

These notes are in the following order:

1. Attendance
2. Correspondence and handouts
3. Administrative Items
4. CAC Discussion on the ESD
5. Community Comment
6. Environmental Update, George Goode
7. Membership Discussion
8. Agenda Setting

1. Attendance

Members/Alternates Present:
See Attached Sheets.

Others Present:

M. Bebon, T. Burke, A. Carsten, J. Carter, P. Chaudhari, J. Clodius, H. Corrano, J. D'Ascoli, W. Dorsch, K. Geiger, G. Goode, L. Hill, M. Holland, S. Johnson, T. Kneitel, S. Kumar, R. Lee, M. Lynch, B. Mahoney, V. Racaniello, A. Rapiejko, R. Rimando, S. Robbins, J. Tarpinian

2. Correspondence and Handouts

Items one through three were mailed with a cover letter dated January 7, 2005. Item four was placed in the member's folders, and item five was available at the meeting as a handout.

1. Draft agenda for January 13, 2005.
2. Draft notes December 9 meeting
3. Final notes October 14 meeting
4. Copy of membership categories
5. Copy of Environmental Update presentation.

3. Administrative

The meeting began at approximately 6:34 p.m. Reed welcomed everyone and went over the ground rules and the draft agenda. Those present introduced themselves, Member Amper introduced Suzy Husted as the Pine Barrens Society's program manager and Adrienne Esposito introduced Brendon Mahoney from the Citizens Campaign. Reed asked that the Membership discussion be moved to the end of the agenda, the CAC agreed.

Iqbal Chaudhari thanked the CAC members for voting for him at the December meeting. He said he looked forward to working with them.

The minutes from the December 9 meeting were approved. There were three abstentions.

4. CAC Discussion on ESD

Reed reminded the CAC that they had several presentations over recent months on the ESD and said their charge was to provide the Laboratory with input. The normal process is to have a group discussion and then it can be decided if it's the CAC's desire to work toward consensus or to work toward a poll of the interests. The Lab has said either will be useful.

There being no discussion, Reed said it would be useful to conduct a poll of the members. They were asked to provide recommendations and input to the Lab.

Anthony Graves: I found BNL's explanation last month creditable. It made sense to me. I'm still interested in of course the details in monitoring the cleanup as it continues but I felt fairly confident that the analysis done was done reasonably and that contamination would not move off the Lab site. It would stay well within the borders, could be monitored and I am comfortable with being updated on that. It made more sense to me to do it that way then to take the contamination out of the ground and create potential exposure pathways and also raise expenses. I understand the nature of the pilot project, that's what pilot projects are for and the way the resin was filling up faster than anticipated made sense to me. It also made sense that it was attracting substances that were chemically similar to the contaminants and filling up that way, so I felt that the Explanation of Significant Differences was reasonable and I think it's something that the Town can accept.

Mark Walker: I'd like to agree with a lot of what Anthony said the only thing I'd like to add is I'd like to see them somewhere commit to continuing to look for ways around the problems with the resins and the resin filters filling up with the calcium instead of the Strontium-90. I just can't help feeling that's an avenue that they should actively pursue to attempt to make things work a little faster.

Bob Conklin: I second Mark and Anthony and just about everything they've said. The concern that I have in relation to this is with some of the technologies to be used. I'm very hesitant with air stripping. I'd like to know, and I'm talking about the VOC plume now, when you get into the technology of the carbon filter versus an air stripper, which is cheaper and which is more effective. I'm not opposed to air strippers but I just haven't received an explanation of what happens to these VOCs when they're stripped off and go into the air. It doesn't seem that they're being changed to any extent. They're just taking a poison, if you will, in one source, which is water and its being placed into another source which is air. Being a resident of the Town of Riverhead we are in direct airflow from Brookhaven National Lab and carbon filters solve the problem for me completely. If you're going to use air filters, I really would like to know the technology of what happens once these things have been stripped and put into the atmosphere and are blown away. What happens from that point on? To date, I haven't gotten an explanation that makes me happy about that. That's the only part of this whole process that bothers me.

Mary Joan Shea: I wasn't here for the last meeting so I'd like to listen to the others first then comment.

Ed Kaplan: Based upon our previous discussions, presentations and the minutes I'm satisfied that this group has gotten as much information as we possibly can. Bob raises a very interesting point that I've been discussing for years now with classes. You take something out of the ground and you put in it the air, it's in the air. That's the answer. *And, if it gets photo-degraded, it gets photo-degraded. Very often* it doesn't do anything, it just dilutes into the air. But I don't think *that* that's going to have a significant impact on the Town of Riverhead or anyone else around here. *And I was particularly happy to note reading in the minutes that the EPA gave us an explanation last time concerning its view on this and how it looks at the alternatives, does an analysis, and allows something to go forth.* My only concern is something I've raised here before *is, unfortunately, the regs allow for activities to go on, changes to be*

made to the plan, as it's happening under certain circumstances, and I don't feel comfortable with that. I would rather that kind of information come to us first before any activity is allowed. (Additions to original text in italics.)

