

Final

These notes are in the following order:

1. Attendance
2. Correspondence and Handouts
3. Administrative Items
4. Schedule Update for BGRR/HFBR: Les Hill, Director, Environmental Restoration Projects
5. BGRR Work Activities: Tom Daniels, D & D Operations Manager
6. Community Comment
7. Choosing Our Research Directions and Obtaining Funding for Them: Peter Bond, Deputy Director for Science & Technology (Interim)
8. Briefing on Integrated Safety Management (ISM): Michael Bebon, Deputy director for Operations
9. Agenda Setting

1. Attendance

Members/Alternates Present:
See Attached Sheets.

Others Present:

S. Aronson, M. Bebon, P. Bond, J. Carter, F. Crescenzo, A. Csorny, T. Daniels, J. D'Ascoli, D. Gibbs, N. Geiger, K. Geiger, L. Hill, S. Johnson, T. Kneitel, M. Lynch, S. Penn

2. Correspondence and Handouts

Items one through three were mailed with a cover letter dated June 8, 2007. Items four through seven were provided in the member's folders and item eight was available as a handout at the meeting.

1. A copy of the June 14 draft agenda
2. Draft notes for May 10, 2007
3. Final notes for April 12, 2007
4. A revised agenda
5. A copy of a letter from the L.I. Pine Barrens Society dated May 31.
6. A copy of the Choosing Our Research directions and Obtaining Funding for Them presentation
7. A copy of the An Overview of Integrated Safety Management at BNL presentation
8. A copy of the presentation on the BGRR Graphite Pile Inspections

3. Administrative

The meeting began at approximately 6:35 p.m. Reed Hodgkin reviewed the ground rules and the draft agenda. Those present introduced themselves.

Approval of Minutes

Reed asked for corrections, additions or deletions to the May 10 draft notes. Member Garber requested that Tim Green's response to Member Mannhaupt's questions about the loss of the forest be added to the notes verbatim. Member Martin asked that the answer to his question on the concentrations at the g-2 source be included in the notes. Member Graves asked that his observation that large amounts of lawn and turf grasses were a common theme with the deer and goose populations and nutrient loading to the groundwater and thought that maybe they should all be looked at together, be included in the notes. The notes were accepted as amended with no objections and four abstentions.

Jeanne D'Ascoli welcomed Doon Gibbs, the new Deputy Director for Science and Technology. She said a letter received from the Pine Barrens Society suggesting potential organizations for membership had been inserted into their folders and suggested the CAC consider how they would like to respond to the letter.

D'Ascoli recommended the CAC meetings for July and August be omitted from the calendar because several members indicated they would not be available. The next scheduled meeting would be in September. She also reported that Emilio Mendez, Director of the Center for Functional Nanomaterials (CFN) offered to host the October CAC meeting in the CFN conference room. A presentation on ES&H issues related to nanoscience will occur at that time. Member Schwartz asked that environmental issues specific to nanoparticles be included in the October nanoscience presentation and Member Mannhaupt asked that an outline of the Laboratory's risk management initiatives related to nanoscience also be included in the presentation.

Member Shea said there had been discussions about forming a nanoscience sub-committee and asked if those CAC members still interested could develop questions for the October meeting.

Reed asked the CAC to make a decision on the July and August meetings. He suggested they could postpone meeting until September if no important issues arose. There were no objections. Reed said that Jeanne would contact them should a compelling issue arise.

Member Heil suggested an informal August meeting could be held to discuss the direction of the fall and winter program. Member Shea suggested that could be done using e-mail. Member Graves thought the suggestion had merit and said it would be nice to meet when there wasn't a fixed agenda to discuss longer range ideas.

Reed asked if those interested would like to assemble in August to work as an ad hoc agenda setting group.

Members Sprintzen and Conklin said the discussion should be part of a regular meeting so that all CAC members could be present. Member Henagan asked if it would make sense for a group to assemble in August to create a general outline of agenda items for discussion in September.

Member Mannhaupt said it was very important for all the CAC members to be together for this discussion. She said it was important to hear the smallest suggestion, which might otherwise be put aside by virtue of an ad hoc committee. This is especially important because of the previous month's discussions on purpose and direction of the CAC.

Member Henagan said they could brainstorm ideas prior to the September meeting but not eliminate any. The ideas could be put into an organized format for presentation.

Jeanne D'Ascoli reminded the CAC that the HFBR would most likely be on the September agenda.

