Community Advisory Council
January 22, 2026
Action Items/Notes

Final

Note: This was a hybrid meeting, held virtually through Zoom and in-person in the Science and User Support Center (SUSC) Room 121-122. A video recording of the Zoom meeting is available.

These notes are in the following order:

1. Attendance
2. Correspondence and handouts
3. Administrative items
4. Follow Up to the December 2025 Community Advisory Council Meeting
5. Community Comment
6. Agenda Setting

1. Attendance

Members/Alternates Present: See attendance sheet at the end of the notes

Others Present: B. Barth, D. Bauer, D. Carlson, A. Emrick, A. Engel, P. Genzer, S. Gonzalez, K. Green, J. Higbie, J. Hill, A. Juchatz, A. Klein, D. Manning, A. McGovern, R. McKay, R. Metz, J. Michaels, J. Milligan, R. Minzloff, A. Moeller, A. Morocho, A. Ozelis, C.Polanish, V. Racaniello, A. Rapiejko, J. Remien, K. Schwager, L. Singh, M. Sweet, A. Urist, J. Wanless, K. White, W. Yeung

2. Correspondence and Handouts

Items numbered one and two were e-mailed to Members on January 15, 2026. Item number three was e-mailed to Members on January 22, 2026.

1. Draft agenda for the January 2026 meeting
2. Draft notes from the December 4, 2025 meeting
3. Copy of presentation: Follow Up to the December 2025 Community Advisory Council Meeting

3. Administrative Items

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

Ken White, Facilitator, explained that the reason for this unscheduled meeting is to address concerns from the December CAC meeting. He reviewed the ground rules and draft agenda.

Everyone in the room and online introduced themselves.

The December 2025 CAC Action Items and Notes were approved as written.

Interim Laboratory Director, John Hill, welcomed everyone and apologized that the previous meeting caused some apprehension among some members. He ensured everyone that the Lab is interested in hearing all viewpoints and encouraged everyone to continue to share their input.

Member Esposito said the rules of conduct for the Community Advisory Council (CAC) apply to members and Brookhaven National Laboratory (BNL) and the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) employees. She said it is the facilitator's duty to ensure that. The whole reason the CAC was formed was to provide input on remediation and other environmental issues. The Lab promised us transparency, and we would like to be kept informed so we can have input from a community/stakeholder perspective on how the remediations are going. We are here to voice our opinions.

Member Schuhmann said there has been a lot of press about the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) changing the way they work and evaluate. Will that have any impact on this issue?

Hill said none so far.

Jason Remien said we are also answering to other agencies in addition to the EPA. We will continue to do what we are doing.

Member Jordan Sweet said she read that the EPA has gotten rid of As Low As Reasonably Achievable (ALARA). What is the new basis for assessing radiological doses to employees then?

Remien said it was the DOE, not the EPA that made that decision. This decision is new, and we are trying to understand what it means. This is not going to change the way we do things here, we are always trying to reduce our doses to the lowest extent possible and that's something we're always going to continue to do.

Member Sapp asked if there is any documentation showing what was agreed upon [with regard to the Records of Decision (ROD)].

Hill said that is what the ROD is.

Remien said he is going to talk about the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process. We recognize there are a lot of new CAC members that would like to see that information. There is an Administrative Record. All that information is available to the public.

Brian Barth said the Administrative record does not include everything.

Member Sapp asked if the CAC is able to see more of that information.

Remien said we will try to do that for you tonight. We will also send you that information.

White said AI (Artificial Intelligence) will take you right to it.

Member Sapp asked for the link to be sent.

ACTION ITEM* Send the CAC the link to information on the RODS

White said there are Operating Guidelines for the CAC that we must adhere to and comments made last month were not intended to be offensive to anyone.

John Hill said with regard to finances, the DOE budget is on the President's desk right now. It is good for the Lab. We are waiting to hear more in the next few days.

