

These notes are in the following order:

1. Attendance
2. Correspondence and handouts
3. Administrative Items
4. Review of BGRR PRAP Alternatives, Fred Petschauer
5. Discussion on alternatives
6. Community Comment
7. Comments on the Peconic River, Bob Conklin
8. Peconic River Remediation Update, Skip Medeiros
9. Agenda Setting

1. Attendance

Members/Alternates Present:

See Attached Sheets.

Others Present:

S. Anker, D. Atchison, P. Bond, H. Carrano, J. Carter, P. Chaudhari, J. Clodius, J. D'Ascoli, A. Dudley (ATSDR) K. Geiger, G. Goode, L. Hill, M. Holland, S. Johnson, T. Kneitel, J. Lister, E. Lowenstein, M. Lynch, A. McNerney, S. Medeiros, J. Monroe, L. Nelson, M. Parsons, J. Petry, F. Petschauer, A. Rapiejko, S. Robbins, C. Vasudevan

2. Correspondence and Handouts

Items one through four were mailed with a cover letter dated August 6, 2004. Items five and six were available at the meeting as handouts.

1. Draft agenda for August 12, 2004.
2. Draft notes June 10 meeting
3. Final notes May 13 meeting
4. Notes from the July 21 Peconic River Workshop
5. Copy of BGRR PRAP Alternatives presentation
6. Copy of the Update on the Peconic River Presentation

3. Administrative

The sound level was not set correctly on the recording equipment, as a result the recording on the tapes was very soft and very difficult to understand.

The meeting began at approximately 6:35 p.m. Jeanne D'Ascoli welcomed everyone and explained that Reed would be late as his flight was delayed due to bad weather. She went over the ground rules and the draft agenda. Those present introduced themselves. Jeanne told the CAC that there would be a reception beginning at 5:30 p.m. on September 9 in celebration of their 6th anniversary. She also informed the CAC that the regular meeting date in November fell on a holiday and asked if they wished to cancel or reschedule their meeting. It was decided that a determination would be made in October.

Dr. Chaudhari spoke about the summer students and about Congressman Bishop's attendance at the poster session where their research findings were presented. He noted that Secretary Abraham had introduced a seven-point plan that would increase the role of the National Labs in science education. Dr Chaudhari also spoke about the basic research the Lab does and said that 90% of the matter in the universe was unknown and called dark matter. He explained that scientists believe that solar neutrinos make up some of the dark matter and he talked about Laboratory experiments that will explore this.

Member Amper told the CAC that his organization had visited the Lab's Science Museum and filmed a television show for cable TV. The show is currently running on Channel 20 and a program schedule may be found on the Society's website. Amper also announced that the Lab had been selected to receive their 2004 award for "Outstanding Contribution to Long Island's Environment." The award would be presented at the Society's annual gala in October.

As a quorum had been reached Jeanne asked the CAC to review the June notes. She asked if there were any additions, deletions, or corrections? Don Garber asked that his comments on the discussion of the number of fish that had to be consumed to get one cancer be included. It was agreed that the conversation would be captured verbatim. The notes were approved, pending the change, with one abstention.

George Goode, Manager, Environmental and Waste Management Services briefed the CAC on an incident that occurred with a waste shipment that originated from Brookhaven. On July 26 a truck driver reported liquid seeping from a corner of one of the packages on his truck. The truck was stopped in Wyoming in route to Utah. Local authorities were called and the scene was secured. The local Radiological Assistance Program team responded. A team from Brookhaven flew out and coordinated with local authorities. The container was repackaged and the truck was decontaminated. The truck was moved and no contamination was detected in the parking area. The repackaged container was placed on a second truck and accompanied to its destination. Upon arrival the container was opened and found to meet the criteria. No free liquid was found in the package, it had completely solidified. A team is being put together to evaluate the entire incident from start to finish and to perform a root cause analysis. The analysis should be completed by August 23. Goode will give an update on the findings at the next meeting.

4. Review of Alternatives for the BGRR, Fred Petschauer, BGRR Project Manager

Fred Petschauer gave a summary of the information that had been provided to the CAC previously. He went over the alternatives, explained each and gave their cost. He explained why Alternative C is the preferred alternative and went over the next steps that include two informational meetings on August 17 and 19 respectively and the public meeting to be held on August 24.

The CAC asked many questions including why there was an increase in cost between Alternative C and D to remove only one more curie, if there was a working scenario or best case scenario of how much contamination will be left, to characterize the remaining curie in Alternative D, what the Lab found about previous decontamination and demolitions of graphite reactors, costs, the projected timeline, groundwater contamination, where the material was going, and the frequency of monitoring tests. Petschauer responded to all questions.

5. Community Comment

There were no comments from community members in attendance.

Upon return from the break, Member Mannhaupt asked why the gentleman from the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) was in attendance? Andy Dudley said that he was at BNL on a site visit. He went on the Peconic River tour and tomorrow will tour the BGRR. He is still in the process of writing the public health assessment. The first draft was released to the vested parties – the site, state, and county. They've commented on it or are in the process of commenting. He explained the ATSDR is part of the Department of Health and Human Services and a sister agency to the Center for Disease Control. It was created through the Superfund legislation and is required to perform public health assessments on all Superfund sites.