Member Mannhaupt said the two topics could be the agenda for September as they are lengthy enough for a full meeting.

Reed asked the CAC if they preferred to assemble for discussion of possible agenda items in August with the intent to organize the brainstormed ideas in a format to facilitate the September discussion. He said suggestions could be e-mailed to Jeanne and incorporated into the presentation for September if a CAC member did not wish to attend in August. The CAC agreed.

Member Mannhaupt said that notes should be taken at the August discussion so that the ideas could be e-mailed to all CAC members prior to the September meeting.

Reed then asked the CAC to consider how they would like to address the letter from the Pine Barren's Society suggesting potential organizations for membership.

Member Sprintzen asked if the Pine Barrens Society created the list or if the people and organizations had expressed interest to them, and asked if anyone was familiar with any of the suggested organization's concerns.

Member Garber said the letter stated the suggested candidates had not been approached.

Member Alayeva said the Pine Barrens Society had not talked to the potential candidates about joining the CAC but did feel the groups had concerns common to those shared by members of the CAC. The candidates were presented for consideration.

Member Giacomaro suggested that the CAC speak to Sheldon Penn, who in addition to being present had attended previous meetings, to inquire about his interest. He asked Mr. Penn what organization he was affiliated with and if they wished to become a member of the CAC. Sheldon Penn said he was affiliated with the Suffolk Y Jewish Community Center (SYJCC) and he and the organization were interested in membership.

Member Sprintzen said it is appropriate to fill vacancies as there is a specific number of environmental positions available. If the candidates are reasonable, an inquiry should be made to determine their level of interest. The Group for the South Fork (GSF) was involved but stopped coming. He said the organizations suggested in the letter seemed reasonable; an inquiry should be the next step.

Reed suggested letters could be sent informing the suggested groups of their potential candidacies and detailing the responsibilities of CAC membership.

Member Jordan-Sweet suggested Renewable Energy on Long Island (RELI) as a potential membership candidate and said they would be a valuable member and energy as a new category for the membership list.

Member Giacomaro asked if Sheldon Penn would be willing to talk to the CAC about his organization.

Reed said that would be a normal part of the process and if the CAC agreed, time could be made for Penn to speak or, if he preferred, at another time. Penn said he would be willing to speak to the CAC. Reed asked if the CAC was in agreement that letters of inquiry should be sent to the other potential membership candidates suggested to determine their level of interest.

Member Henagan said if potential members were going to be solicited the CAC should look at the entire list of vacancies to fill those as well. He said there were several civic associations,

including Middle Island, that weren't represented and if the CAC is going to solicit membership, all openings should be considered.

Member Martin suggested that could be a topic for the non agenda brainstorming session in August.

Reed said that decisions about membership would require a quorum and needed to take place during a formal meeting as membership decisions including allocation of positions and selection of CAC members must be announced to all members at least one week in advance of the meeting and a supermajority vote (75% of those present) is required for approval.

Member Garber said Associated Brookhaven Civic Organizations (ABCO) is in transition and a number of names listed among the suggestions from the Pine Barrens Society represent the newer members coming on board. Member Jordan-Sweet said Member Garber's comment was compelling and suggested that the potential members be researched in order to understand their positions before they meet with the CAC.

Member Graves said it was great that Mr. Penn was interested in membership and his organization should be included on the list of candidates that will receive the letter of inquiry.

Member Mannhaupt said she would like to hear Mr. Penn speak. She asked if the North Fork Environmental Council was still active and suggested they be approached. She also suggested Kate Browning be invited to assume the seat formerly occupied by County Legislator Fred Towle.

Reed said historically organizations or individuals had been identified as potential candidates and then the CAC would invite them to express interest. He suggested that could be done with these or any other organizations or individuals the CAC believed would bring value to the committee. This would result in many candidates that could then be examined as potential members.

Member Alayeva asked if the CAC members were being asked to inquire about interest from the suggested organizations or if the CAC would do it as a whole?

Reed said the inquiry would come from the CAC as a whole.

Member Chaudhry said he joined the CAC as a member in the category of Science and Technology, but is really an energy person not a scientist and has spent his career as an engineer. If there is consideration for creating an energy category, he would like to be placed in it.

Reed asked that the discussion on creating new categories for membership be postponed to avoid having to make a serious adjustment to the evening's agenda.

Member Alayeva asked for clarification of the CAC process used to approach potential members.

Reed said prior to an invitation or a letter, the names should come before the CAC. If there was agreement, a letter would be sent inviting the potential member(s) to appear before the CAC and express interest.

