

These notes are in the following order:

1. Attendance
2. Correspondence and handouts
3. Administrative Items
4. Update on the Lab's Financial Status, John Hauser
5. Workforce Restructuring Plan, Robert Gordon, DOE
6. Overview of the Lab's Layoff Process, William Hempfling
7. Community Comment
8. Discussion and Formation of Funding Recommendation
9. Survey on Communications for Five-Year Review
10. Agenda Setting

1. Attendance

Members/Alternates Present:

See Attached Sheets.

Others Present:

P. Bond, J. Buscemi, H. Carrano, J. Carter, P. Chaudhari, J. D'Ascoli, K. Geiger, P. Geiger, G. Goode, R. Gordon, J. Hauser, W. Hempfling, M. Holland, S. Johnson, T. Kneitel, M. Lynch, S. Robbins, A. Russo, J. Tarpinian

2. Correspondence and Handouts

Items one through four were mailed with a cover letter dated May 6, 2005. Items five through seven were placed in the member's folders and items eight through ten were available at the meeting as handouts.

1. Draft agenda for May 12, 2005
2. Draft notes April 14 meeting
3. Draft notes March 10 meeting
4. Copy the letter transmitting CAC recommendation to DOE
5. Copy of 5-Year Review survey questions
6. Survey responses from G. Proios and J. Hall.
7. Copy of Rachel's Environment & Health News
8. Copy of BNL's Financial Status presentation
9. Copy of Draft Workforce Restructuring Plan presentation
10. Copy of BNL Layoff Process presentation

3. Administrative

The meeting began at 6:38 p.m. Reed Hodgkin went over the ground rules and the draft agenda. It was agreed that the presentation on the Draft Workforce Restructuring Plan would be moved up on the agenda to follow John Hauser's presentation. Those present introduced themselves.

The April minutes were unanimously approved pending the addition of Dr. Lewis' comments on page five. The March notes were approved as written with four members abstaining.

Jeanne D'Ascoli indicated that the members' folders contained copies of Rachel's Environment & Health News on issues surrounding nanoscience at the request of David Sprintzen and input on the survey questions from George Proios and John Hall.

Michael Holland, Manager Brookhaven Site Office reported that at the April Department of Energy Laboratory Director's Meeting, Dr. Ray Orbach, Director, Office of Science presented a Certificate in Appreciation of activities and initiatives that are ongoing in the areas of pollution prevention to the Laboratory. Dr. Chaudhari received the certificate for Brookhaven for the work that was done on the Fleet Manager's Pollution Prevention Workshop. The Office of Science and Dr. Orbach also recognized the Community Advisory Council, George Goode, and Jeanne D'Ascoli with certificates.

Holland also reported that the Explanation of Significant Differences (ESD) for Operable Unit III for the alternative proposed was approved by the EPA earlier this month. Friday the ESD will go into the Public Record, there will be notification of availability to the media Sunday, and a press release will be issued Monday.

Michael Bebon gave an update on the status of negotiations with the New York Power Authority (NYPA) on the Lab's electric rate. He reported that the Laboratory has reached a conceptual agreement with the NYPA. The rate will go up but will still be favorable in terms of being able to run the large machines at the Lab.

CAC members asked where the power would come from, about competition, about using green energy, what the Lab's demand was, the cost difference, if the Lab coordinates with LIPA when there's a power crunch on the Island, and why doesn't the Lab generate its own power.

Bebon said the power would come from plants that NYPA owns or they will purchase it from the grid on behalf of the Lab. On competition the Lab looked at various scenarios, DOE requires they do a Utility Options Study. The consultant that worked on the study looked at the available routes to get power and determined that the best option was to negotiate a contract with NYPA. The Lab is talking to NYPA about green energy, the Lab is interested in bringing in green power but no details have been worked out. The Lab's power demand ranges from 22 mega watts to the high 50's depending on where RHIC is in its cycle. The kilowatt-hours over a year are divided to reach the cost. The cost increase is 1.5 cents. The Lab works with LIPA and schedules load to save electricity. Not running RHIC in the summer and being able to shed load rapidly can give back power (up to 9 mega watts in an hour). The Lab has looked at generating power; there are economic issues with capital cost. When compared to the cost that the Lab gets from the NYPA it's not favorable.