Jim McLoughlin: I've missed the last several meetings so I'm certainly not up to speed on the subject so I'm just going to listen, rather than comment.

Mike Giacomaro: Our main concern has been the Magothy Aquifer. What we had looked at last year without doing anything is the zero option. What they're saying now is Option #1, where it will take 110 years, was an option without doing any pumping. Now they're going to Option 2 which is what they're proposing, the Preferred Alternative. While it reduces the number of years it doesn't add any more safety to the community because it's water that will never be used. So we do have a difference of opinion. If I were to look at it, I would go with No. 1 for the Magothy Aquifer for the option and continue what you're doing. I have no problem with anything else that was proposed.

Jean Mannhaupt: I wasn't at the last meeting but drinking water has been upper most in my mind for a number of years. I've read the ESD. I went back and revisited part and parcel of the OU III ROD and also some of the information that got captured in the Groundwater Monitoring Plan that the site is doing now and the updates that went from the baseline study back in 1992 where we were increased Areas of Concern or AOCs and captured more information about groundwater and contamination of water in and around the site. I support the ESD document. I think the ROD itself acknowledged that we had to deal with these issues. It was flexible enough that we could deal with them. The pilot study was done. I know the low flow is more efficient but I'm very concerned about waste products in the future and coming years and that's looked at, how that's handled. I'd also like to make sure that within the ESD and moving onward with any of the cleanup issues, that EPA's policy of revisiting things every five years is also taken into account.

David Sprintzen: I don't have anything to add to what Jean or the others have said. I'm quite comfortable with the analysis and the revisions as proposed. I really would be concerned about doing something that would actually increase the availability of the Strontium-90 to the public so I think that the proposals are quite acceptable.

Rita Biss: I guess my only problem is that people are interlacing VOCs and Strontium-90. They're two completely different subjects. I guess I've been following more of the Strontium-90 and I can see why you can't pump that very fast because you get too much water in and it uses up the filters. The only thing I have to keep saying is do it dynamically. When things go down a little bit, make sure they've gone down for real and it just hasn't moved 200 feet south of the well. Follow it dynamically, don't think it's a static condition and you can just leave the wells where they are now.

John Hall: On behalf of the 660 members of the Peconic River Sportsmen's Club we support the Lab in all their efforts to cleanup the environment. We support the decisions that the Lab has made in the past.

Graham Campbell: It seems to me that prime issue in the ESD is the stretch out in time that it takes to cleanup. I feel quite comfortable with the Strontium-90 cleanup and the stretch out for that because it seems like there's no pathway to cause serious troubles. It's well understood and that seems like a quite reasonable approach given the significant increase in expense in trying to keep the original the schedule. I'm less sure of the VOC cleanup issue. And it might be because I don't understand that well enough. There's nothing I can particularly point to that makes me uncomfortable about it, I'm just somewhat less sure. I feel quite confident the Strontium-90 cleanup changes will work out fine. And furthermore, given the nature of Sr-90, if things don't happen as people anticipate, it's much easier to detect a change that's happening there I think than it would be with the VOCs.

Sarah Anker: I have a couple of comments. I'm uncomfortable. I would like to see the cleanup done faster for both the Magothy and Upper Glacial. I'd like to see the whole thing done faster because the longer that it's there, is the longer that it will have to disperse. When something spills the quicker you clean it up, I think the more efficient it can be cleaned up. I understand about the filters and I went to the meeting last week and it was better explained to me. But again, my concern is that it is not going to be cleaned up fast enough.

Adrienne Esposito: I know you won't find this shocking, but our organization opposes the 70-year plan for cleaning up the Strontium-90 and we oppose the 65-year plan to cleanup the Magothy. I think that what Rita said was exactly right. I think that if we can look at these as two completely differently issues because in fact they are. And I agree with what Graham said. I think they deserve to be taken differently because the Sr-90 does move slower. The reason we oppose 70 years is because we do feel that it's too long, it's two generations out.

I did speak with the EPA, they did a little research, they didn't give me a definitive answer, I don't want to misrepresent them but to the best of their knowledge and to the best of their search they couldn't find another 70-year ROD in the nation and this may be a first. He was very clear saying he doesn't know that for a fact. There may be other ones out there, but he "just couldn't find them." I don't exactly know what that means but I think 70 years is out there.