Member Schwartz said all CAC members should be encouraged to suggest potential members for consideration prior to sending the letters of invitation.

Member Sprintzen said these were not letters inviting membership but letters to invite the expression of interest. There are a number of available positions. The candidates can be explored to determine their appropriateness for the positions.

Reed said there could be a constant flow of letters as members identify candidates.

Member Schwartz said he is concerned about starting the process with one list as the available slots may be eliminated before broader consideration is given to lists from other CAC members.

Reed asked Member Alayeva if the Pine Barrens Society would be willing to make contact with the candidates to invite them to come to the CAC meeting to express interest.

Member Alayeva said yes if the CAC agreed. She said she could reach out to the organizations to see if they are interested, and if they are, invite them appear to before the CAC.

Member Jordan-Sweet said the invitation should come from CAC.

Reed asked Member Schwartz if he was comfortable letting the action go forward.

Member Jordan-Sweet asked Reed to repeat the suggestion.

Reed said the CAC could send a letter to each of the Pine Barrens Society's suggested potential candidates and any others suggested by CAC members that were thought to bring value to the organization. They would be invited to express interest at a CAC meeting.

Member Schwartz said he did not wish to be an obstructionist but he was not wholly comfortable. He would like to see a more concerted effort to draw suggestions from the entire group before sending out any letters.

Member Corrarino agreed with Member Schwartz and said this was a good opportunity for the CAC to examine membership, rather than saying "all these look good, let's reach out to them". Perhaps a membership subcommittee could look at this. She said the membership list looks narrow.

Member Sprintzen said that had already been done. There are a limited number of openings and an invitation would be made in order to determine interest. If additions to the process are desired, they can be made. There are no commitments being made. The CAC is responding to a request made by a member to determine if the suggested candidates are interested.

Member Mannhaupt said when the letters are sent the potential members can speak to the CAC just as Mr. Penn was invited to speak. The CAC can then vote whether or not to accept the candidates as members.

Member Conklin said it was clear there were different ideas about the process. He suggested the CAC move on to the evening's agenda and devote a portion of September's meeting to this discussion.

Reed said the CAC needed to move on to the rest of the agenda because the process for membership-related voting issues requires notification of at least one week in advance. He suggested the discussion be announced for the next meeting. Interested CAC members could then submit candidates of interest, and they would be discussed during the administrative portion of the next meeting.

ACTION ITEM: CAC members to provide lists of membership candidates.

Members Corrarino and Jordan-Sweet asked for a list of membership categories and current vacancies.

ACTION ITEM: Provide CAC members with a list of membership categories and current vacancies.

Member Martin said he did not see the need for a letter from the CAC inviting interested candidates to respond. He said he felt free to invite interested candidates to attend a CAC meeting in order to express interest.

Reed said the topic would be on the agenda for September and invited Mr. Penn to speak to the CAC at that time. Mr. Penn agreed to do so.

During the meeting, Member Sprintzen found the report that had been provided to the CAC in the February 8 notes which outlined the membership categories and vacancies. He read the vacancies as follows: two business, one civic, one education and three from environment.

4. Schedule Update for BGRR/HFBR, Les Hill

Les Hill told the CAC he met with the Department of Energy (DOE) and the regulatory agencies last week to discuss the various remedies proposed for the HFBR that had been presented to them quite some time ago. Hill said another meeting or two was needed before he could come back to talk to them. He said progress is being made and they are moving along.

The focus for the BGRR is on planning the physical field work. The safety analysis submitted for the field work was approved by the DOE last month, which was a major milestone. The RD/RA work plans have been submitted for approval to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Suffolk County and the appropriate regulators. A detailed work schedule is being compiled and he projected work to begin inside the reactor sometime next summer. Hill said there was a tremendous amount of planning and preparation that would take place prior to beginning the actual work. An inspection of the graphite pile was recently conducted to confirm existing conditions. Nothing unexpected was detected. Preparatory activities including overhauling the overhead crane in the reactor building, removal of physical interferences, and identifying the remote equipment to be used have begun. Hill was pleased with the progress on the BGRR and said the group was enthusiastic about getting started on the project.