6. Discussion on the BGRR Alternatives and CAC Recommendation

Reed asked if anyone had any questions on the consensus process. Member Conklin asked for clarification on abstentions. Jeanne D'Ascoli read from the draft charter. *"The importance of CAC recommendations is the diversity of input into them. The CAC will endeavor to reach a consensus among its members. If there are no objections the consensus position will be presented to BNL as a recommendation of the CAC. If agreement cannot be reached the CAC will solicit the comments of individual members with transmittal to BNL rather than taking a vote."*

Reed said that the idea of consensus is that "you reach a position as a group so that everyone around the table will be able to support the recommendation of the group."

Amper asked how that differed from a unanimous decision. He thought of consensus as more of a general agreement. Whereas a unanimous decision is something that everybody feels exactly the same way about.

Reed: Right, and I was saying be careful that everyone around the table can support the position that the group has taken, that doesn't mean that you agree with all of it but that means that enough of your core interests have been met so when that position goes out you'll say as a member of the CAC I support that position. How you deal with an abstention on that if you don't have enough support so you want to go out and push for that position that's fine, but if you feel about the groups position enough so that when the whole group makes a decision you'll stand behind it then all you do is to say I'm going to support the consensus of the group. That's what, in this process an abstention would be. You choose to support the group and then you can go forward, even if there are pieces you don't like, its about your decision to support the group fully when the group goes out with that position. The real key thing is to say if there is anything that is important to you, key to your interest on this issue, the BGRR, you need to stand up and say I have a key interest that's not being met here and we have to deal with that as a group. The group has to support you and deal with it.

Amper: Understanding that I'm not in any way seeking a unanimous decision, I'm suggesting we consider the possibility of simply limiting what we're doing tonight, answering the question, does the CAC support the preferred alternative? Can the CAC support the preferred alternative, which is Alternative C? I'm suggesting that I think it would be a very good idea for the Lab and the Community if we could do that.

Proios: How are you defining everyone around the table?

Reed: All the members of the CAC that are sitting at the table tonight.

Proios: Although I requested my group to give me direction, they have not. So I have no direction for representing them. My intention was to abstain on that basis. Does that open up another whole issue? Are we supposed to be getting votes from our organizations and

presenting them? Does Don have to go out to ABCO and does every group that represents ABCO have to take a vote in this, or are the people here representing...

Reed: I'll tell you where you were when you set up your Charter. Some of you are representing yourselves as individuals and others are at the table representing specific groups. When you're representing your specific group you are always representing your group. And the idea is that you come to the table with enough information about where your group stands so that you can participate in the process representing your group. Sometimes you're going to try as hard as you can and just not get that and then you have to make a decision. You can make the decision on that standpoint, but the thing you can do is stay in the process and remove yourself from the table. If you don't have enough information from the group to participate in the discussion other than abstain you can become absent for that time. Do you see what I mean? You don't have to worry about an abstention or not. Does that work for you?

Guthy: I have not specifically gone over these points with my civic association but it's been mentioned off and on for months. Every time I have gotten information on the BGRR I have passed it on to them. To me no one has shown any concern so I'm assuming that they would go along with the way I feel. But no one has said that they have questions. I hope I'm right with that.

Reed: Each of you that are representing an organization has to evaluate that for yourself according to this process.

Amper: The standard we use is, are we authorized to represent that group. We're not going back and asking about each item or each member of it. We need to, a: satisfy ourselves that we are informed enough to make or express an opinion and, b: that our group is authorized to do so.

Reed: Each group gets to figure out how that works for themselves and how to make you comfortable as their representative, so that you can represent them in the process.

What I would like to do is to open up to the floor. The comments that you make, the information that you give and the interests that you express I'm going to try and capture as we go along. I want to capture that for the record as you move forward on consensus on the question.

Amper: Well I almost made a motion there, is there enough of a consensus that the Lab and the community would benefit by supporting C, I would love to hear my fellow members.

Reed: That's where we're going in the process right now. I will ask the question "Does anyone around the table feel that they have an issue or interest that is not being met and that would cause them to block the consensus." We're going to hear about that and see what we can do about it.

Mannhaupt: Right now to specifically answer a yes or no of support for Alternative C, NEAR cannot do that. I can't support or not support it. NEAR's technical advisor is still gathering information and I will have to have a telephone conversation with Fred on what he has gathered so that NEAR can make an effective decision. There are very specific questions regarding the robotics, the technology, and amount of contamination. When I have that information then NEAR can say either yes or no. But at this point, we cannot say either way on any alternative.

Giacomaro: Our feeling is that everything should be left intact and that additional research should be done, is being done by BNL on radiation to resolve any problems. Also, we don't agree so much with concentrating contaminated materials in just a few locations.

Reed: Do you have, from a process standpoint, latitude to work away from that position, or is that it? Is that a position that you're going to hold to?