4. Follow up to the December 2025 CAC meeting, Jason Remien – Manager, Environmental Protection division and Brian Barth – Manager, Groundwater Protection group

Topics covered:

- BNL's Commitment to the CAC
- BNL's Environmental Cleanup
- CERCLA Cleanup Process
- Record of Decision (RODs)
- VOC Plume Comparison (1997 vs 2024)
- Remediation Systems – Closure Timeline
- Treatment System Closure Process
- Evolving Understanding and Actions
- Ongoing Challenges
- Prioritizing Future Actions

Remien said we heard your concerns and hopefully tonight we will be able to answer some of your questions. He said please let us know if your questions are not being answered, if you need more detail, or if the information is too technical. There was a lot of reflection after last month's meeting. Your input and knowledge is instrumental. We will continue to provide full and transparent information and hear your concerns. There has been a tremendous amount of progress over the years. We recognize that we can do better communicating challenges to you to maintain your trust.

He said BNL is committed to the restoration of the aquifer. The remedies are designed to be protective of human health and the environment and during cleanup potential exposure pathways are mitigated. Resources are focused where they will reduce the highest risks as quickly as possible. Risk based decisions are made and revisited as new data becomes available. Framework for cleanup was established under CERCLA in a Federal Agencies inter-agency agreement (IAG) between DOE, EPA, and NYSDEC.

He then explained the CERLCA cleanup process.

- Find the problem – Identify areas of concern
- Check for risk – Assess health and environment
- Decide what to do – Plan and get public input
- Clean it up – Perform the cleanup
- Keep it safe – Monitor and maintain

Member Sapp asked if there is another agreement from 30 years back, not sure if it was a ROD or a different term/ some other agreement.

Member Esposito said it was a ROD on one of the groundwater plumes and asked if there was a ROD for the Mercury Remediation.

Member Sapp said he was confused about the terminology. If it's a ROD, that's fine, it seems that we have to do these pretty frequently. If it's 30 years ago to now and then talking through when those problems come up each time would go a long way. Sometimes it gets lost in a long presentation.

Member Esposito said last month she was concerned about the casual attitude regarding the fact that the ROD was not going to be met. She said she thought that was the plan but felt shaken that these were not as solidified as she thought they were.

Remien said it is complicated. We never lost sight of the importance but did not do a good job of communicating the information to the CAC.

Member Esposito said the CAC was not made aware that there was an issue of not meeting the ROD.

Member Sapp said all we have heard is everything is good and we were not told that there were problems.

Member Esposito said 30 years ago we were made a promise, and she feels like the Lab got a little too comfortable. She said she wants to make sure environmental protection is still prioritized as much as the science.

Hill said there is a lot of truth to what you have said. This has been a wakeup call for us.

White said this is good conversation, we want to continue to hear your input.

Member Schuhmann said one of the goals of the CAC is to hold the Lab accountable. The presentations are very data dense and hard to pick out the headlines, so it's hard to keep accountability.

Hill said this is what we are trying to do with tonight's presentation. If this format works, maybe we will do this every six months or so and then it will be clearer

Member Sapp said this format is great, it should be more of a discussion. Informal conversations are more informative than just data on the screen.

White said these conversations are really important and the perspective of you and your colleagues is what this team needs to hear.

Remien said there was a lot of reflection after last month's meeting. We are giving you the groundwater update once a year, but now we will try to keep you informed more often.

Member Esposito said the one groundwater report is too much for one night. Maybe it could be broken up into several presentations.

Member Sapp said the agendas are too long.

Hill said perhaps we need to meet more often.

Member Esposito said the meetings have reduced in number, perhaps we need to go back to having them more often.

Member Keenan said we have had three or four trust issues since we have lessened the frequency of our meetings, so maybe we need to look at that.

Barth said he wanted to formally apologize to everyone for the prior month's meeting. He said it was never his intent to be disrespectful or to make anyone feel like they couldn't voice their opinions/concerns. He said he hopes moving forward he will be able to earn and maintain the CACs trust and convey honesty and transparency. He said all the points that have been made are well taken and things we have thought about over the last month on how we can improve how we communicate with you going forward.

Barth said the Lab currently has nine RODs. He said the ROD defines what will be done to remediate the Areas of Concern (AOC). The ROD is determined by going through the investigation process, the feasibility study process, the risk assessment process, and through community involvement. The ROD will make a formal codified legal decision on what the remedy is going to be and what its goals are.

The Lab has 34 AOCs currently. Part of the response strategy was to organize them into eleven Operable Units (OU). Some operable units have just one AOC, others have many. OU III is the groundwater one both on- and off-site. OU VI is for Ethylene Dibromide (EDB). Both of those operable units are facing challenges.