5. BGRR Work Activities, Tom Daniels

Tom Daniels reported that over the past year the Lab has been doing activities at the BGRR to mitigate risk while they've been setting up bid specs and going through the safety analysis with the Department of Energy. One of the activities has been an inspection of the graphite pile that was conducted to examine the pile thoroughly, obtain additional radiation dose data, ensure that the existing graphite pile removal assumptions were valid, identify and resolve pile anomalies during detailed pile removal planning and confirm that detailed planning would reflect the actual conditions inside the pile. The objective was to go into the pile and bioshield to look at everything and to make sure that the waste is correctly categorized so it can be disposed of properly without slowing down the graphite removal process.

The scope of the inspection was to inspect, remove, and characterize all remaining in-core experimental components, verify that all nuclear instrumentation had been removed, inspect, dose rate and document anomalies from accessible fuel, non-fuel, and Newson channels, and to inspect and characterize the boron shot from the emergency shutdown wells.

Thirty experimental channels were inspected. Fourteen were either not previously inspected or components were still within the channels. Experimental components were removed from 13

ports. Components with dose rates at approximately 30R/hr were removed. The inspection provided verification that the nuclear instrumentation had been removed. A visual inspection of the target conveyor graphite sleeves was also completed.

A total of 1,398 fuel, non-fuel and Newson channels were inspected. Two rows, 74 channels, had tie rods permanently installed to keep the pile compressed and did not require inspection. Forty-five channels could not be inspected because of interferences and 50 channels were documented with internal interferences including thermocouple wires, sleeves, cans, dummy fuel elements and pipe sleeves.

Daniels said the pile was extensively examined and explained that Newson channels were 30 channels that were off center and used for graphite temperature modeling, to measure flux, and as experimental ports. He also explained how the four emergency shutdown wells worked with cadmium boron shot that was released to shut down the reactor quickly – it stopped fission - and that the wells were inspected to see if the shot was still in them. Nothing was found that was not illustrated in pile construction drawings. The interior spaces of the pile and the biological shield were free of dust material, though planned contamination control measures would still remain comprehensive and conservative. It was concluded that the inspections validated the assumptions made to date regarding conditions in the pile.

Member Giacomaro asked if the inspections were done with cameras and if there were sensors on them.

Daniels said there was a quick-response dose-rate probe on the camera that had an alarm set at 2.5R/hr so if they came across any channels that were greater than 2.5R/hr the alarm sounded and it was documented.

Member Giacomaro asked if there were other regulatory agencies present while the inspection was conducted.

Daniels replied there were not.

Member Chaudhry asked how the uninspected channels and the channels where dose rates were discovered would be dealt with.

Daniels said a two-ended visual inspection was performed on the 50 channels that contained items. A determination could be made of the whole channel up to where the item was inserted from each end of the channel. There were 45 channels that could not be inspected, and though there is a slight risk that something could be in the channels, the risk was lowered considerably by performing this inspection.

Member Mannhaupt asked if the uninspected channels would be handled with greater caution, if all the inspection objectives had been met and if the boron shot was radioactive.

Daniels said the channels would be treated as if they did contain something and that all inspection goals had been met. The boron shot was not radioactive and was being handled as mixed-waste. It was removed and sent out for analysis. It was determined they contained enough cadmium to be considered mixed-waste.

Member Graves asked where the standard of 2.5R/hr came from and why there was no dust in the biosheild.

Daniels said the 2.5R/hr standard was chosen by the regulators because levels exceeding 2.5R/hr could require special shielding when shipped. He said it appeared the graphite was

machined correctly and the evolutions had not done damage to the graphite, therefore dust would not have been produced.

Member Garber asked if the inverted plugs were left alone because they might disperse material.

Daniels said they had been found as they had been designed and did not require disruption.

Member Conklin asked if a BROKK-type machine was going to be used to remove the graphite, how hot spots would be handled and if different containers would be used for those spots.

Daniels said a BROKK-type machine would probably be used. Remote operations were required so there would be no entry of the biological shield to remove the pile. Whether it would be a BROKK or a robotic arm it would have to be remote. Dose monitoring will occur before graphite leaves the shield. If the dose rate indicated, a cask would be made available to contain the material.

Member Henagan asked if the channels had been viewed from the bottom as well as the top.

Daniels said they were viewed from the bottom, the top and essentially all angles because for most of the channels the viewing was rotated 360 degrees.

Member Jordan-Sweet asked what was done with the radioactive experimental components that had been removed during inspection.

Daniels said the components were removed to the edge, sectioned off, sealed in containers and shipped off site as waste.

Member Mannhaupt made note that the presentation contained failsafe measures and precautions were being taken to scrutinize assumptions.