4. Update on the Lab's Financial Status, John Hauser

John Hauser briefed the CAC on funding, the Lab's FY05 financial status, and FY06 budget. He reported that 84% of DOE's funds come from the Energy & Water Appropriations Bill and the remaining 16% comes from several other federal and non-federal bills and agencies. BNL annually submits 170 research and facility operations proposals to DOE for new and continuing funding. One hundred additional proposals are submitted to other federal and non-federal agencies. The funds support direct research and facility staff and support and in-direct staff. The funds come in three categories – operations, capital equipment, and facility (construction).

Hauser explained how the fiscal year budgets are projected, what they're based on, how the funding comes in, and how it's tracked. He also talked about the Spallation Neutron Source, the environmental restoration work, and Large Hadron Collider, which are projects that have been completed and will cause a reduction in staff. The FY06 budget is also a cause for concern. Specific reductions to RHIC operations and bio-imaging were described as well as a projected

cost of living escalation. A \$26M gap will have to be closed to maintain BNL at the current level. Hauser summed up by saying the Lab is cautiously optimistic that some funding will be restored.

CAC asked about the money coming in from other laboratories, how the funding is determined for individual programs, if there was money that could be invested, if there are Labs whose budgets are increasing and if they could subcontract work to Brookhaven, and if the House and Senate understand enough about the Science done here to make decisions on the projects.

Hauser said for the work for the Spallation Neutron Source the funding went to Oak Ridge but came to Brookhaven via an interagency agreement transfer where Oak Ridge authorized Brookhaven to do the work. The money that comes in from other Labs is included in the budget. The process of determining the funding for programs starts in Washington, they put money in specific areas. Hauser said the Lab is forbidden from investing federal money and explained how budget authority works. If Brookhaven has the same program as a Lab that is getting funding for that program it might be possible to get subcontracted work but we have to have the skill-set needed. Hauser said that often senate and congressional staff and members of key committees visit the Lab. The science and facilities are explained to them.

5. Workforce Restructuring Plan, Robert Gordon, DOE

Robert Gordon explained DOE's Draft Workforce Restructuring Plan. The National Defense Authorization Act, Section 3161 was passed by Congress in 1993 and the Office of Legacy Management provides guidance to Defense Nuclear Facilities on reductions in force and restructuring the workforce. BNL was declared a Defense Nuclear Facility because of the Lab's two operating science research reactors and DOE Defense Program work. Gordon said efforts to remove BNL's designation have been unsuccessful. He said there is no relationship between the Workforce Restructuring Plan, which is a requirement of Section 3161, and the reductions in force that are occurring. The reductions are caused by specific program completions. The plan is on the web at <http://www.bnl.gov/bnlweb/workforce.asp> and the comment period is open from May 9 through May 23, 2005. Members of the CAC were encouraged to give input into the plan if they wished.

The CAC asked about relying on retirement volunteers and why the plan didn't address if their benefits are maintained, about the 100-employee benchmark number, if the first person gets the same deal as the 101 person, and if this is a normal procedure.

Gordon said that would be the responsibility of the Laboratory, if there are things missing from the plan you should forward the comment to DOE. Gordon said the DOE has delegated the authority for a normal reduction of 10 employees, between 10 and 100 the DOE site office has authority, and anything over 100 goes to Washington for approval authority. One hundred is when the approval authority does not allow the Laboratory to go through a reduction in force, it kicks it to Washington. Gordon deferred that question to Bill Hempfling. Yes, this is a normal procedure, it was started about three years ago, but events forced its delay.