Giacomaro: No, it can be worked on. The timing is not always the best, our August meeting was just a social meeting so therefore I can't conduct additional research. But I went back into our files and we had sent notices back in February to speak with our members, we had someone from BNL come in February to specifically discuss this topic and the general opinion was to go along with what I just said.

Reed: The point I'm getting at is if the group in general wanted to reach consensus on this statement would you be able to go along with that given the advice that you've had from your group or would you be forced to block consensus.

Giacomaro: I would have to say I'd probably have to block until I can really...At this point I think everything has lead me to state that for me to go any further, I would need greater latitude.

Reed: So we have two folks, make it three folks here who are in the position right now who don't have enough interaction with their groups yet to ...

Giacomaro: Well, in my situation everything that led me to this point to oppose it. So for me to change it I would have to go back and convince them otherwise.

Reed: I understand what you're saying.

Don: The process, would it be helpful to have a straw poll to see how close we are to a consensus on option C. Are we almost there or is there something that....

Reed: That's essentially what we're doing. All we're seeing right now is the cards of people who wouldn't go to consensus right now. And we're trying to see what their issues are, and so far issues are procedural not contextual. Of the four cards that are up, do any of you have issues that would cause you to block the consensus?

Amper: Mine is just a process question. While we are trying to resolve this, among those people who could not tonight support the preferred alternative, is there a mechanism by which they would be comfortable abstaining from tonight's vote so long as their viewpoint could be considered at a time when they have had a chance to do further consultation. Is that an alternative as well? Apart from the straw pole that was suggested, is it possible that these groups might say, we're not opposing this, we don't want to kill consensus on it, but we're willing to abstain until we have satisfied ourselves that our group has all the information it needs to make a recommendation so long as those groups recommendations are certain to be heard. Is that possible?

Reed: Certainly it is, and from a procedural standpoint, when those groups come back would you re-open the recommendation or does the recommendation stand and you're going to get their input to the process.

Amper: Well, they would certainly have to decide that. My suggestion is to be fair to them and to have their presence counted I think we should agree, that we want the record to somehow reflect what the position is that they finally arrive at without delaying the consensus judgment of the CAC tonight.

Reed: Mark and Tom are you looking to help process or do you have issues? You have an issue, what is the issue.

Talbot: Basically, I want to reiterate the question I asked Fred earlier about making every effort to further investigate as soils and obstructions become available during the deconstruction phase to determine if there are in fact some pockets of contamination. He assured us that they would do that and yet I do not see it in writing here. I will take Fred at his word that he will do

that, but the only concern is that I just don't see it. That is my concern, if I'm convinced that Fred has the authority to say that and it is a part of the plan then I have no problem. Then the issue goes away.

Reed: For the record, the request is that BNL make every effort to further characterize the contamination during the remediation to identify any additional contamination that may exist.

Hill: Just to clarify. If we go in and get these pockets of soil we'll characterize what's left behind. We're going to use reasonable efforts to get every last bit of this that we can. But let me be clear. If something starts dipping under the Building 701 foundation, we're not going to be able to get it. We're going to document what's left behind. We can't start undermining the reactor building. That's what we call a reasonably acceptable soil sample. We will use every reasonable effort we can to get every last bit that we can but it is practically bounded by not undermining the building. The mechanism to deal with it is to receive these types of comments on the PRAP just like we did on the Peconic River. We would take these comments, evaluate them and include them in the responses summary and address them at the recommendation stage. So eventually we would look at these things and whatever the final determination, it would be written down in the Record of Decision.

Reed: So Tom, the way we'll capture this is that the specific need and specific response from the Laboratory will become part of the official record.

Talbot: That was my intent.

Walker: Ok, I just have two points, one point is the last page of the PRAP, everybody here can submit their own recommendation from their group or as an individual, you have until Sept 3 according to this, for the formal period. Which brings me to my second question, is the CAC bound by the formal period? Would they accept a consensus decision from the group from its September meeting?

Holland: The public comment period ends on the Sept 3, it would be best if we could get comments by close of the comment period. I think there are mechanisms that allow...
(indecipherable)

Amper: I appreciate the willingness to look at this in a broad...(indecipherable) but we have been looking at this for a long time. It does seem to me that those who have now gone through the process and in that period of time have been able to arrive at a conclusion ought to be able to bring that forward so long as we are protecting the rights of those who need to abstain for one reason or another as long as they can make their comments within the comment period and have their voice heard. I would ask them as colleagues to allow the rest of us to move ahead so long as we're not denying them the right to represent their own views and groups views. I just think it would be a shame for the CAC not to serve the function we're charged with simply because some people have not finished the process so long as they can be heard in the end.

Mannhaupt: I would like to clarify something you said before about those of us in the group who couldn't answer tonight. NEAR members have their decision already made. NEAR is the recipient of the Technical Assistance Grant from the EPA. It cannot function with its technical advisor until a document is released. This document was just released. It would be too quick and too soon and EPA would probably ask why if I did not have the technical advisor follow the process set forth in the TAG do what he had to do and it wouldn't be prudent of me as a project administrator to give an answer to the Department of Energy or BNL without that information. So until all the ducks are in the row, abstaining, or however this group wants to put it, that's NEAR's position.