Member Perez asked, for the newer members, OU II and OU VII, OU X where are they on the list?

Barth said the remedy for OU II and OU VII was addressed under the OU I ROD because they had such a similar nature to them. There was an initial response strategy document that was developed and approved, but as time went on and again new data information became available, they rolled the ROD for that into OU I. You don't see OU X on here because we don't have a ROD yet. OU X was established in the 2022 timeframe, that's for PFAS and 1,4-dioxane.

Member Perez asked if there were some AOCs that don't have RODs yet associated with them?

Barth said correct, that included AOCs 33 and 34. AOC 33 includes 11 sub AOCs for all the individual source areas that we've identified so far and AOC 34 is for 1,4-dioxane collectively on site and off site.

Member Esposito said she was under the impression the EDB plume was responding well to the remediation technology that was being used. Did something happen? When did you begin to have challenges?

Barth said that was based on modeling. That system does respond well to treatment. However, when that system came online originally, we weren't seeing the concentrations of EDB that we expected in the extraction wells. That led us to do additional testing, and we found contaminations deeper than what was originally estimated that were migrating south. That is why the two deeper extraction wells were installed. The data we are seeing now indicates we are capturing the higher concentrations of EDB. It is migrating slower than originally estimated.

Member Esposito asked if at this point you feel comfortable that this will do the job and you just need more time.

Barth said that's correct. This is minimizing plume growth and further migration. It's the travel time from the northern end of that plume through the aquifer to the extraction points that is taking longer than initially estimated. The end game hasn't changed.

Member Karp asked if there is an estimate of how much longer.

Barth said our best estimate is 2035 timeframe, but there are many variables.

Member Karp asked if there was an error margin in the original ROD.

Barth said yes, the ROD states that those are best estimates at the time and that the estimate is dependent on the data. The data will also support closing out a system and whether or not the goals have been met. Cleanup continues, but the timeline could change based on the data. We have data now that we didn't have then. We are refining and learning as we go. It's a constant process.

Member Esposito said when the ROD was originally written, there was additional time built in.

Barth said thirty years is a long time.

Member Kaloski asked who is overseeing this process, are there deadlines?

Barth said the deadline is established in the ROD. We have input from DEC, DOE, EPA, and the CAC.

Member Kaloski asked if the Town of Brookhaven had any input or received any of this information.

Member Esposito said the Town of Brookhaven had representation. The Member was Anthony Graves. He has since retired.

Member Sapp asked if Suffolk County Legislature has had representation

Engel said yes, they have, but don't currently have a CAC representative. We are working on that. We have been in touch with several Legislators.

She then said Alex Klein, NYSDEC, online participant, mentioned having a brief overview on the inter-agency agreement (IAG).

White said we will put the discussion of membership in a parking lot for now and have that discussion at a later time.

Member Perez asked if there were any lessons learned in the modeling software that we are using.

Remien said models are only as good as the data we have. We have collected a lot of data over the last thirty years. But the lessons learned is, that every time we get more data and we put more data into the model, we get better information back.

Barth said the IAG was signed in 1992, between DOE, EPA and DEC. That is the framework that establishes our cleanup process. That set a lot of the initial deadlines. A lot of that initial work has been completed.

Member Esposito said there were multiple agencies and multiple levels of government involved. That's why we thought this ROD was so strong.

Remien said the Lab meets with the regulatory agencies monthly on all of these topics. We provide weekly/monthly and quarterly reports.

Barth said we are fully engaged with all of them on all the decisions we make.

Engel said Alex Klein, NYSDEC, wanted to confirm that the agency speaks to BNL regularly.

Barth said the cleanup objectives of OU III are to:

- Meet maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) in groundwater for volatile organic compounds (VOCs).
- Complete the cleanup of groundwater in a timely manner, which for the Upper Glacial aquifer is 30 years or less (2030) and within 65 years less for the Magothy aquifer (2065)
- Prevent or minimize further migration of VOCs.

He said the OU III Middle Rd/South Boundary system and Airport system are unlikely to meet the 2030 goal for the upper glacial aquifer but are expected to meet the 2065 goal for the Magothy aquifer. The OU VI EDB plume system is also unlikely to meet the 2030 goal.