Sixty-five years for the Magothy? I don't think this committee has ever agreed to a 65-year ROD for VOCs for the Magothy. VOCs as we know, do move quicker than Strontium-90. The current plan does a lot to stop the migration of VOCs off of the Lab property. We've never supported that in the past. I don't know what's the difference today then June 2000 when we decided not to allow that to happen. Everyone wants to save money. If you start weakening these cleanup RODs will you weaken the one that comes next month? That will save money. Let's do that. I think you have to hold the line somewhere. Sixty-five years to do the Magothy cleanup. I think that's outrageous.

Richard Amper: This is really the saddest night that I have had since I came to the CAC. It is really unimaginable. We've all been very understanding of the Laboratory for so long. We didn't understand exactly what these threats were. The Laboratory responded very, very well and went above and beyond the call. I think part of our complacency tonight is based upon the fact that the Lab has done so well. This is not its finest hour. I am of the notion that we're pushing this off two generations, 35 Congressional sessions, I think we're going to find that the cost of paying for this is far greater than we think in the budget of 2065 than it is today. I don't believe that the economies are what is being represented.

I agree with Rita and Graham and Adrienne and Sarah that the Magothy problem is not the same thing as the Strontium problem. But I try to balance these things and I try to be fair. We've been very supportive of what the Lab has done up to this point so I try to remember when I felt best about the CAC and I have to go back a few years. It was when we ran into the process of how much it was going to cost to clean this place up and how long it was going to take. Everybody was very negative then, and they were very concerned about how much money was available. We went to Washington and we talked to people in the Executive Branch and we were not very encouraged and then we went to Senator Schumer. The Senator brought the Secretary of the Department of Energy here and cut the time it took to clean this place up in half and produced money that we didn't even know was there. I think we're cheapin' out on this. I think that if this CAC stands up and says we don't want to make this concession, we want the Lab to have a perfect record from having done it right and having obtained the support that is needed to get it right, that we will get it. That's why we got it last time. We all stuck together. People at the Lab worked with people in the civic community, people who don't see this as a big threat worked with people who do think it was a big threat and Senator Schumer delivered for us and the Department of Energy delivered for us. I think we're selling our friends in Washington short if we don't say let's do it right. That's what makes us feel good about our service. That's

why the Pine Barrens Society honored this organization because when it had a chance to do it right or wrong, it has always done more not less. We stand here prepared to go in a different direction and I don't want to see us do that. We don't have to do that. We'll have the support that we need to do it right if we stick by our guns and stand together and have the help that we need to do it right. Let's not make any concessions that we don't need to make, let's not have a problem that was created by this generation get passed to another generation. Let's do what we said we should do. There is no new evidence. There is no different problem. There is no different set of circumstances that we face. What we thought was right when we wrote the ROD is just as right today.

Anthony Graves: Do you feel the same way about the VOCs and the Strontium??

Amper: I think they should be approached differently. I'm more concerned about the VOCs because one of the things we've done is that we've tried to contain the stuff and we've listened to George and we've listened to David and I'm not casting any aspersions, we're playing by the rules. We have different views as to whether we have this cost/risk factor or whether we ought to get it right. The one thing we've stuck with is what's here stays here, we don't let it migrate. There is some evidence that the Strontium-90 won't migrate, there is over whelming evidence that the VOCs will. I don't think we should sit for that.

Helga Guthy: Unfortunately I have the privilege of following a few people who I really can't agree with. I have to agree with Anthony and Mark and so many others. I haven't heard anything that would make me think that this is an immediate problem. I think they seem to have looked at everything and have it under control. It will take longer and just rushing it to me is going to disturb more. It is not only costing more money, but it's taking more out of the ground then it needs to take out to make it safe. The Lab did do more with the Peconic River cleanup than we had initially thought was necessary. We went along with that. I don't see any reason to change this. In that case there were people that would have been exposed and environmental exposures - fish and fishermen and so on. No one has any information that anyone would be exposed to this. We have been assured that if they find anything different and there were changes, that the plan will be changed. So if things go faster or further I do believe that it will be taken care of.

Jean Jordan- Sweet: I basically agree with the document. The thing that struck me was that for both the Magothy and Strontium-90, the Lab recommendation was to go backwards. You'd spend far more money to decrease the level of the contaminants by half and that just doesn't seem very reasonable to me especially for the Strontium-90 that isn't really going to be going anywhere. As for the Magothy to punch twice the number of holes through the clay layer to get the less contaminated plumes, I don't think is really worth it either.

Iqbal Chaudhry: Unfortunately I was not able to attend the last meeting and I missed the two handouts that were available for reading and review. I think this problem is really related to what they call groundwater hydrology. Groundwater hydrology is not a very precise science. You state that Strontium-90 travels 25 feet a year and groundwater travels 300 feet a year. It can be way off from these figures depending on the soil, the aquifer, and the underground layers and the clay layers. But I just tend to believe based on the explanations that BNL has put in a lot of effort and I think they have made an effort to do the best job possible. We can keep on asking questions and trying to pin them down. I think it's very realistic to expect very, very accurate figures from BNL. While it's important to know the time frame, at the same time let's give some leeway to BNL for the practicalities. Having said all that I believe that I am satisfied the road BNL is taking is acceptable and I recommend that we should go with their recommendation.