6. Overview of the Lab's Layoff Process, William Hempfling

William Hempfling said the Lab's philosophy on layoffs is to mitigate against the number of involuntary layoffs. The secondary goal is, when they do need to have an involuntary layoff, that all employees receive fair and equitable treatment. Hempfling said that layoffs are driven by funding and explained the things that have an impact on funding, that the layoff process starts with a manager specifying the need for a reduction, and how the volunteer layoff works. In cases of voluntary reductions in force - RIF's - the vacated slot cannot be filled. Hempfling explained the process for involuntary RIF's if there are not enough volunteers. If the Involuntary RIF Committee approves the involuntary layoffs, the final Laboratory approval comes from the Laboratory Director. Lists of all layoffs, explanations for the need, and formal Diversity Impact Analyses are sent to DOE for their approval. HR works to find employment within the Lab for

impacted employees during the entire process. The Lab's policy regarding laid-off employees are severance benefits of up to 39 weeks pay, capped at \$45K, medical coverage for one year at employee premium rate, second year at half-COBRA rate and third year at 102% of COBRA, preference in hiring for up to one year, continued tuition coverage for semester in which layoff occurs, and assistance in resume preparation, interviewing skills, and job referrals.

CAC members asked if there was such a thing as a Lab-wide call for volunteers, if the 100 number included voluntary and involuntary layoffs or just involuntary layoffs, about fluctuations in workforce numbers over the years, if BNL's policy was similar to the other labs, with the changes in benefits are people still volunteering, comparisons of workers to managers, about the interaction with state agencies to supplement funding, the numbers laid off in the past three years, what can the CAC do to apply pressure, why aren't Lab employees as residents encouraged to contact the Senators, and what areas the Lab is looking to for the future.

Hempfling said that the Lab policy with respect to benefits that are provided laid-off individuals actually met or exceeded the requirements of Section 3161 so the first person that goes out the door gets exactly the same benefits as the one hundredth person. A Lab-wide call would be issued only if they were expecting a very large layoff such as when the HFBR was shut down. The 100 layoffs include both voluntary and involuntary. Hempfling said there has been a slow, steady erosion in the workforce number since 1993 due largely to flat budgets and increased costs. BNL's policy is largely the same as other Labs. Even after the change, a large number of employees have still stepped forward to volunteer. Hempfling said that the percentage of scientific staff to bargaining unit staff runs almost parallel. Dr. Chaudhari said the Lab does talk to the state and got a great deal of help from them on the power issue. The state does help. You can get one-shot deals, but you can't expect the state to do that unless there is some value to them. Other states help other laboratories much more historically than New York State has, but this year they did help us. Hempfling did not give a clear number of layoffs per year. He did say there were roughly 50 per year in 2004, 03 and 02. Dr. Chaudhari said members are free to contact their local elected officials; who is best to contact depends on the time of year. It is too late to approach the House for 06, but it's not too late for the Senate. For the FY07 budget, the Department of Energy has not yet formulated their budget. He listed the RHIC upgrade, the new NSLS, the CFN, and Medical Imaging as future growth areas for the Lab.

7. Community Comment

There were no comments from the audience.

8. Discussion and Formation of Funding Recommendation

Reed noted that the position of the Lab and DOE are very sensitive and anything the CAC decided to do would have to be done on their own, not in their advisory capacity to BNL.

Reed said given what the CAC has heard they need to make a decision on how they want to move forward. If the CAC wants to send a message to someone, they need to decide who that might be and what the content of the message would be. The CAC also has to deal with the fact that a quorum is not present at this point in the evening.

A lengthy discussion ensued among CAC members. They discussed what programs should be supported, if letters of general support should be written in addition to supporting increased funding for Imaging and RHIC, what information the letters would include, and who the letters would target.

It was agreed that Member Graves would draft one letter and that Jean Jordan-Sweet would draft a second letter. The drafts are to be emailed to members for comment prior to the June meeting. Member Anker agreed to investigate what U. S. Senators needed to receive the letter on full funding.

Outline from flip chart for the letter to the State on the Dewey Program to be drafted by Anthony is as follows:

1. Local resource on effects of substance abuse (#'s)
2. Benefits to the community
3. Funding has been cut
4. International importance of work
5. Request restoration of money at Federal level
6. Request state support

The CAC listed the following points to be covered in the letter on full funding for BNL:

1. Who the CAC is
2. That the CAC is not writing this in an advisory role
3. The key work done by Brookhaven
4. The importance of BNL in the international, national, local community
5. The support for BNL within the community
6. The FY 2006 funding situation that is of concern, CAC's specific concern highlighting RHIC and PET
7. Key consequences if the funding cuts remain
8. CAC's strongly worded urging that full funding be restored

There was discussion on whether or not the letters should be signed individually. It was decided that the letters would go on CAC letterhead and that would be sufficient and that an effort to ensure that a quorum is present at the next meeting should be made.