Reed: My suggestion for process to you tonight plays off of what Dick has suggested and that is with the three of you, I would ask this question, would you be willing to step back from the

process at this point because you need more input from your organizations tonight and allow the rest of the group to go to consensus. Let the rest of the group go to consensus tonight with the proviso that at the next meeting you'll be formally on the agenda to bring the position of your groups formally to the CAC and have those positions heard formally by the Laboratory and Dept of Energy. Are you willing to take that step tonight? If you're not, if you feel you wouldn't want the CAC to be able to go to consensus because your position needs to be part of that or you would want to block the consensus for that reason, that's fine. We just need to know that and we will continue ahead.

Giacomaro: Are you assuming that's how everybody is going to vote and that everyone is going to feel that Alternative C is the preferred alternative.

Reed: I know that because of the way I asked the question earlier. We have now heard from everybody that feels they could not go along with the consensus. We know that we have three folks who have procedural issues and no one has a content issue because we have asked the question. I can do a straw vote but the way we have asked the question the same result has already occurred, we know that.

Guthy: Since we all have email if we take consensus other than those three people if they find out their information and they go along, if they email Jean can they be added to the consensus of the group?

Reed: I think once you reach consensus tonight, you have consensus and then the other three can come into the process. Once consensus has been reached, it's a done deal by the people who are here. So let me ask this question, other than the three folks that we've talked to who have raised the issues, is there anyone else at the table that would not support consensus on this night?

Biss: I guess I'm a little afraid of removing the pile. It really hasn't been done before... lot of radioactivity that I think you're doing something that you really don't know. The way science is going forward at a rapid rate what are we going to be able to do to take some of that radioactivity down without removing, which is what I brought up to my board and they didn't disagree with me, but they don't know anything better. So I guess I'm saying, no I can't agree with C because I think it could be a catastrophe.

Reed: You're worried about the unknown association with...(indecipherable). Is there any additional information that might let you understand more?

Biss: Radioactivity is a very dangerous thing and I'm not sure, do they really have all their eggs in their basket that they need. And I know Richard brought that to my civic and disagrees with what I state, they had no hang up with what said, which is I'm afraid, it could in another couple of years that it will be done in many other places and you could be sure of it, but right now I think it could be very, very dangerous.

Reed: You evaluated all the information presented to you and that's a very strong feeling on your part. Anybody else?

Shea: I have a question for Rita, if the building were removed would that still be the case?

Biss: The building staying doesn't make any difference because I don't think the building is particularly radioactive. It's the pile, the graphite coming out. I think the thing that bothers me is "what's under that building"? And if we don't take the building out, we really don't know what's under there so if you do C instead of D, are we kidding ourselves because there is a lot of radioactivity under the building.

Shea: If you could do D, would that solve part of the problem? If you cleaned it up by taking the building down, then you would know what's under there.

Biss: No, it's taking out the pile that scares me, so whether you do A, B, or C you're taking out the radioactive pile. Do you have enough of a handle on what you're doing? I'm not saying these guys are stupid or anything but there are so many things that could come up that could further endanger the local community.

Reed: Thank you very much,

Amper: Along that same line, do you have anxiety or concerns about leaving it there, doesn't that have some problem, in other words since we're being asked as a group to see if we can agree or find a consensus on which of a certain limited amount of alternatives there are, I guess my question is would you like to see a consensus for alternative A? I think it's a shame for us not to decide. I guess I'm asking for all of us to abstain if we haven't reached an opinion so long as our opinion is heard and if we don't like something, what recommendation are we going to make? It's one thing not to have complete consensus or complete agreement about C but then it would seem to me that you want to say that you think the group supports A and I'm not sure based on your genuine fears and concerns whether there is another alternative that's out there that we could recommend that would address those concerns.

Biss: If you go with A they will be re-roofing the building, they will be supporting (indecipherable). It's not that they're not going to do anything. They would try and make the building secure. For 87,000 years I'm not sure.

Giacomaro: We have looked at A, and you said what additional things? To A, we would add, as I mentioned before about research, the Lab is doing research in radiation right now. Part of tacking on the institutional controls would be for additional research that works with the NASA radiation research that they are doing and to see if they can come up with the solution to dissolve, un-radiate, absorb, neutralize, or change this material so that it is not harmful or destructive in anyway. In other words, use that research team that they have to solve some of the earthly problems that there are regarding radiation before we go into space. I can live with that yes.

Mannhaupt: The comment is a question spurred by Rita and Dick's discussion. Alternative A is leave it alone and do the below ground duct line. B is remove the pile and bioshield and A. For C, we have remove the pile, bioshield, fuel canal, and subsurface pockets and all. How come we have removal of the pile and bioshield, removal of pile and bioshield with added intervention. Why isn't added intervention a separate alternative? Why isn't fuel canal structure external to Building 701, subsurface pockets of contaminated soil adjacent to the below ground duct structure and fuel canal and anything reasonable accessible, why isn't that an alternative?

Reed: Let me if I may re-phrase your question a little bit, because what I don't want to do is craft another alternative. Why did they come out the way they did? Can you give a short version.