Tom Talbot: Certainly Strontium-90 and VOCs are in fact two very different issues. It appears to me that given the location of the current Strontium plume, the projected movement, and the half- life, you could almost go with Alternative 1 that is basically do nothing and it will never

leave the property. I don't have access to all the technical modeling the Lab has, but Strontium is by far more defined, and is less a concern to me. The VOCs, I'm a little bit fuzzy on because there are some things that I'm just not as clear on. The phrase in the ESD says there are no current receptors and hence no human health risks associated with the contamination of the Magogy Aquifer. The word current is a concern to me. I'm relying on the Lab's contact with the community and the monitoring to keep the word current accurate and I'm a little bit concerned with the fact that there are no known human health risks because we do have health risks of things that we previously believed to be safe. We read about these every day. Things that have been previously approved by the FDA all of sudden become poison. In a perfect world we would get all this stuff, contamination taken out tomorrow at zero cost, but we're not in a perfect world. But from my technical background I also have to be willing to consider cost and risk assessments. I was involved in that for many, many years in the nuclear power industry. Every decision that was made, in designing plants and the day-to-day operation, there was a risk with everything that we did so I'm relying on the Lab's expertise and research. At this point, I am inclined to support both of the Lab's published recommendations.

Barbara Henigin: The Longwood Central School District also feels comfortable with Brookhaven National Laboratory's proposal. Sitting here each month and listening to the presentations and the depth of the reports I don't feel that there's a reason to go with any of the other alternatives.

Mary Joan Shea: I think I have a lot of questions about changing the time for the cleanup, you're just about doubling it. Several people around the table here have mentioned the uncertainties of the health risks from the VOCs. I also feel that in the current political climate that we're in that money that's available now even though it's never enough, in the future there may be even less money for cleanup so we don't know what we're facing in the future. I feel that the best thing to do right now is to go ahead with No. 3 because that would guarantee that within a reasonable period time that we would know what's going on with the cleanup and nothing is more important to the health of people than the water that they drink and the air that they breath. So I think that the key issue, the main reason why I'm here as part of this group is because I am so concerned about the water for the future and the air that we breath.

George Proios: I'll probably be redundant with some of the things I've said in past. (Some comments were made that were not picked up by the recording equipment.) We have a lot of good strong built in safety factors in playing with numbers and a lot of unknowns but people are talking about time. This planet has been around for four billion years and whether we're talking 65 years, 100, 65 thousand, six thousand years, 65 years is not a long time in the history of this planet. It's not a long time in our own history. I don't think time is the element to use for criteria to make a decision. Our criteria should be public health and the impact on the environment. I've said this a million times before, if it doesn't come in contact with you, if you don't breath it, you don't drink it, you don't eat it, the fact that it's there doesn't pose a health risk. There has to be a route for human exposure in order for that health risk to exist. Simply being in the groundwater does not create that condition. If you don't have a public water supply that's drawing from that aquifer, we're not drawing water from a bathtub, the lines are very specific, they're singular, we know exactly where these plumes are coming from because we've got more monitoring wells at Brookhaven then we have anywhere else in the country in terms of monitoring a single site. The fact that it's under our ground...

(tape switched)

...It's just a fact of life. Radiation is with us, and it's always going to be with us. You have to ask if this project is going to impact any water people will be drinking. I can conceive no way that's going to happen. There's no way that a public water supply is going to locate a well down gradient. If they do and they see contamination they can't pump it unless they treat it. So I haven't seen any way that we're going to be exposed. The fact that it's down there doesn't create the problem by itself. You have to stick a well down there, draw it up and pump it to

people's homes for them to drink in order to create a health threat. Now, should we be doing things based on money? Sure we should because the simple fact is that we don't have money to do everything that needs to get done to protect public health. There was news on the radio today saying there are chemicals that this country manufactures that have never been tested. Some are simple things like plastic that we use, Pampers, other things that we put next to babies. So if we have extra money to spend there are things that we come in contact with in our daily lives every day that pose a health risk that we haven't tested. On some microscopic particles of material thousands of feet below us in groundwater again doesn't seem to pose a threat to other things, I would be more concerned about these things that we do eat and ingest everyday as opposed to these other things that are just there, that we can monitor but will not in any way going to be taken into our bodies. So that's why I think this proposal is reasonable. I think there should be an escape clause, we're going to be doing monitoring so if something comes out in the future, yes, if we find something is different than what we expected, we should revisit it. I don't anything is ironclad that says this is going to be item for item for the next thousand years. But for the fact that right now there's no evidence that shows we have any kind of potential health threat, I don't see why we need to waste money when there are other more important things that the Lab needs to spend money on right now in order to make this site clean.