Member Esposito said she does not remember discussing a cleanup plan for the Magothy that was for 65 years.

Barth said we can go back into the CAC records to see when it was discussed.

***ACTION ITEM: Look back through CAC records to find out when the 65 years was discussed with the CAC**

Barth explained the treatment system closure process.
In operation – Active groundwater treatment (P&T) until plume capture goal is met.
System shutdown – After capture goal is met, prepare a “Petition for Shutdown” for regulatory approval. After approval, shut down extraction wells and maintain system in “Standby”. Continue monitoring.
System closed – When chemical concentrations remain low and stable, prepare a “Petition for Closure” for regulatory approval. Following approval, system is closed and active treatment is complete.
ROD Goals met – In most cases, continue limited post-closure monitoring. Residual low-level contamination naturally attenuates to ROD cleanup goal.

Barth said he wanted to address the big question from last month regarding when the Lab knew we weren’t going to meet the 2030 ROD cleanup goal for the Middle Road/South Boundary AOC. He said in 2019 is when it was first documented in the annual status report that the VOC decline rate may not meet the 2030 cleanup goal. Additional extraction wells were recommended at that time to enhance the cleanup timeframe. In 2021, the CERCLA 5-Year review recommended further evaluation and additional extraction wells. In 2022, additional site characterization and monitoring wells were installed. In 2023, we refined the hydrogeologic characterization of the Upton unit. In 2024, the groundwater model was updated, simulations evaluated extraction well locations and rates. From 2025-2026 modeling results were received, and the engineering design is underway.

John Hill asked how large this area is.

Barth said it is at least half a mile long and it is fairly narrow.

Barth said the goal of the ROD is being met, but not the timeframe. He said during this timeframe we had some other issues competing for our time and funds to deal with. So we didn’t have an “aha” moment where we realized we weren’t going to meet the timeframe of the ROD, but it evolved over time.

Barth said ongoing challenges are:
For the OU III system – low permeability zone in the deep Upper Glacial aquifer is impeding the VOC removal. Estimated timeframe – 2040 with current systems and 2035+ with modifications.

For the OU VI system – two additional extraction wells installed to capture the deeper EDB. Additional modeling is planned to refine the cleanup timeframe. Estimated timeframe – 2035+ with current systems.
For the OU III system – VOCs are migrating slower than expected in the deep Upper Glacial aquifer. The residential area to the north prevents the installation of additional extraction wells. Estimated timeframe – 2035+ with current systems.

Member Esposito asked how many years the + indicates.

Barth said we don't really know, we don't want to under or overstate the estimated timeframe.

Member Israel asked why this happened. Why is it requiring more time?

Barth said we didn't have as much information as we would have liked. The migration rate has been slower.

Member Karp asks are there any factors beyond the geology that could potentially impact the situation or create additional challenges?

Barth explained that geochemistry influences how contaminants move, as clay and finer silts have higher adsorption properties than sand, causing some of the high-concentration plume to pass through and bind to these lower-permeability zones rather than only following the path of least resistance. Although the original source has been removed, the contaminated fine-grained materials continue to act as a secondary source, slowly releasing low concentrations and sustaining the plume.

Barth said future actions that the Lab is prioritizing are:

- OUX current firehouse PFAS system – installation of 3-4 additional extraction wells to address a shift in migration pathways – estimate cost $2M
- OU III SB/MR/WSB and airport treatment system – install advanced oxidation process (AOP) treatment to meet discharge standards – estimate cost $8M
- Conduct OU X remedial investigation/Feasibility study – complete investigation of extent of PFAS and 1,4 dioxane in groundwater and soil – estimate cost $10M
- Building 197 Mercury – complete cleanup of mercury contaminated soil – estimate cost $5M
- OU III Middle Road and South boundary treatment systems – install 3 additional groundwater wells to accelerate the capture and treatment of VOCs that are in the low permeability Upton unit – estimate cost $2M

Member Esposito asked why the plume at the OU X current firehouse PFAS system moved the way it did.

Barth explained that the site includes both the current and former Firehouse treatment systems, with significant pumping and recharge on the western side influencing groundwater flow direction. Additionally, the Suffolk County well field across William Floyd Parkway—especially during high summer pumping—strongly affects regional groundwater movement. The original modeling assumed BNL supply wells 4, 6, and 7 were operational, but wells 4 and 6 were later shut down due to PFAS concerns and age, leaving only one active well with reduced pumping capacity.