Petschauer: (pretty much indecipherable) You can build many alternatives....

Mannhaupt: (indecipherable)

Reed: Rita, let me ask you a question if I may. Given your concern about the unknowns and the uncertainty of doing the work is there a level of protection against the uncertainty if you find things that are going wrong? Is there a level of comfort you could get by talking about the uncertainty that would put you in a position to feel that you could support consensus on this issue?

Biss: (indecipherable) Well, they're going to use gantries to take the graphite pieces out. I've used gantries to put ...into magnets. I've had the luxury of laying (indecipherable)

Reed: So if inspections and oversight to identify safety concerns and address them ... could something like that be put in to leave you confident that if something did start to go awry that (indecipherable)

Rita: Well it would certainly help the situation. What could go wrong? You don't know, it's going to be something new.

Reed: It would need to be done with a level of care that's appropriate to, attention to safety that's appropriate for a process that has not been done before. If that sort of concern statement was built into your recommendation, would you feel comfortable enough to support this at this time?

Biss: I think you're asking if I would abstain, rather than vote.

Reed: I'm really looking to see if that would make you comfortable enough to support consensus... (indecipherable).

Guthy: I had the same concern as Rita.Three things changed my mind. One, I talked to Bob and he said he saw the machine that is to do a lot of digging, the taking apart of the pile itself. He saw how well they can manipulate it and how safe it was. They seem to be able to handle the equipment. Anyway, we had a talk about that and that changed my mind. We had someone come and speak and showed us how they work from another room for most of it, they are not in the room at the time and that was discussed, everyone heard that. And the last thing I believe if I remember right Dr. Chaudhari said that they do not want this on the Lab site. Those three things changed my mind about removing the pile.

Reed: The Laboratory does not want the contamination to remain. It's the machine, the remote work, and the fact that the lab wants the hazard to be gone.

Biss: (indecipherable) do the gentlemen have the air filter put on correctly... It's so easy to make a little stupid mistake that can really cost you and now your talking about something that can be a real problem.

Reed: There will be in everything that's done, risks remaining, there's no question, the choice is which risk do you want to keep and which ones do you want to remove and that's really what the choice (gap from tape switching)

Biss:they have to get somebody from the outside. Get another opinion.

Esposito: Rita had a specific concern about what could go wrong, we need to look at that, and I think that's a good part of the process because we have to come to a solution or by default we come to no answer at all and I think the reason CAC exists is to come to a consensus during these critical times when we're supposed to be giving our recommendations to BNL. So I think that listing out your specific concerns is very helpful. None of these alternatives are great. All of them come with risks. All of them come with uncertainties and I guess it's a matter for all of us to weigh out what are the risks associated with leaving it there. What are the risks associated with greenfields, what are the risks associated with (indecipherable) and which risks would you be most comfortable with? And which risks.....can we address so that we can reach consensus tonight.

Biss: Things are being discovered constantly. Science has changed....some of the technical things I read and I don'ttremendous changes....are they rushing ahead with something they

really don't know everything about? ...all these new things are wonderful, but they have side effects.

Reed: We don't want to take away your concerns. What we need to do is deal with them in the context of what we're talking about. Let me offer this, if you like this and see if it deals with your need or doesn't and then we'll move along from there. Let's investigate this, what comes after the Alternative is the findings stage and if the plans must include attention to and oversight of the safety of the project that's appropriate to a new process with significant unknowns. If that sort of statement was made by the CAC would that leave you with enough comfort about these unknowns so that you could support consensus.

Amper: I think you're on to something that we all ought to think about. And that is that we're talking about now not 100% agreement, but we're talking about whether or not any group would need to block consensus. So maybe we should be figuring out especially those who have ongoing concerns or unresolved matters, what we can do or what we can agree about or what we can say as a group. That even if it did not make them say I love Alternative C, I can abstain from preventing the advocates of consensus so long as I am certain that the principal concern that my group has is addressed by what comes out of this forum tonight. Maybe we should be looking proactively for what is it, or maybe we need someone to simply say there is nothing that can happen tonight that will prevent our feeling obliged to block consensus. I think what you were saying is let's think about what we can say and what we can agree about rather than to focus too much on the things we're not in 100% in agreement about.

Giacomaro: Why does BNL want the pile removed?

Reed: Why is this the preferred alternative for the Laboratory?

Hill: I think that the CORE team, the DOE, the EPA, and the state of New York, struggled with the uncertainties that are associated with the long-term entombment of this pile and this radioactive material on the site for an indefinite period of time and they concluded that dealing with it in 50 years would be as complicated as dealing with it now. It appeared that removing the pile made sense. I sat in on all the CORE team meetings and we struggled with it. When you look at the long-term reality of how long this would exist as a potential threat, we struggled with how we could justify in our minds keeping it here for an indefinite period of time.

Chaudhari: If I knew something in science or even speculated that in science that we had a magic wand... (undecipherable) . There are ways of changing radioactive decay by radiating them in ...but for these large, large piles...I cannot think of something so that I can tell you today wait 100 years and it will go away. If I cannot get something to decay in 50 or 100 or 200 years, it's something that...87,000 years it just doesn't make sense to leave something in place that we would have to monitor for that long.