Reed read emailed comments from Don Garber (ABCO) read into the record. Basically, ABCO's comments for tonight's proposition are that Don says it's usual that he as ABCO's representative provides his input without consultation, but in this case the ABCO board itself voted and came up with a position that was eight (8) to two (2) not to oppose BNL's attempt to relax the cleanup goal timetables. He said that the majority position is also his position. The members of the minority position were present and they argued their position forcefully. That is his input to the group from ABCO.

Member Mannhaupt asked if there was a norm for cleaning up Strontium-90 somewhere in the nation? What is normally done with Strontium-90 because most of the RODs she's seen for other sites leave it to naturally attenuate because the cleanup process is too costly and we've done the pilot program. Does Bob Howe know?

Tom Burke responded that there aren't many places that he knows of that are pumping and treating Strontium-90. I've heard they were pumping it at Hanford and I heard second hand they were having tremendous difficulties with the resins and the costs. I don't know all the details. And even after they treat it, their effluent is still high.

Bob Howe said West Valley did some treatment of Strontium-90 and I know they had similar issues with calcium.

Mannhaupt said that from what she understands it's usually left to naturally attenuate. Correct? (could not decipher if there was a response or not, many people were speaking) She asked if there was any other way it was extracted. Tom Burke described a reactive wall, where resin material was put in a trench.

Member Sprintzen asked for a clarification on the VOCs and the changes that are being suggested in the ESD with respect to the impact of the VOCs off the Lab site.

Bob Howe said that the original ROD was part of the Upper Glacial program. Three extraction wells have been installed as part of that proposal. There are two additional wells in ESD. We have already pulled out VOC's out of the Magothy Aquifer. I couldn't tell you how many pounds, but we have done remediation on the Magothy and we are also preventing further migration into the Magothy. The two wells will pull out more of the chemicals.

Member Esposito said that the original ROD didn't have cleanup of the Magothy, you can't compare that.

Howe said that what the original ROD said was that the Lab will do additional characterization. Also as part of the Upper Glacial treatment system wells were put into the Magothy.

Reed asked if the clarification was okay.

Member Amper said that based on some of the reactions that he has heard there seems to be a willingness on the part of some folks to look at the Magothy in a way that's different from the Strontium and maybe the CAC's advice to the Laboratory with respect to the VOCs should be different from that pertaining to Strontium-90. And if that's true, some of those who came to agree about that as they gave their input around the table should come forward and say that they are concerned about a migration that wasn't anticipated. That it should be dealt with a little bit differently than the other. I am usually accused of being overly idealistic in thinking we can do the impossible. I think we do ourselves a great service by very pragmatically acknowledging early in this process rather than later that we're not going to arrive at consensus on this matter tonight.

Member Kaplan said that as Iqbal mentionedhydrology isn't an exact science, engineering, but we do know a lot about Strontium-90, in particular how it behaves in the ground. George, Rita mentioned something about a dynamic approach to this and it's my understanding as it seems to be George's that this is indeed going to be dynamic. That there will be ongoing measurements taken and analysis done. George mentioned something that's rather significant – No dose, no effect. That's the bottom line. And when we think about problems I think it's important to put things in perspective. He asked if anyone had ever driven behind a school bus where the exhaust is right at your level. It annoys the heck out of me, and to me that is a far more significant problem to me personally than the VOC's that would be omitted through the air, unfortunately, but this is the standard technique. Every gas station you see that has had it's tanks removed and reinstalled has a air stripper. So I can't help but think that I would like to take some of the extra money that some people are asking for tonight which I agree with, if it was easy to get and available.pressing problems so that when I drive to work behind a school bus I don't have breathe everything that's being emitted.

Member Mannhaupt pointed out that the Institutional Controls on the projects call for five-year reviews. So every five years this will be revisited the data and reviewed just like has been done. And more new data comes and we go forward that monitoring well data trends and the plume movement will be evaluated on an annual basis as part of the Institutional Controls besides the five-year reviews and BNL intends to take the annual Groundwater Status Report that it does every year and they'll be controls in that in regards to the groundwater regardless of what chemicals are in the groundwater. So there are three areas of things that they're put in place over the course of the ROD that can be visited on a yearly basis and a five-year basis. And I don't think the EPA would have a 70-year ROD because there are no 70-year RODs because most sites have 30-year RODs cause they don't want to deal with committing to anything further than 30-years. It's five years they review everything, change the ROD if they have to move forward, but 30-years they're looking to be economically out of business to have to handle any kind of environmental stewardship so to speak for their site. And then everything naturally attenuates so I understand the Strontium-90 is the headache in going in going further, there are some things with the Magothy. I don't believe in the years that we've been the CAC and the years that BNL's been a site with a lot of us kicking at the door that they're going to allow state-of-the-art not to graduate and constantly change year-in and year-out, day to day to make sure the Magothy is cleaned up to drinking water standards. But I do believe we have a problem with how we treat and how we go after the cleanup of the Strontium-90 and I can credit BNL that they went after the pilot study program and worked out some of the bugs and I know they'll continue to work to out bugs. We have a waste issue that we're going to have to look at as a CAC. I'm relying on the fact that we've got the Clean Water Program in effect right now. I want to comment to Senator Schuman's office and Congressman Bishop as the TAG Community Leader for the Technical Assistance Grant, out of all the RODs, out of all the documents, I think