6. Community Comment

Member Talbot announced that Member Sprintzen was to be recognized and honored by the Vision Long Island Association, a premier organization in community planning and social responsibility. The CAC congratulated him.

7. Choosing Our Research Directions and Obtaining Funding for Them, Peter Bond

Peter Bond gave a presentation on funding and research. He said Brookhaven National Laboratory's mission is to design, build and operate large research facilities for the international science community, such as the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider (RHIC), the National Synchrotron Light Source (NSLS) and the Center for Functional Nanomaterials (CFN) and carry out forefront scientific research in both basic and applied areas to contribute to the technology base of the nation through research, technology transfer, and science education. Bond said the first two items dominate funding.

Large projects, such as CFN, RHIC and NSLS II are user facilities. Bond said operations costs are approximately 20 percent of building costs. Large projects at BNL begin with an idea, are reviewed by Chairs and Associate Directors, assigned relative priority by the Director and then begin a cycle of further review. Each initiative is reviewed for level of interest, why it should be performed at BNL, the expertise needed, the funding and agency support required, time scale, impact on laboratory infrastructure and conformation to national priorities.

Bond said after Lab priorities are decided it is essential to garner the support of a potential user community, without that type of support there is no possibility of the project proceeding. The DOE or other funding agency, the President and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) must also be convinced of the value of the project and make it a priority. Then Congress must fund it. The effort to secure funding for large projects may span many years, as it did for RHIC, which spanned 17 years from proposal to operation.

Smaller research efforts are proposed by individuals or groups of scientists writing grant proposals that are subject to a peer or agency review process, or by funding obtained from private companies through Cooperative Research and Development Agreements (CRADAs).

The vast majority of BNL funding comes from the DOE. Additional sources of funding come from smaller agencies, users and other inter-laboratory sources. DOE funding is apportioned to a variety of research programs that correspond to DOE priorities. The DOE provides detailed guidance to ensure the desired apportionment. Funding is not guaranteed and Congress must be approached yearly to renew or initiate funding. Therefore, a program's success is dependent upon appraisals from peer reviews, agency reviews and performance reviews as well as the changing priorities at the national or agency level.

At BNL, small projects that have the potential to develop new ideas, successful research directions and proposals that might lead to future funding may be funded by allocations from the Director. These usually last about two years. Some of the current major programs, such as RHIC, nanoscience, medical imaging, energy and the environment had a start this way.

To continue at the forefront, planning must always include a focus on the future due to the long lead times needed for major projects. Funding for these ideas is not always assured and is subject to extensive review. The funding system is in place primarily to provide a vehicle for responsible use of taxpayer money.

Member Sprintzen asked what type of changes in national priority the Laboratory would like to see.

Bond said, though he could not speak for the Laboratory, it was timely for the focus to be on energy, a topic which had been on and off the forefront for over 30 years.

Member Campbell asked why the project costs related to NSLS II were one third larger than those reflected for RHIC, given his impression of the scale of the two projects.

Bond said it was important to note that one half of RHIC already existed prior to the project which doubled the cost immediately. The current numbers also reflect twenty years of inflation for costs to the year 2010.

Member Giacomaro asked if graduate students are solicited to submit proposals given the relationship between Stony Brook University, other educational institutions and the Laboratory.

Bond said BNL works in cooperation with Stony Brook University as well as other universities.

Member Garber asked if there was speculation that the DOE's budget was pushed to New Orleans to address the challenges caused by Hurricane Katrina.

Bond thought the money that went to Katrina aid didn't belong to the DOE, but that it was located in the bill that funds the DOE, but also includes funding for the Department of the Interior and the Army Corps of Engineers. The money for the Army Corps of Engineers could easily have been diverted to New Orleans, but it didn't affect the DOE budget.

Member Graves noted that the Town of Brookhaven has benefitted from the research that has come out of the Upton Reserve.

Member Anker said she found it hard to understand how projects can be planned when funding can take as long as 15 years and if there were plans for the Laboratory to investigate the new findings about Tesla's work with energy.

Bond said energy is certainly a focus now. When planning for a project, one consideration is need for the facility and if there are plans for a similar facility with the same capability to come online somewhere in the world before the project could be completed. RHIC was the one and only facility of its kind when it was designed and it still is. A project is evaluated for capability, that it will provide what is needed for a variety of experiments.

Member Mannhaupt said she would welcome BNL's research participation in the energy field and agreed it should be a focus.