Biss: No doubt we'd be better off getting rid of the pile. It's just that I think there are so many unknowns. What other nuclear plants are going to be decommissioned within the next 20 years? Are there other places that will be doing the same thing that we can learn from?

Chaudhari: You have a very valid point about safety and I think everything we do has to be done ...that's what Fred was eluding to. Once we have the go, we need time to plan this operation very carefully. And that is true for any of the four options. There are risks involved and so we have to weigh the risks. But I would love to find a process that just magically removes this but I can't see that so that's why I took the position that we should remove the pile.

Giacomaro: What about the NASA research? Would it have any application at all that we could use some of the data and information?

Chaudhari: No, what they're doing with NASA is producing ions that exist in space that come from the sun. These are radioactive substances sometimes, but mostly these are If you think of a trip from Earth to Mars, it's a three-year trip, every cell in the body will be hit once by radiation. We don't want to send an astronaut out there where every brain cell has been hit by some....radiation. We would like to understand how the body responds to this type of radiation. What we are doing is actually producing radiation, simulating what the space radiation is like, then we put biological objects – cells, sections of cells, and we try to understand what the radiation does to the cells. It's not to detect radiation, it's to study the effect of radiation on the human body and cells. So it won't help us with the pile.

Proios: I was going to go along with Dick's proposal to just abstain but having participated in the process now for six years and I feel I've earned the right to express my concern having been involved in water issues for 30 years and my background being a biochemist and majoring in biology in college. When we first talked here about doing bioremediation I was the first one to really voice concern about it because my training has always been that you look at risks in terms of how things get into the ecosystem that work their way up the food chain to human beings and immediately I knew from studies and so on that you move sediment and stuff....and that's sort of the same way I've looked at this whole issue. When I was with the Water Commission we looked at banning pesticides in this country that were being persistent and then found out the same stuff that was banned was coming back to us in greater concentrations than our farmers were using in imported foods. There is no place that's completely safe and we're taking something, from the day we start cutting it up into little pieces, we increase the potential threat to the humans in this area and where it's eventually going to go. Right now it causes no threat, other than it is persistent, but when we cut it up, do we increase the threat of it bioaccumulating somewhere? Either here or where it's going, and because it's going to Utah doesn't make me feel safer because I don't know what place on this planet is safe.

Mannhaupt: First of all what you wrote up there for Rita is "plans must include attention to oversight and safety." If by now I had any thought whatsoever that BNL and DOE were not paying attention to safety on any project I wouldn't... (indecipherable). But with what Rita is saying about the filter masks and all, and then Helga bringing up the reasons for her changing her mind - Bob watching the robotics and explaining it to us and his feedback on that other information, BNL not wanting the core here. I understand why to remove the core, but let's face it, removing the core is the political thing to do on Long Island. Everywhere else in the country we are naturally attenuating up the ying yang. Where Rita was concerned, and should be concerned and everyone should really think was where we had a detailed causal analysis and the conclusion was some form on human error and that the proper technique is now in use. I am a licensed asbestos handler/contractor and At no time have I ever walked into a decon or performed a project where any of my people did not know how to put on their respirators or anyone of them fell off. This I'm not buying into, this is not acceptable.

Reed: Rita, what are your thoughts at this point?

Biss: I want to go home.

Reed: We have to make this work.

Biss: I don't think I'm going to be the only one that votes against Alternative C. I don't think I'm the only one that is a little scared about not knowing everything about cleaning up this kind of radioactivity.

Reed: If this doesn't make you comfortable then we need to move on.

Mannhaupt: I'm not sure that we're prepared to do this in 30 days.

Reed: This doesn't do it for you?

Biss: I think that you could put something like that in, but it's nice words to read.

Graves: The point I'd like to make is thatconcern....what I keep coming back to is the reactor is not just sitting anywhere. It's sitting on one of two places in the U.S. that has a sole source aquifer. There's risks of leaving it where it is, and there's risks with transporting it somewhere else. I think the risks are less transporting where it's not sitting over the top of a sole source aquifer.

Biss: I'm not saying that it wouldn't be great to get it out of here. You probably want it out of this area, but at what price? And I'm not talking money. What could go wrong?

Reed: Rita, your point is that removal of these components is important to do, you're concerned whether it can be done safely with the current level of knowledge.

Biss: Right.

Reed: We could add something like that to your statement about the concerns if that would work for you. That's reasonable to do. The statement of consensus could be, for example, the CAC supports Alternative C as the preferred Alternative among the alternatives that have been presented and some members have expressed concern over the safety considering the level of unknowns associated with this process. Would that work for you?

Biss: (indecipherable)

Reed: And that's true.

Biss: It's really what I'm saying.

Reed: So you could go with that. Fair enough. I want to move us toward closure on this because the evening is getting late. Given what we've just crafted for Rita is there any one around the table that wouldn't be able to go along with that or remove themselves from the conversation because they don't have sufficient information from their group? So removing yourself from the conversation at this point because you don't have input from your group is okay. Otherwise I'm looking for anybody who can't go along with Alternative C with a statement for Rita.