This decrease in pumping reduced hydraulic influence to the east, allowing the plume to shift, widen, and spread as recharge increased.

As a result, the current Firehouse system uses three transects to capture the broader plume, while the former Firehouse system has wells aligned in a straight line because that plume remains more narrowly defined.

During the discussion of remedial investigation feasibility study, Remien clarified that a significant amount of information has been gathered and presented in recent years, effectively serving as a “mini RI” [Remedial Investigation] due to extensive on- and off-site monitoring that has improved understanding of site conditions. However, data gaps remain, particularly regarding soil contamination, which must be addressed to prevent long-term reliance on treatment systems and to support informed decisions about next steps.

Barth then addressed the cost estimates. The cost estimates shown primarily reflect initial investigation and construction expenses—such as extraction wells or treatment systems—not the full life-cycle operations and maintenance costs, which can be substantial. Variations in estimates, including the mercury project increase, may be due to differences in burdened versus unburdened costs and evolving project understanding. Because environmental projects are difficult to fully define until work begins, total costs often become clearer only after excavation and further characterization.

Member Esposito, asked how can you reassure us that stabilizing the mercury soil now, rather than fully remediating it, won’t lead to future migration and ultimately higher costs? And additionally asked about significant rain or flooding event and how this could affect the contamination.

Barth said stabilization measures include placing a geotextile fabric over the remaining excavation area with backfill to prevent direct contact and reduce wind dispersion, and the site is managed under the Land Use Institutional Controls (LUIC) program to restrict access and prevent unauthorized disturbance. The area will now be inspected at least twice a year under LUIC, with additional inspections after significant rain events.

A downgradient monitoring well was installed and sampled at the end of last year, with no mercury detected in either dissolved or non-dissolved phases; it will continue to be monitored routinely, likely annually, to confirm conditions remain protective. These measures were implemented to mitigate exposure risks while plans to complete the remediation move forward.

Member Jordan-Sweet asked about offering orientation sessions for new CAC members.

Engel confirmed that this is something that is in the works, and the option for current members to attend as a refresher. Suggestions were also made to provide helpful reference materials, including a list of acronyms and a basic aquifer cross-section diagram.

Member Sapp agreed that an orientation would be helpful, along with visuals and shorter presentations.

Member Esposito commented that she particularly liked and appreciated the way it was divided up into the different operable units with the AOCs and then where we were with each of those AOCs to help understand the moving parts in the remediation process.

Member Karp asks whether a ROD has been developed for PFAS.

Barth said that a ROD has not been issued yet. AOCs have been established, and two high-concentration source areas were addressed through a time-critical removal action with treatment systems already operating. A Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) work plan has been drafted and tentatively approved but is on hold pending funding and will need updates to reflect new data before moving forward.

The PFAS treatment systems currently operate with a 100 parts per trillion (ppt) capture goal, which is set at 10 times New York State's drinking water standard of 10 ppt. This capture target is used for plume containment and system operation, not necessarily as the final cleanup standard. Whether a future ROD would adopt a cleanup objective other than the Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL)—such as EPA's proposed 4 ppt standard—has not yet been determined and would be evaluated as part of the formal remedy selection process. The final cleanup goals will ultimately be established through the CERCLA process and informed by regulatory requirements and site-specific data.

Before a ROD is issued, several formal steps must occur, including completion of the RI/FS and development of a proposed plan. Each of these milestones includes opportunities for public review and comment. The team emphasized that CAC input is especially valuable early in the process, so community concerns and priorities can help shape the analysis and proposed remedy before decisions are finalized.

Remien added comments that although full funding is still needed to formally execute the RI process for PFAS and 1,4-dioxane, the team has not been waiting idle. Using limited available funds, they have proactively addressed higher-risk areas and completed portions of the planned work—such as conducting additional vertical profiling to better define the PFAS plume. The work plan will need updating to reflect this progress, and they continue to evaluate what additional actions can be taken each year while awaiting full funding.

