water table fluctuate, it will rise and lower, but not nearly enough to get to the level of the surface. It's only a risk or danger if the groundwater table that's rising is within a few feet of where you can walk by it and that's not the case. At it's most shallow point it's 35 or 40 away from someone at the surface.

Shea – You're going to provide maps of this? Burke - Yes!

Member Esposito asked for clarification that the increase in levels just discovered but not yet evaluated will not impact the high flow pumping of 30 years to reach drinking water standards nor the low flow pumping of 40 years to reach the drinking water standard.

Burke said we haven't done that evaluation, but in his opinion, it would have very little effect. The contamination would cover the same area, however, the concentration of contamination is higher.

Esposito said that when she read the ROD for OU III and it said that based on the pilot study the remedy could be modified, she thought the flow might be changed, she did not interpret that as meaning the proposed remedy would be abandoned. She didn't think it was reasonable to say that doing away with the remedy is modifying it.

Member Garber asked for clarification on the estimates for monitored natural attenuation remediation, it was his understanding that half disappears because of radioactive decay and the half due to diffusion. Burke said that was correct, the dispersion, decay all factor in.

Reed asked what the decay product of Sr-90 was and if it was radioactive. Burke said one of the decay products is yttrium and that there is a radioactive form, but he does not think it is an

environmental concern, high levels are not found onsite. Peter Bond said that yttrium decays to zirconium.

Member Shea asked the half-life of yttrium. Burke will find out. Bond said it is much less and zirconium is stable.

Member Walker asked about the difference between low flow and high flow pumping. Burke said the biggest difference is the groundwater velocities are fairly slow in the areas by the BGRR so a smaller pump has a greater influence or pumping rate. Also low flow will not pull in as much of the naturally occurring heavy metals (calcium and iron) and therefore will not use up the resin. He said "hot spot, low flow pumps" will be more effective.

CAC members also asked how long the resin lasts, the cost of the vessel, and if disposal was burial.

Member Henigin asked if both the high flow and low flow pumps could be used in different areas. Burke said the thinking behind the low flow pumping would be to strategically place the extraction wells in the high-density concentrations.

Member Esposito asked if the new data would be available next month? Burke said they are still drilling and collecting data. He said they would have the new data by the middle of January but they may not have time to run the groundwater model simulations.

10. Agenda Setting

Reed said that the next steps are to prepare to consider the questions at the next meeting and develop what the CAC would like to send back attached to the RBES to DOE HQs.

<u>January Agenda</u>
Respond to RBES Questions
Quarterly Environmental Sciences Update (move to February)

Member Garber asked about the presentation on sediment that was supposed to have been on this month's agenda.

Member Sprintzen asked if there could be a presentation sometime in the coming months on the relationship of the Lab and the New York State Environmental Business Association. He said he's heard bits and pieces of it from Ira Rubenstein.

Member Esposito suggested that the BGRR subcommittee work on the questions before the next meeting. There was discussion on whether the committee was interested in getting together and preparing a report. The committee members are Ed Kaplan, Bob Conklin, Jerry Minasi, Mary Joan Shea, and Adrienne Esposito. Committee members decided not to meet, but instead asked for a report from the BGRR team to get their perspective. Reed asked if the CAC was okay on the Peconic and Sr-90 questions or did they need more information before they tackled them. Member Shea asked for the maps and numbers on Sr-90.

It was agreed that the presentation on sediment would be delayed until a new contractor is selected. Reed said that identifying the Peconic sediments as an issue for the RBES and outlining how it should be addressed should be included in the addendum.

Member Shea asked for a schedule for modeling and monitoring the Sr-90 plumes prior to the discussions next month.

The meeting adjourned at 9:16 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	X	X
ABCO	Alternate	Richard	Johannesen	O	O	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	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	O	O
Citizens Campaign for the Environment	Member	Adrienne	Esposito	X	X	X	O	X	X	X		X	X	O	X
Citizens Campaign for the Environment (Ottney added 4/02)	Alternate	Jessica	Ottney	O	O	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	O	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	O	X
Educator	Member	Audrey	Capozzi	O	O	O	O	X	X	X		O	O	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	X	O
Educator	Alternate	Adam	Martin									X	X	O	O
Environmental Economic Roundtable (Berger resigned,Proios became member 1/01)	Member	George	Proios	X	O	X	O	X	X	X		X	X	O	O
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	O	O
Fire Rescue and Emergency Services	Alternate	James	McLoughlin	X	X	X	O	X	X	X		O	X	X	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	X	O
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	O	O
Health Care	Member	Jane	Corrarino	O	X	O	O	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	O	O
Huntington Breast Cancer Coalition	Member	Mary Joan	Shea	X	X	X	O	X	X	X		X	O	O	X
Huntington Breast Cancer Coalition	Alternate	Scott	Carlin	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		O	O	X	O
Intl. Brotherhood of Electrical Workers/Local 2230	Member	Mark	Walker	X	X	X	O	X	O	X		X	X	X	X
IBEW/Local 2230	Alternate	Philip	Pizzo	O	O	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	O	X
L.I. Pine Barrens Society	Alternate	Katherine	Timmins	X	X	O	O	X	O	X		O	O	X	O
L.I. Pine Barrens Society	Alternate	Jane	Geary									X	O	O	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	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	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	O	O
Long Island Association	Member	Marion	Cohn	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		O	O	O	O
Long Island Association	Alternate	William	Evanzia	O	O	O	O0	X	O	O		X	O	O	O
Longwood Alliance	Member	Tom	Talbot	O	X	O	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	O
Longwood Alliance	Alternate	Kevin	Crowley	O	O	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	O	X
Longwood Central School Dist.	Alternate	Candee	Swenson	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		O	O	O	O
NEAR	Member	Jean	Mannhaupt	O	O	X	O	O	X	X		O	X	O	O
NEAR	Alternate	Wayne	Prospect	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		O	O	O	O
NSLS User	Member	Jean	Jordan-Sweet	O	X	X	X	O	O	O		X	X	X	X
NSLS User	Alternate	Peter	Stephens	O	O	O	O	O	O	X		O	O	O	O
PACE Union	Member	Allen	Jones	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		O	O	O	O
PACE Union	Alternate	Philip	Plunkett	O	O	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	O	O
Town of Brookhaven	Alternate	Anthony	Graves	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		O	O	X	X
Town of Brookhaven, Senior Citizens	Member	James	Heil	X	X	X	X	X	O	X		X	O	X	X
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	X	X
Town of Riverhead (K. Skinner alternate as of 4/99)	Alternate	Kim	Skinner	O	O	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	X	X
Wading River Civic Association	Alternate	Sid	Bail	O	O	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	O	O
Yaphank Taxpayers & Civic Association	Alternate	None	None												