Member Chaudhry said there were over \$2 billion worth of projects in the pipeline that did not have budgets and asked if there was a commitment at some level from DOE to support the projects, what happens if funding is not received in a particular year and if work is not done on time, could funding be lost.

Bond said the DOE's Critical Decision (CD) process is rigid. The first level, CD-0, confirms that the DOE sees a scientific need but allocates no money. The process must work through to CR-4 before it is completed. The time span between the decisions can be from 1 to 10 years. When funding is not received in a year, the schedule must be revisited and costs rise and the experiment then must be reevaluated. It becomes very complicated. There is no guarantee of funding. Funding can be lost when a schedule is not kept.

Member Shea asked if the energy focus would be nuclear.

Bond said no, the BNL focus would not be on nuclear energy, but on hydrogen, solar, bio-fuels and others.

Doon Gibbs said the BNL's future research on energy will involve renewable energy and efficiency.

The CAC thanked Peter Bond for his presentation.

8. Briefing on Integrated Safety Management (ISM), Michael Bebon

Mike Bebon gave an overview of the Integrated Safety Management (ISM) program at BNL. He said the focus on safety is not new to the Laboratory. It is a moral imperative and an achievable goal to keep employees and all those who have contact with the Laboratory safe. Industry has been getting smarter about preventing injuries and making the workplace safer. New thought processes have been developed and people have begun to realize that it is possible to achieve an injury free workplace. It's a hard job and it's tough to figure out what works, but it is doable. We're not there yet, he said, but it is possible. To support this goal, the DOE gathered the best ideas and processes and the general principles of safety management and organized them into the Integrated Safety Management Program. The framework of the program is organized around the principles of how organizations should be set up and operate and functions that should be performed each time anyone at any level does work. That goes for both the Laboratory and how it does its work globally down to each employee, each craftsman in the field or scientist at the bench, how they do their work on a given day.

Bebon identified the ISM guiding principles and cultural elements within the ISM framework. The guiding principles include line management responsibility for safety, clear roles and competence commensurate with those responsibilities. Cultural elements include individual attitude and responsibility for safety, operational excellence and organizational learning for performance improvements.

Most of the day-to-day work at the Lab involves the “five” core functions. They are basic “Management Cycle” functions applied to performing work safely; plan-do-check-act. This involves the following elements:

- Define the scope of work (what needs to be done)
- Identify and analyze hazards (what can hurt people or damage the environment)
- Develop and implement hazard controls (what must be done to protect people and the environment)
- Feedback and improvement (learn from successes and mistakes)

Bebon said implementation of ISM at the Laboratory involves multiple approaches that ensure the integration of safety and environmental protection into the work. Programs such as the ISO 14001 Environmental Management System, OHSAS 18001 Worker Safety & Health System, Work Planning and Control and Worker Observation make the principles and functions of ISM work better. In order to achieve an injury free workplace, everyone must be reached by these and other supporting programs. It is important to hear back from those involved in issues in order to facilitate feedback and improvement. It is essential to have a portfolio of programs in order to reach safety goals.

Bebon presented a table which illustrated data recorded since 1998. The graph indicated that injuries had declined greatly but there was still effort to be made to achieve the DOE goals on the way to zero injuries. Currently there is a slight rise in recordable injuries, and that is being addressed now.

Member Campbell asked how this data compared to other multi-program labs.

Bebon said that the patterns were very similar, a few are lower but all the Labs have been trending down and there is a large safety community. DOE has been emphatic about setting goals for all the laboratories.

Member Mannhaupt said it seemed the efforts were working. She said it was significant to see the efforts working as the programs matured over the last ten years and to hear Tom Daniels give his presentation on a critical issue such like the BGRR and make reference to site safety, worker safety and community concerns. She said a community member can now hear this and trust that these issues are considered when planning takes place. The mindset has changed at BNL.

Member Anker asked if there was a death rate record and if the most serious injuries were recorded.

Bebon said there had not been a fatality since the unfortunate construction accident in 1997. He said the accident data was not separated by severity; however severity is tracked and a decrease is shown there as well. Most of the injuries are very short term, but the focus is not just on the data but on analysis of the cause of the injuries or accidents, which relates back to feedback and improvement.

Member Chaudhry asked if there were in house safety management controls in place and if the organization polices itself, or if an independent inspector reviews the site prior to implementing a work plan. If an organization controls the safety, there can be a tendency to push production at

the expense of safety, but an independent inspector has the ability to really ensure the safety is there.