5. Community Comment

- Andrew Rapiejko, Suffolk County Health Department, clarified that while the Health Department is not formally part of the IAG (which includes EPA, DOE, and NYSDEC), its role is more significant than implied. Because NYSDEC is an environmental agency and does not make health determinations independently, decisions require input and sign-off from the State Health Department, with the Suffolk County Health Department serving as a full-service arm of the state in that process. He also stated that he does recall the 65-year ROD but does not remember if it was from the CAC or from internal discussions.

6. Agenda Setting

- Amy Engel said there were quite a few topics of interest from the last several CAC meetings for us to provide on future agendas.
- Member Sapp asked for a site visit when the weather gets warmer. Also, presentations on energy, cancer treatments, and government relations.
- White said we will follow up on pursuing local representation on the CAC. He said some other topics of interest are the Lab's relationship with the IAG, Explanation of Significant Differences (ESD), and the Firehouse PFAS system. He said information on the Magothy layer and whether the information on the 65-year ROD was shared with the CAC.
- John Hill said this was a great discussion, perhaps we should schedule more meetings in the future, instead of only six per year. Member Esposito agreed.

Meeting adjourned at 9:05 pm

Next meeting: March 12, 2026.

X = Present 2026 Affiliation		First Name	Last Name	Jan	Feb No mtg	Mar	Apr	May	June No mtg	July No mtg	Aug No mtg	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec No mtg
ABCO – Civic	Member	Ray	Keenan	X											
	Alternate	Michael	Madigan												
Brookhaven Coalition of Chambers of Commerce – Business & Labor	Member	Ron	Trotta												
	Alternate	Carmine	Inserra												
Brookhaven Retired Employees Association- BNL Affiliation	Member	Mark	Israel	X											
	Alternate	Eena-Mai	Franz												
	Alternate	Arnold	Moodenbaugh												
Brookhaven Village Association – Civic	Member	Reinhardt	Schuhmann	X											
	Alternate	Chris	Ciervo												
Citizens Campaign for the Environment – Advocacy & Environment	Member	Adrienne	Esposito	X											
	Alternate	Christina	Lizzo	X											
Cornell Cooperative Extension – Health based	Member	Chris	Pickerell												
	Alternate	Lorne	Brousseau												
Country Pointe Meadows – Civic	Member	Jeff	Williams	X											
	Alternate														
East Yaphank Civic Association - Civic	Member	Robert	Feinman												
	Alternate	Laura	Reid												
Emeritus	Member	David	Sprintzen												
FOREST - Advocacy & Environment	Member	Tim	Green	X											
	Alternate														
Foundation for Economic Education – Education, Science & Technology	Member	Craig	Pratka	X											
	Alternate	Christian	Price	X											
Individual	Member	James	Freeman	X											
Individual	Member	Jane	Corrarino												
Individual	Member	Karen	Blumer	X											
	Alternate	Michael	Madigan	X											
L.I. Pine Barrens Society – Advocacy & Environment	Member	Nina	Leonhardt												

	Alternate	Travis	Cutter	X											
Longwood Central School Dist. – Education, Science & Technology	Member	James	Crenshaw												
	Alternate														
Middle Island Civic Association – Civic	Member	Martin	Filler	X											
	Alternate	Margaret	Malloy												
National Grid – Business & Labor	Member	Brian	Sapp	X											
	Alternate														
New York League of Conservation Voters – Advocacy & Environment	Member	Casey	Petrashek												
	Alternate	Joseph	Stallone	X											
NSLS-II User Committee – BNL Affiliation	Member	Jean	Jordan-Sweet	X											
	Alternate	Matthew	Whitaker												
Ridge Civic Association – Civic	Member	Scott	Wood												
	Alternate	Barbara	Royce												
Stony Brook Hospital – Health based	Member	Erika	Karp	X											
	Alternate	Kristin	Cuomo												
Suffolk County Legislature 1st Dist. – Government	Member														
	Alternate														
Teachers Federal Credit Union – Business & Labor	Member	Jashmin	Futch												
	Alternate	Kathleen	Misiano												
Town of Brookhaven – Government	Member	Karen	Dunne Kesnig												
	Alternate 1	Patricia	Kaloski	X											
	Alternate 2	Julia	Norris	X											
Town of Riverhead - Government	Member		Kern												
	Alternate	Frank	Mancini												
Wading River Civic Association - Civic	Member	Henry	Perez	X											
	Alternate	Linda	Rundlett												