we have a comprehensive and proactive OU III document and I would like to thank your offices for being so proactive in all of this

Reed told the CAC that they needed to decide if they would like to work toward a consensus recommendation or not as a group. The Laboratory is asking for input and the input you've already given is a type of input, they're not requiring that you go to consensus. What I'd like to do is to get from the group, your decision on whether you want to continue the discussion toward consensus or end it with your input being the poll that has been taken.

Member Amper said that he doubts they will be able to reach consensus and thinks it's an exercise in futility, but he would love to hear from anyone who reacted to the comments about the distinction between the Strontium-90 and the VOCs so that whatever information we give the Lab can be formed by any observations if you hadn't actually thought about the distinction before Rita first raised it. If any one on that side of the table agrees with that or disagrees, that may be useful to the Lab.

Reed asked if anyone would like to make an additional comment on the idea that Strontium-90 and the VOCs should be treated as separate issues in theprocess?

Talbot said at the risk of repeating what he said earlier not knowing any current receptors, and no known "at this time" human health risks associated with the contamination, I'm going to rely on the Laboratory's keeping us up to date with any new receptors that may appear and also staying up to date if some new currently unidentified human health risk associated with this level of VOCs happens to come on the horizon that that would be the kick off, either one of those things would be a kick off to again revisit the ROD and you might be able to do another ESD based new information.

Anthony Graves said that he thought that Dick and Adrienne made sense in separating the two issues, the nature of the contaminants and the technology used to treat the contaminants aren't something that should lumped together, they should be discussed separately.

Mannhaupt said they are separate issues and she would be very upset if the Laboratory and the Department of Energy didn't know that they were separate issues and separate contaminants and had to be dealt with. She doesn't expect in the ensuing years that these will be treated as the same.

Reed said that he thought the issue was whether the final cleanup decision can be separated or if they have to be taken as a package, the way it is right now. Potentially there could be some modification to the decision for one of the remediations and no modification to the decision for the other.

Member Giacomaro asked if Reed thought there should be two polls or two consensus recommendations, one for the Magothy and one for the Strontium-90. The results maybe exactly the same or they may be different. There might have consensus on one and not on the other.

Amper said that it wasn't clear to him that there would be consensus on either, but he thought the Lab should be informed if the overwhelming majority of folks thought that the Strontium delay was more acceptable then the other. Or if in fact a majority of folks were more concerned about the VOC's and were more eager to see the timeline held on that then on the Strontium. He said the CAC was advising the Lab and members may not have the same feeling about the delay of one cleanup as the other and that should be made clear to the Lab especially in the absence of being able to obtain consensus.

Reed said he was looking for more input on that from the people around the table.

Member Esposito said she thought they should be taken separately for all the obvious reasons, but also in addition she thought there were some good arguments for the 70-year ROD for the Strontium-90. It's unique, it binds to the soil, the chance of the facility staying in the governmental realm for a long period of time is good. So that's one discussion that we can have. But for the Magothy she said a 65-year ROD would be setting a national record from what she's been told by the EAP for VOCs and it seems like everyone is very casual about that. She said that in 65 years they'd all be dead. She looks at it as what can we do better. She said the CAC had always voted for 30-year RODs.

Reed asked if there was anyone that believes that pushing toward a consensus recommendation is the appropriate action for the CAC to take. As no one responded Reed said the poll would be the input from the CAC to the Laboratory. Reed asked the Lab representatives if they felt the input was adequate. They indicated it was.

5. Community Comment

There were no comments from the audience.

After the CAC reconvened from the break Barbara Henigin announced that on Tuesday Tom Talbot was to be honored by the Rotary Club of Middle Island and the Longwood Alliance as the Civic recipient at their first Leadership Awards Dinner.

6. Environmental Update, George Goode

Reed asked that the CAC hold their questions until the end of the report. He said topics of particular interest could be put on a future agenda for a more detailed presentation.