Bebon said there were several answers to that question. Safety is a line responsibility. If a manager pushes schedule or cost before safety, that manager puts his/her position at risk. All levels of staff are accountable to the next level for safety. There is a safety organization within the Laboratory that participates in planning work, identifying hazards and providing oversight. The DOE site office has facility representatives, and safety and operations personnel who are independent of BNL. They observe Lab work sites on a daily basis. BNL is regulated by DOE unlike private industry which is regulated by OSHA. Periodic independent reviews are also conducted by offsite DOE personnel, Battelle and Stony Brook.

The ISM/Safety Improvement plan was created in spring of 2006 to "projectize" the institutional ISM/safety improvement agenda. This is formal and consists of a Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) built around an external fall 2005 ISM Readiness Review, "Lessons Learned" from events and BNL ISM improvement initiatives.

Emergency Management at BNL relies on a strong ISM program in an effort to protect people during crisis situations, rather than day-to-day. Major work has been done to achieve compliance since 2004 with a major focus on chemicals, Hazard Survey's and assessments, building a new Emergency Operations Center and constant training.

The DOE review in August, which happens about every five years, is very important to the Laboratory. It will examine Emergency Management along with the central focus of the ISM program. A scoping visit was conducted in May 2006, a planning and on-site data collection visit will occur during August and the validation and closeout of the review will occur in September 2007.

Member Talbot asked if an injury incurred by an outside delivery person, at no fault to the Laboratory, is reported in the ISM accident data.

Bebon said yes, and it is the responsibility of the Lab to anticipate conditions that may lead to an incident. The DOE sets the bar high.

Member Anker asked if there was a penalty system if an employee does not comply with these efforts.

Bebon said there is language in the employees' disciplinary process. Safety performance is evaluated during reviews and moves through the hierarchy from line responsibility upward. Additionally, contractors are incentivized to comply with safety and if there are no injuries during the project they can receive as much as \$100,000.

Member Corarrino asked if there is awareness at the Lab that print materials be developed at the sixth grade level for readability.

Bebon said there has been an assessment of the readability of the materials used in the safety efforts. There have been problems in that area and the materials that present problems are often translated to scale to address readability. Adaptations have also occurred to create safety signs in many languages to accommodate the diversity of the working population.

The CAC thanked Bebon for the presentation.

9. Agenda Setting

Reed told the CAC Jeanne would contact the members about the informal August meeting and said he would not be present.

Agenda July

No meeting

Agenda August – Optional Meeting

Membership

Future agendas

Agenda September

HFBR

CAC discussion on membership and future agendas

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:49.