No one indicated that they did not agree.

Member Giacomaro asked if Institutional Control covered monitoring groundwater, and others asked if chopping up the pile would add to the contamination that exists right now, about preventing contamination from getting into the aquifer, and what level of contamination might result if the pile is left in place and it leaks.

Jordan-Sweet: It is in the Lab's interest to make sure that this job is done with absolute safety. And just in the last couple of years, my own personal experience has been the amount of effort that goes into work planning...has increased...and I think the work planning and controls are so much improved from five years ago and it is so much in the Lab's interest to not have any more problems.

Biss: I've run many jobs and I've always planned as best I could, but there is always new things coming up. You hit things that you wouldn't expect.

CAC discussed their concerns about the unknown and the risks of the pile

Mannhaupt: I'm sorry but I do have to leave. NEAR wishes to abstain pending the recommendation from our technical advisor after his discussion with Fred Petschauer.

D'Ascol suggested that the CAC could meet one week earlier than their regularly scheduled meeting to still be within the public comment period.

Reed asked if having the meeting a week earlier gives members sufficient time to come back with a position from their groups. Members indicated that it would not help them.

Reed next asked where members Proios and Giacomaro stood. Discussion ensued on whether or not they could abstain and bring their group's position back to the next meeting. At the next meeting Members Proios and Mannhaupt will report to the CAC on their organizations positions.

All the members around the table supported consensus. Member Proios did not have sufficient guidance from his group and will bring their position back at the next meeting. Member Mannhaupt did not participate because she does not have sufficient guidance from her group and will bring their position back at the next meeting. Member Giacomarco will bring a position back from East Yaphank also.

Jeanne D'Ascoli suggested that the groups not wait until the next meeting to submit their comments. They can be mailed or emailed to DOE before the comment period ends on September 3 or the CAC members can attend the public meeting on August 24.

7. Comments on the Peconic River, CAC member Bob Conklin

Bob Conklin showed photos of the Peconic River before, after, and during various stages of the ongoing remediation. He noted the quality of the vegetation before and after restoration and commented on existing evasive plant species, the sediment, and the decisions to not bring in topsoil and to use only Peconic River plants for replanting. He discussed the pilot projects and the unsuccessful efforts to keep out the reed canary grass. Conklin reported that 40 additional Banded Sunfish had be relocated to the holding pond and that observations seem to indicate that the fish placed in the pond earlier have reproduced.

8. Peconic River Restoration, Skip Medeiros, OU V Project Manager

Skip Medeiros reported that the majority of the comments received during the comment period pertained to how the restoration work would be completed. He noted that there were several tours conducted for groups interested in seeing the work and river area. The two primary concerns expressed were that topsoil not be used because it would introduce excessive nutrients and may contain undesirable seeds and that non-local plants not be used in the restoration areas.

BNL responded to the comments by holding a roundtable and by conducting a field trip to the river to view the wetland areas and plants available for transplanting into the cleaned up areas. The Lab determined that topsoil will not be used in restoring wetlands unless it is absolutely necessary. Instead, soil will be obtained from the open water areas after cleanup goals are met. The Lab also will use plants from the river to the maximum extent practicable.

Medeiros also reported that the onsite cleanup is expected to be completed by mid-September. The Lab has taken 400 post excavation samples and the mercury average is 0.18 ppm, which is substantially better than expected. Offsite cleanup is expected to start mid-September, an Action Memorandum will be issued in late August for the offsite work, and the Record of Decision should be final by mid-fall.

CAC members asked about sampling, the Record of Decision, and if methyl mercury sampling was being done. Member Proios expressed disappointment that the CAC did not get to see the wetlands permit and was concerned that the decisions on the topsoil and native plants were made at the last minute. Medeiros responded to the questions.

Jeanne D'Ascoli said that Member Mannhaupt was aware that Michael Deering had been instrumental in helping to gain access to the County Parkland and suggested that the CAC send him a letter of thanks. The CAC agreed to do this.

9. Agenda Setting

September Agenda

Waste transportation accident update
Three organizations responses on BGRR PRAP
Groundwater ESD
BGRR comments and responses

Meeting adjourned at 10:17 pm.