George Goode told the CAC that each year, as part of the ISO 14001 Program Management Review, he must give a presentation to senior management on the performance of all the environmental programs at the Laboratory. His presentation would consist of that information that included the Lab's performance in wastewater, air emissions - both radioactive and non-radioactive, the storage facilities tank program, waste generation, and some of the proactive initiatives such as the Pollution Prevention Program.

The most recent review in July was the recertification audit. There were five minor non-conformances found, three opportunities for improvement, and many examples of continual improvement. It was found that overall the system was well-established and there is very active management and employee participation. The Lab is implementing a similar management system to improve safety, OSHAS 18001.

Goode explained the environmental aspects that the Lab is managed under with the ISO 14001 program. There aspects that are expected and facility-specific aspects. Controls and objectives are placed on them to lessen the impact to the environment. The Lab has also recently been accepted into the EPA's National Environmental Performance Track program and the requirements and commitments were explained. The commitments the Lab has agreed to are to restore 10 acres of land per year, reduce the use of mercury, reduce ozone-depleting substances, and reduce emissions from the BLIP.

The environmental performance trends of the Sewage Treatment Plant, wastewater, Non-radiological air emissions, radiological air emissions, BNL's potable water supply, and the natural and cultural resources were discussed. The trends and results of monitoring and testing were explained in great detail.

The Lab is not hooked up to the Suffolk County Water Authority. It pumps its own water and has a Water Treatment plant. The Lab is pumping 800 million gallons of water less now than it did in 1995. The reduction is attributed to changes to the way the large machines are cooled. Cooling water is no longer used once. It is now re-circulated. The Lab received an A+ in 2004 from the Citizens Campaign for the Environment for the Water Quality Consumer Confidence Report it publishes annually. CCE representative Adrienne Esposito commented that it's the best one in the state.

Goode also discussed Suffolk County Sanitary Code Article 12 and progress removing underground storage tanks. He talked about spills and efforts to reduce the numbers. He said that Suffolk County's spill reporting requirements are very stringent. Any amount of spill to soil is reportable. In some applications, the Lab has switched to a vegetable-based hydraulic oil. Member Anker asked about biodiesel fuel, George explained the difference.

CAC members commented about scientists being accountable for the waste they generate and that while the CERCLA cleanup will continue, the Lab now is implementing pollution prevention programs to prevent the past from repeating itself.

Goode briefly described the Site Environmental Report and noted that copies were available for the CAC.

Member Mannhaupt asked how often the equipment used to measure the air emissions was calibrated. Bob Lee said it was checked daily and tested for accuracy once a year.

Member Jordan-Sweet commented that while BNL is reducing its waste stream, the waste may actually show up someplace else. She gave ion pumps used at the NSLS as an example and said they used to clean and rebuild them in-house, now they are sent out and someone else handles the waste.

Member Giacomaro asked about the cooling water and if it was discharged. There is not much loss in the primary loop. The secondary loop is connected to a cooling tower and there is blow down periodically. The blow down discharge is released to a SPDES outfall.

Member Biss asked if the reduction in water usage and effluents were because of the closing of the HFBR and BGRR and what happened to the fish used in the effluent tests. Goode said that the closing of the HFBR did impact tritium emissions to the Peconic and there was a savings in water, however, the waste streams were not affected as much. Bob Lee explained the standard EPA methodology calls for watching the fish for seven days. During the seven days they watch several generations of water fleas grow.

Member Proios commended George Goode for the work he's done at the Lab and lamented that the County did not have a pollution prevention program. He said that even when the regulatory agencies don't require biological testing quarterly it's a good idea to do it because it's a good early indicator of problems.

Member Anker asked about the water filters used to purify the Labs drinking water, water softening, the water used in experiments, and how the leaks from the underground tanks were found. Goode said the Lab uses two methods. Carbon filters, similar to the way SCWA filters their water, are used for some wells. Other wells are located where there is high iron and that water is run to the Water Treatment Plant where it goes through a variety of processes from iron removal and ph adjustment to air stripping. Lee said there was no need for water softening. The water used in the experiments depends on what is required. Cooling water can be used from the distribution system, for other high quality requirements the departments have their own filters and distillation systems. Goode said the leaks were found when the tanks were dug up.

Member Talbot said he didn't think the Lab gave itself enough credit for the ISO 14001 certification. He described his familiarity with the program and said it was a lot of work.

Member Jordan-Sweet asked if the Lab tested for coliform bacteria at the STP discharge? Bob Lee said coliform tests are run twice a month.

Member Anker asked about using solar energy and if the Lab has run any tests to see what fuels are better? Goode said that the Lab has a research program on biodiesel run by Tom Butcher. He's very knowledgeable about it. As for solar, Goode said a lot of land is needed and Long Island is not the greatest location for it.

Dr. Chaudhri said that the Lab is looking at solar energy and is hoping for some breakthrough science.