| 2007 | Affiliation | | First Name | Last Name | JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY | JUN | JUL | AUG | SEP | OCT | NOV | DEC |
|---|---------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Chart Key - P = Present | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ABCO | (Garber added on 4/10/02) | Member | Don | Garber | P | | P | P | P | P | | | | | | |
| ABCO | | Alternate | Doug | Dittko | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Brookhaven Retired Employees Association | | Member | Graham | Campbell | P | P | P | P | | P | | | | | | |
| Brookhaven Retired Employees Association (L. Jacobson new alternate as of 4/99)(A. Peskin 5/04) | | Alternate | Arnie | Peskin | | P | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CHEC (Community Health & Environment Coalition (added 10/04) | | Member | Sarah | Anker | | P | P | P | | P | | | | | | |
| | | | Ann Marie | Reed | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Citizens Campaign for the Environment | | Member | Adrienne | Esposito | | P | | | P | | | | | | | |
| Citizens Campaign for the Environment (Ottney added 4/02-takenoff 1/05 Mahoney put on)(7/06 add Kasey Jacobs) | | Alternate | Kasey | Jacobs | P | | P | | | P | | | | | | |
| E. Yaphank Civic Association | | Member | Michael | Giacomaro | P | P | P | P | P | P | | | | | | |
| E. Yaphank Civic Association (J. Minasi new alternate as of 3/99) (M. Triber 11/05) (Munson 6/06) | | Alternate | Brian | Munson | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Educator (changed 7/2006) | | Member | Adam | Martin | P | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Educator (B. Martin - 9/01) | | Alternate | Bruce | Martin | | | | | P | P | | | | | | |
| Educator (A. Martin new alternate 2/00) (Adam to college 8/01)(add. alternate 9/02) (changed 7/2006) | | Alternate | Audrey | Capozzi | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Environmental Economic Roundtable (Berger resigned, Proios became member 1/01) | | Member | George | Proios | P | P | P | | P | | | | | | | |
| Environmental Economic Roundtable (3/99, L. Snead changed to be alternate for EDF) | | Alternate | None | None | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fire Rescue and Emergency Services | | Member | Joe | Williams | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fire Rescue and Emergency Services | | Alternate | Don | Lynch | P | P | P | P | P | | | | | | | |
| Fire Rescue and Emergency Services | | Alternate | James | McLoughlin | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Friends of Brookhaven (E.Kaplan changed to become member 7/1/01) | | Member | Ed | Kaplan | | | P | P | | | | | | | | |
| Friends of Brookhaven (E.Kaplan changed to become member 7/1/01)(Schwartz added 11/18/02) | | Alternate | Steve | Schwartz | | | P | | | P | | | | | | |
| Health Care | | Member | Jane | Corrarino | | | P | | | P | | | | | | |
| Health Care | | Alternate | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Huntington Breast Cancer Coalition | | Member | Mary Joan | Shea | P | P | P | P | | P | | | | | | |
| Huntington Breast Cancer Coalition | | Alternate | Scott | Carlin | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Intl. Brotherhood of Electrical Workers/Local 2230 (S.Krsnak replaced M. Walker 1/11/07) | | Member | Scott | Krsnak | P | P | P | P | | | | | | | | |
| IBEW/Local 2230 | | Alternate | Philip | Pizzo | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 2007 | Affiliation | | First Name | Last Name | JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY | JUN | JUL | AUG | SEP | OCT | NOV | DEC |
|------|--|-----------|------------|--------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | L.I. Pine Barrens Society | Member | Richard | Amper | | P | P | | | | | | | | | |
| | L.I. Pine Barrens Society (added P. Loris 6/05) | Alternate | Elina | Alayeva | P | P | | P | | P | | | | | | |
| | L.I. Pine Barrens Society | Alternate | Susie | Husted | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | L.I. Progressive Coalition | Member | David | Sprintzen | P | P | P | P | P | P | | | | | | |
| | L.I. Progressive Coalition | Alternate | None | None | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Lake Panamoka Civic Association (Biss as of 4/02) | Member | Rita | Biss | P | P | | | P | P | | | | | | |
| | Lake Panamoka Civic Association (Rita Biss new alternate as of 3/99) | Alternate | Joe | Gibbons | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Long Island Association (Groneman replace 10/05) | Member | Lauren | Hill | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Long Island Association | Alternate | William | Evanzia | P | | | | P | | | | | | | |
| | Longwood Alliance | Member | Tom | Talbot | P | P | | P | P | P | | | | | | |
| | Longwood Alliance | Alternate | Kevin | Crowley | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Longwood Central School Dist. (switched 11/02) | Member | Barbara | Henigan | P | | P | | P | P | | | | | | |
| | Longwood Central School Dist. | Alternate | Allan | Gerstenlauer | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | NEAR | Member | Jean | Mannhaupt | | P | | | P | P | | | | | | |
| | NEAR (prospect taken off ¾)(Blumer added 10/04 | Alternate | Liz | Bowman | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | NSLS User | Member | Jean | Jordan-Sweet | P | P | P | | | P | | | | | | |
| | NSLS User | Alternate | Peter | Stephens | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Peconic River Sportsmen's Club (added 4/8/04) | Member | John | Hall | | P | P | P | P | | | | | | | |
| | Peconic River Sportsmen's Club | Alternate | Jeff | Schneider | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Ridge Civic Association | Member | Pat | Henagan | P | P | | P | P | P | | | | | | |
| | Science & Technology (added 1/13/05) | Member | Iqbal | Chaudhry | P | | P | | | P | | | | | | |
| | Town of Brookhaven (Graves made member 6/06) | Member | Anthony | Graves | | P | P | P | P | P | | | | | | |
| | Town of Brookhaven | Alternate | None | None | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Town of Brookhaven, Senior Citizens | Member | James | Heil | P | P | P | P | P | P | | | | | | |
| | Town of Brookhaven, Senior Citizens (open slot as of 4/99) | Alternate | None | None | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Town of Riverhead | Member | Robert | Conklin | P | P | P | P | P | P | | | | | | |
| | Town of Riverhead (K. Skinner alternate as of 4/99) | Alternate | Kim | Skinner | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Wading River Civic Association | Member | Helga | Guthy | P | | P | | P | | | | | | | |
| | Wading River Civic Association | Alternate | Sid | Bail | | | | | | | | | | | | |