9. Survey on Communications for Five-Year Plan

Reed explained that the CAC has been asked to provide comments for the CERCLA Five-Year Review. The input will be taken in the form of a survey and it was decided that rather than have Reed write the responses on the flip chart, they would be captured verbatim off the tape. It was noted that comments had been received by email from Members Proios and Hall. The questions the CAC were asked to respond to were:

1. Do you think you have had the opportunity to be adequately informed about Brookhaven Laboratory's cleanup and its progress during your time on the CAC? And,
2. Do you believe that the CAC has had an effect on the cleanup? On which projects, and how?

Helga Guthy: "In my mind there's no question, the Lab has been great. With all the people, with all the information we've had, the time schedules have always been brought to our attention. I can't think of any time that they have not supplied us with whatever information we needed to make a decision.

We haven't always agreed on the CAC about what the effects should be or how it should be done but they certainly have given us again every opportunity and I guess the specific one that comes to mind with me is the Peconic River, I think it was Area B at the time. They were going to do a more aggressive cleanup than was thought was the best thing to do for that area. They did go back and change some of it, and did less and so on in order not to damage as much of the property as they were going to. And the concern of the fish, they went back and did some more studies. So I would have to say that it's been done very well."

Sarah Anker: "I agree, I think Brookhaven Lab has done a lot of, has spent a lot of time and even money producing all the information that they have. It can be overwhelming and I think you've made it to where we can understand it, which is really important. So as far as giving the opportunity to be informed I'll give you maybe a B+ because there's always room for improvement.

I think we did have an influence on the Graphite Reactor making you guys go a little faster and that was a big step. And also the Peconic River was a good back and forth of ideas being exchanged. The phragmites that Karen Blumer came in to discuss, the pros and cons with that. And again I think you enlightened us and we enlightened you so I think we worked well together.”

James Heil: “Yes, I think we have been adequately informed both at the conceptual and on the intricate steps on many of the cleanups. They’ve been very interesting, very well done. I think once again we’ve had differences on cleanups and I would hope that we’ve had some effect on the cleanup. I think we have. I could pinpoint the political, technical, and economic process but I think we have especially on the Peconic and the BGRR.”

Graham Campbell: “Yes, I think that the Lab has done an excellent job in keeping us informed about the progress of the cleanup and the design of the cleanup before hand.

I believe we have had an impact (tape changed) on the Peconic and groundwater in initially providing a sense of the importance of that in the community and applying a little pressure to get it done. Also, in terms of shaping in a smaller way, various things that happened in the cleanup. I’m thinking of some of the offsite work that the Lab was open to feedback from us on and I think modified plans in conjunction with that.”

Rita Biss: “I think that we have been adequately informed. What I guess has bothered me is many times things take so long. You seem to come to a conclusion and then a year or a year and a half later suddenly they’re starting to work on it. I guess Peconic River is one these where that whole discussion must have gone on for two or three years. You talked about doing different things and then you wouldn’t do anything for six months or a year. Granted, it’s difficult to work during the winter. But I have found coming here has been very interesting. We try to help, there’s many different ideas coming up which I think helps the Lab.”

David Sprintzen: “No. 1, Yes.

No. 2, Peconic, Graphite Reactor, the groundwater cleanup, and increased funding to speed up the cleanup. So the answer’s Yes, I think it has been a remarkably successful process and I certainly appreciate the way the Lab has been providing responses and it’s been constructive.”

Don Garber: “Definitely yes. First of all I now know more on numerous topics that I never ever thought I would. I also want to very much compliment the Laboratory in briefing us in a timely way as the decision process was developing. It was very refreshing and reinforced. I think we were more than well briefed during the various, numerous cleanup processes.