Member Mannhaupt noted that the CAC had come along way and said she looked forward to this coming year and bringing closure to many projects.

Helga Guthy said that the Wading River Civic Association was to hold a press conference on the Broadwater issue at the Wading River creek on Tuesday morning.

7. Membership Discussion

The CAC had a brief discussion on membership categories, which area best suited new member Iqbal Chaudhry's interests and engineering experience, and if a new category should be created. The CAC discussed expanding some of the categories and making additional changes and finally agreed and voted on creating the Science & Technology category.

8. Agenda Setting

January Agenda

BGRR Update
Status on CFN - Science facility
Peconic Cleanup Update
Update on NASA - NSRL
Membership

The meeting adjourned at 9:29 pm.

2005	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													
ABCO	Alternate	Richard	Johannesen													
Brookhaven Retired Employees Association	Member	Graham	Campbell	P												
Brookhaven Retired Employees Association (L. Jacobson new alternate as of 4/99)(A. Peskin 5/04)	Alternate	Arnie	Peskin													
CHEC (Community Health & Environment Coalition (added 10/04)	Member	Sarah	Anker	P												
Citizens Campaign for the Environment	Member	Adrienne	Esposito	P												
Citizens Campaign for the Environment (Ottney added 4/02-takenoff 1/05 Mahoney put on)	Alternate	Brendan	Mahoney													
E. Yaphank Civic Association	Member	Michael	Giacomaro	P												
E. Yaphank Civic Association (J. Minasi new alternate as of 3/99)	Alternate	Jerry	Minasi													
Educator	Member	Audrey	Capozzi													
Educator (B. Martin - 9/01)	Alternate	Bruce	Martin													
Educator (A. Martin new alternate 2/00) (Adam to college 8/01)(add. alternate 9/02)	Alternate	Adam	Martin													
Environmental Economic Roundtable (Berger resigned, Proios became member 1/01)	Member	George	Proios	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	James	McLoughlin	P												
Friends of Brookhaven (E.Kaplan changed to become member 7/1/01)	Member	Ed	Kaplan	P												
Friends of Brookhaven (E.Kaplan changed to become member 7/1/01)(schwartz added 11/18/02)	Alternate	Steve	Schwartz													
Health Care	Member	Jane	Corrarino													
Health Care (as of 10/02 per JD)	Alternate	Mina	Barrett													
Huntington Breast Cancer Coalition	Member	Mary Joan	Shea	P												
Huntington Breast Cancer Coalition	Alternate	Scott	Carlin													

2005	Affiliation		First Name	Last Name	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
	Intl. Brotherhood of Electrical Workers/Local 2230	Member	Mark	Walker	P											
	IBEW/Local 2230	Alternate	Philip	Pizzo												
	L.I. Pine Barrens Society	Member	Richard	Amper	P											
	L.I. Pine Barrens Society	Alternate	Jane	Geary												
	L.I. Progressive Coalition	Member	David	Sprintzen	P											
	L.I. Progressive Coalition	Alternate	None	None												
	Lake Panamoka Civic Association (Biss as of 4/02)	Member	Rita	Biss	P											
	Lake Panamoka Civic Association (Rita Biss new alternate as of 3/99)	Alternate	Joe	Gibbons												
	Long Island Association	Member	Matthew	Groneman												
	Long Island Association	Alternate	William	Evanzia												
	Longwood Alliance	Member	Tom	Talbot	P											
	Longwood Alliance	Alternate	Kevin	Crowley												
	Longwood Central School Dist. (switched 11/02)	Member	Barbara	Henigin	P											
	Longwood Central School Dist.	Alternate	Candee	Swenson												
	NEAR	Member	Jean	Mannhaupt	P											
	NEAR (prospect taken off 3/4)(blumer added 10/04	Alternate	Karen	Blumer												
	NSLS User	Member	Jean	Jordan-Sweet	P											
	NSLS User	Alternate	Peter	Stephens												
	Peconic River Sportsmen's Club (added 4/8/04)	Member	John	Hall	P											
	Peconic River Sportsmen's Club	Alternate	Jeff	Schneider												
	Science & Technology (added 1/13/05)	Member	Iqbal	Chaudhry	P											
	Town of Brookhaven	Member	Jeffrey	Kassner												
	Town of Brookhaven	Alternate	Anthony	Graves	P											
	Town of Brookhaven, Senior Citizens	Member	James	Heil												
	Town of Brookhaven, Senior Citizens (open slot as of 4/99)	Alternate	None	None												
	Town of Riverhead	Member	Robert	Conklin	P											
	Town of Riverhead (K. Skinner alternate as of 4/99)	Alternate	Kim	Skinner												
	Wading River Civic Association	Member	Helga	Guthy	P											
	Wading River Civic Association	Alternate	Sid	Bail												