2004	Affiliation		First Name	Last Name	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
Chart Key X = Present O = Absent						No Mtg.					No Mtg.					
ABCO (Garber added on 4/10/02)	Member	Don	Garber	X		X	O	X	X	X		X				
ABCO	Alternate	Richard	Johannesen	O		O	O	O	O	O		O				
Brookhaven Retired Employees Association	Member	Graham	Campbell	O		O	X	X	X	X		X				
Brookhaven Retired Employees Association (L. Jacobson new alternate as of 4/99)(A. Peskin 5/04)	Alternate	Arnie	Peskin	O		O	O	O	O	O		X				
Citizens Campaign for the Environment	Member	Adrienne	Esposito	X		X	X	O	X	X		X				
Citizens Campaign for the Environment (Ottney added 4/02)	Alternate	Jessica	Ottney	O		O	O	O	O	O		O				
E. Yaphank Civic Association	Member	Michael	Giacomaro	X		X	X	X	X	X		X				
E. Yaphank Civic Association (J. Minasi new alternate as of 3/99)	Alternate	Jerry	Minasi	O		O	O	O	O	O		O				
Educator	Member	Audrey	Capozzi	O		O	O	X	O	O		O				
Educator (B. Martin - 9/01)	Alternate	Bruce	Martin	O		X	O	O	X	X		O				
Educator (A. Martin new alternate 2/00) (Adam to college 8/01)(add. alternate 9/02)	Alternate	Adam	Martin	O		O	O	O	O	O		O				
Environmental Economic Roundtable (Berger resigned,Proios became member 1/01)	Member	George	Proios	X		O	X	X	X	X		X				
Environmental Economic Roundtable (3/99, L. Snead changed to be alternate for EDF)	Alternate	None	None													
Fire Rescue and Emergency Services	Member	David	Fischler	O		O	O	O	O	O		O				
Fire Rescue and Emergency Services	Alternate	James	McLoughlin	O		O	O	X	X	X		O				
Friends of Brookhaven (E.Kaplan changed to become member 7/1/01)	Member	Ed	Kaplan	X		O	O	O	O	O		O				
Friends of Brookhaven (E.Kaplan changed to become member 7/1/01)(schwartz added 11/18/02)	Alternate	Steve	Schwartz	O		X	X	O	X	X		O				
Health Care	Member	Jane	Corrarino	X		O	O	X	O	O		O				
Health Care (as of 10/02 per JD)	Alternate	Mina	Barrett	O		O	O	O	O	O		O				
Huntington Breast Cancer Coalition	Member	Mary Joan	Shea	X		X	O	X	X	X		X				
Huntington Breast Cancer Coalition	Alternate	Scott	Carlin	X		O	O	O	O	O		O				
Intl. Brotherhood of Electrical Workers/Local 2230	Member	Mark	Walker	X		X	X	X	X	X		X				
IBEW/Local 2230	Alternate	Philip	Pizzo	O		O	O	O	O	O		O				
L.I. Pine Barrens Society	Member	Richard	Amper	O		O	X	O	O	O		X				
L.I. Pine Barrens Society	Alternate	Jane	Geary	X		X	O	X	X	X		O				
L.I. Progressive Coalition	Member	David	Sprintzen	X		X	O	O	X	X		O				
L.I. Progressive Coalition	Alternate	None	None			No Mtg.						No Mtg.				

2004	Affiliation		First Name	Last Name	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
	Lake Panamoka Civic Association (Biss as of 4/02)	Member	Rita	Biss	X		X	X	X	X		X				
	Lake Panamoka Civic Association (Rita Biss new alternate as of 3/99)	Alternate	Joe	Gibbons	O		O	O	O	O		O				
	Long Island Association	Member	Matthew	Groneman	O		O	O	O	O		O				
	Long Island Association	Alternate	William	Evanzia	X		O	X	X	O		O				
	Longwood Alliance	Member	Tom	Talbot	X		O	X	X	X		X				
	Longwood Alliance	Alternate	Kevin	Crowley	O		O	O	O	O		O				
	Longwood Central School Dist. (switched 11/02)	Member	Barbara	Henigin	X		X	O	X	X		O				
	Longwood Central School Dist.	Alternate	Candee	Swenson	O		O	O	O	O		O				
	NEAR	Member	Jean	Mannhaupt	X		X	X	O	O		X				
	NEAR (taken off ¼)	Alternate	Wayne	Prospect	O		O	O		O		O				
	NSLS User	Member	Jean	Jordan-Sweet	X		X	O	O	X		X				
	NSLS User	Alternate	Peter	Stephens	O		O	O	O	O		O				
	PACE Union	Member	Allen	Jones	O		O	O	O	-		O				
	PACE Union	Alternate	Philip	Plunkett	O		O	O	O	-		O				
		Member	John	Hall				X	X	X		X				
	Peconic River Sportsmen's Club	Alternate	Jeff	Schneider				X	X	X						
	Ridge Civic Association (resigned in 03)	Member	Ron	Clipperton												
	Ridge Civic Association	Alternate	None	None												
	Town of Brookhaven	Member	Jeffrey	Kassner	O		O	O	O	O		O				
	Town of Brookhaven	Alternate	Anthony	Graves	X		X	O	X	X		X				
	Town of Brookhaven, Senior Citizens	Member	James	Heil	X		X	X	X	X		X				
	Town of Brookhaven, Senior Citizens (open slot as of 4/99)	Alternate	None	None												
	Town of Riverhead	Member	Robert	Conklin	X		X	X	X	X		X				
	Town of Riverhead (K. Skinner alternate as of 4/99)	Alternate	Kim	Skinner	O		O	O	O	O		O				
	Wading River Civic Association	Member	Helga	Guthy	X		X	X	X	X		X				
	Wading River Civic Association	Alternate	Sid	Bail	O		O	O	O	O		O				
	Yaphank Taxpayers & Civic Association	Member	Nanette	Essel	O		O	O	O	-						
	Yaphank Taxpayers & Civic Association	Alternate	None	None	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-