Do I believe the CAC had an effect on the cleanup? Yes I do. While I may not have been enthusiastic on many of the options, there was obviously controversy amongst us. I think that ultimately where the CAC came down had to help. We should also remember that there was also an initiative where the CAC actually tried and was successful in getting more money for the cleanups. So it has been extremely successful, it’s been a model for interaction between the Laboratory and the CAC.”

James McLoughlin: “Yes, absolutely, they kept us informed on the cleanup operations.

On the second question do I believe that the CAC has had an effect on the cleanup? Yes, I do. The Lab has always been sensitive to the concerns of the CAC on the cleanup projects. They’ve always listened to our concerns and taken them into account and that was certainly so with the Peconic River and some of the other projects.”

Jean Jordan-Sweet: "A resounding yes. I think Brookhaven has just put great effort into investing a lot of resources into educating the CAC. Not only with BNL people, but with outside speakers as well and documentation, and web postings, and you name it, everything. It's been very impressive. And in the opposite direction, I think it says a lot that the Lab has been very good about taking everything that's been said around this table, not just things that we've come to consensus on and written letters of recommendation about but everything that everybody says around this table is listened to by the Lab and I think that's impressive.

And as far as impact on cleanups, I wanted to mention getting the funding four years ago was important and the other two projects that we had a lot of impact on were groundwater, the Peconic River, and the BGRR."

Michael Giacomaro: "The first question, well to the point of overkill I believe most of the time. More information that you didn't have idea that you really wanted to know. All questions were answered and some were even taken further to analyze all the aspects of the question so that you'd have the appropriate answer. So definitely, the Laboratory analyzes everything and gives you more than you need.

As far as do you believe that we had an effect? There have been times when we have had an effect on the cleanup especially with all the alternatives that are usually put out there that we're able to look at. The one instance that I have, that the Lab, I should say DOE didn't necessarily agree with was the Magothy cleanup, but still they looked at what we had to say. The other one of course was the Peconic River and we did have some thoughts on the cleanup there and were listened to. So yes!"

Robert Conklin: At the onset of the Peconic River sediment removal and restoration, public meetings were held in many communities. Most of the decision making process was presented to the CAC at monthly meetings. A work group was formed that met frequently to address the then current issues and answer individual questions. Many excursions to the impacted sites were arranged.

If a person was interested and willing to put in the time and effort, one would have to say that we were offered a superlative opportunity to interact with the ongoing process.

As the path forward in the process became clear, the working group was phased out, the CAC discussions became less frequent and site visitations less numerous. However, any individual who wanted questions answered was afforded every opportunity. At this point, after many years of discussions and presentations, the CAC might have reached its saturation point with the Peconic River. The important offsite work in Robert Cushman Murphy County Park was not given a strong emphasis.

The dismantling of the BGRR took a similar course, frequent updates to CAC, a working group, and visitations but with the crucial core removal at hand, we have been given little information on the prospective process.

The OU III groundwater remediation had frequent CAC presentations and we were aware of the issues and process.

Did we have an effect on the cleanup? On the Peconic Project, from the CAC, there were very diverse opinions presented on most topics. Consensus was difficult to reach. I am sure that regulators and Lab authorities listened carefully to the public opinions expressed but the effect of these on the final outcome is questionable. For example: we have little knowledge that considerably greater quantities of smartweed were added to the river in former banded sunfish habitats. Will the restored habitat be adequate for sunfish survival? Has the evasive plant issues really been addressed? The pilot project would indicate that this is questionable.

The BGRR project did not involve as much of the unknown of Mother Nature's ecology. It was more a matter of degree of contaminant removal. The Lab authorities and regulators have gone to the wall to satisfy the most stringent public opinions. The CAC seemed to have a more united front and hence, a more potent effect. Final determinations wait in the wings.

Groundwater issues being long term, ongoing, and having limited technologies to apply to projects were less contentious. The CAC expressed a strong hand toward a timely and complete as possible contaminant removal. It would seem that Lab officials are moving in this direction.

Mark Walker: "Ok, part one, absolutely! It's hard to go last, everyone's already said everything. The Lab has been very forthcoming. I feel very informed.

Part two, the CAC has had a tremendous effect on the cleanup. I think back to the earlier days of the accelerated cleanup, I think that was a landmark of community involvement in an institution like this. I think that was just tremendous. The work that was done for the input for the reactor cleanup, the groundwater cleanup, the siting of different things having to do with the groundwater cleanup as far as where it was going to land outside in the community and what side of the street would it go down. I think those are all important things that we did. Just to close I'd like to say that I've been very proud to be a member of this organization and the work that's been done and the commitment by the people that are around here. Thank you all."

10. Agenda Setting

Jeanne D'Ascoli reminded the CAC that a wrap-up session for the environmental projects was needed for next month and she said that they would like to talk about the High Flux Beam Reactor.

Member Anker asked if there was anyway to find out about the projects in place that benefit the nation, or to benefit Medical, or education. She asked if a summary was available. Reed suggested Dr. Chaudhari give an overview of some of the projects at a future meeting. Member Walker asked if there was a link to the Discovery video on the web and said that might have some of the information about the Lab's science.

June Agenda

CERCLA Project Closeout

HFBR Overview

BNL Mission and Programs Overview

The meeting adjourned at 9:44 p.m.

| 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 | | P | P | P | P | | | | | | | | |
| ABCO | Alternate | Thalia | Bouklas | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Brookhaven Retired Employees Association | Member | Graham | Campbell | P | | P | P | P | | | | | | | | |
| Brookhaven Retired Employees Association (L. Jacobson new alternate as of 4/99)(A. Peskin 5/04) | Alternate | Arnie | Peskin | | P | | P | P | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CHEC (Community Health & Environment Coalition (added 10/04) | Member | Sarah | Anker | P | P | | P | P | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Member | Adrienne | Esposito | P | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Citizens Campaign for the Environment (Ottney added 4/02-takenoff 1/05 Mahoney put on) | Alternate | Brendan | Mahoney | | P | | P | P | | | | | | | | |
| E. Yaphank Civic Association | Member | Michael | Giacomaro | P | P | | P | P | | | | | | | | |
| E. Yaphank Civic Association (J. Minasi new alternate as of 3/99) | Alternate | Jerry | Minasi | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Educator | Member | Audrey | Capozzi | | | | P | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | P | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | P | P | | P | | | | | | | | |
| Friends of Brookhaven (E.Kaplan changed to become member 7/1/01) | Member | Ed | Kaplan | P | P | | | | 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 | | P | 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 | P | P | P | P | | | | | | | |
| | IBEW/Local 2230 | Alternate | Philip | Pizzo | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | L.I. Pine Barrens Society | Member | Richard | Amper | P | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | L.I. Pine Barrens Society | Alternates | Jane Kathleen | Geary Timmins | | | P | P | P | | | | | | | |
| | L.I. Progressive Coalition | Member | David | Sprintzen | 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 | 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 | | | | P | | | | | | | | |
| | Longwood Alliance | Member | Tom | Talbot | P | | | P | | | | | | | | |
| | Longwood Alliance | Alternate | Kevin | Crowley | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Longwood Central School Dist. (switched 11/02) | Member | Barbara | Henigin | P | P | P | | | | | | | | | |
| | Longwood Central School Dist. | Alternate | Candee | Swenson | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | NEAR | Member | Jean | Mannhaupt | P | | P | P | | | | | | | | |
| | NEAR (prospect taken off 3/4)(blumer added 10/04) | Alternate | Karen | Blumer | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 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 | | | | | | | | |
| | Peconic River Sportsmen's Club | Alternate | Jeff | Schneider | | P | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Science & Technology (added 1/13/05) | Member | Iqbal | Chaudhry | P | P | P | P | | | | | | | | |
| | | Member | John | Turner | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Town of Brookhaven | Alternate | Anthony | Graves | P | P | | P | P | | | | | | | |
| | Town of Brookhaven, Senior Citizens | Member | James | Heil | | 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 | | | | | | | |
| | Town of Riverhead (K. Skinner alternate as of 4/99) | Alternate | Kim | Skinner | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Wading River Civic Association | Member | Helga | Guthy | P | P | | P | P | | | | | | | |
| | Wading River Civic Association | Alternate | Sid | Bail | | | | | | | | | | | | |