

These notes are in the following order:

1. Attendance
2. Correspondence and handouts
3. Administrative Items
4. Summary of public comment period, John Carter
5. Update on phragmites and herbicides
6. Discussion on Strontium-90 and Magothy aquifer with EPA and SCHDS participating.
7. Community Comment
8. Additional Administrative Items
9. Prescribed Fire Plan, Tim Green
10. ESH & Waste Management Update, George Goode
11. Agenda Setting

1. Attendance

Members/Alternates Present:

See Attached Sheets.

Others Present:

S. Anker, P. Bond, A. Carsten, J. Carter, P. Chaudhari, I. Chaudhary, J. Clodius, M. Cowell, T. Daniels, J. D'Ascoli, W. Dorsch, G. Goode, T. Green, C. Guthrie, L. Hill, M. Holland, B. Howe, S. Johnson, E. Keveney, T. Kneitel, S. Kumar, R. Lee, A. McNerney, S. Medeiros, D. Paquette, F. Petschauer, D. Pocz, A. Rapiejko, R. Rimando, S. Robbins, J. Tarpinian, C. Wirick

2. Correspondence and Handouts

Items one through three were mailed with a cover letter dated October 8, 2004. Items four through eight were placed in the member's folders, and item nine was available at the meeting as a handout.

1. Draft agenda for October 14, 2004.
2. Draft notes September 9 meeting
3. Final notes August 12 meeting
4. Iqbal Chaudhry's resume
5. Action Item 04-04
6. Copy of the presentation from the September 29 workshop
7. Copy of Groundwater presentation from September 9.
8. Copy of Prescribed Fire Plan presentation
9. Copy of Environmental Update presentation

3. Administrative

The meeting began at 6:35 p.m. Reed welcomed everyone and went over the ground rules and the draft agenda.

Dr. Chaudhari expressed his appreciation to the Pine Barren's Society for the award that the Lab received on October 7th at their annual dinner. He noted that DOE policy prevented DOE

representatives from attending the dinner and acknowledged their role in the Laboratory achieving its environmental goals.

Dr. Chaudhari continued briefing the CAC on the mission of the Lab and spoke at this meeting about security. He said the Lab divides security into two parts. One is trying to help the former Soviet Union control their nuclear material and help their scientists find jobs and get involved with nuclear technology. The second aspect of security is Homeland Security. The Lab does not work with weapons, most of the work is defense. The Lab provides a facility where proposed radiation detectors are tested for functionality. This is a service that the Department of Homeland Security pays for and the Laboratory works with them. Dr. Chaudhari also talked about studying the possible air dispersion of chemicals or radioactive materials by terrorists in New York City and explained the Lab's role in the research. He noted that the Lab's RAP team was the most called upon team in the country and that they had worked on both the Democratic and Republican National Conventions.

Reed said that the membership issues and minutes would be taken care as soon as a quorum was present. Member Walker asked if Sarah Anker could sit at the table and participate in the discussions until her membership could be formally voted on. The CAC agreed and she was invited to sit at the table.

Jeanne D'Ascoli informed the CAC that Mr. Chaudhary's resume was in their folders. She reminded the CAC that their regular November meeting fell on a holiday and advised that she didn't see any issues needing immediate action that warranted meeting on a different date. The CAC members suggested waiting for a quorum before they decided on the November meeting.

Reed went over the ways the CAC works as a group for the new members. He said that the draft Charter and voting process would be sent out to them. The ways that the CAC operates, i.e. monthly meetings most months, occasional formation of subcommittees, and forums and workshops that might be held on an issue, were described. He suggested that the group website be checked for historical meeting notes (<http://www.bnl.gov/community/CAC.asp>) and said if further information was needed they should call Jeanne D'Ascoli.

He explained that decisions are only made if there is a quorum present. There are three types of decisions that might be made, administrative decisions, membership decisions which need a quorum and approval by 75% of the membership present at the meeting, and recommendations to BNL which are made by consensus. If consensus cannot be reached, then a decision may be made by 75% (supermajority) of the members present, and if a formal recommendation is not chosen, a poll may be taken instead to gain input from each member of the CAC.

Reed said that the CAC works on information and gave examples of sources of information and said that Jeanne D'Ascoli is the point of contact. Members wishing to make contact with an outside group to get information should go through Jeanne whenever possible and should not represent themselves as representatives of the CAC unless they have been specifically authorized to do so by the CAC.

4. Summary of BGRR public comment period, John Carter

John Carter briefed the CAC on the background and results of the BGRR public comment period. A notice announcing the beginning of the comment period was published on August 2 in Newsday. Two thousand-five hundred (2,500) letters were sent out that reviewed the project plan and told how to submit comments. Two public information sessions and a formal hearing were held. One hundred-ninety comments were received. The breakdown was one comment form, three emails, five letters, and 181 copies of a form letter. The Alternatives were supported as follows: there was no support for Alternative B, Alternative A received two comments in support, Alternative C received five comments in support, and Alternative D received 182

comments in support. One was a letter and 181 were the copied form letter. The DOE is now drafting responses to the comments for the Responsiveness Summary. That document should be finalized by March 2005.

CAC members asked questions about the form letters and who submitted the other comments.

5. Update on phragmites and herbicides

Skip Medeiros updated the CAC on the status of using an herbicide to control phragmites in the onsite Peconic River restoration areas. The herbicide that the Lab proposed to use is Glypro. He reported that a workshop had been held on September 29 and all those CAC members and several others who had expressed an interest had been invited to attend and bring any information they had gathered on the subject with them to be shared with the group. After the September 29 workshop the decision was made to go forward with treating the phragmites with the Glypro. A permit was applied for and a window from October 12 – 20 was given to complete the process. Because of the threat of rain in the forecast, the phragmites were treated on October 13. Medeiros said that any need to repeat the treatment or to treat other sections of the river would be shared with the CAC.

Jeanne D'Ascoli added that those present at the workshop were polled and said that although a couple of people were not happy with a decision to apply an herbicide, they could live with the decision if it was decided to go ahead with the treatment.

Member Blumer said she asked at the workshop if there could be some continued feedback on research into the effect of Glypro. Since the workshop she has submitted some information including the Material Safety Data Sheet. OSHA considers Glypro a hazardous substance and it is toxic to aquatic organisms. Blumer said that there have not been any studies that she has found that cover impacts to the environment. She said that the Lab is mandated to cleanup (under Superfund) and should not be introducing new toxic substances. Blumer went on to describe efforts in Southampton by The Nature Conservancy and others to control phragmites by several methods including removal by hand pulling. She passed several photographs of the results around the table and asked that use of the Glypro be stopped and that the phragmites be removed by cutting them and removing the thatch. She said that lets the sunlight in and allows other plants to re-establish themselves.

Skip questioned if the sediment had been removed prior to cutting the phragmites. He indicated that removal of the sediment would mostly likely remove the dormant seeds in it and the results would not be the same as if the sediment were not removed. According to Member Blumer the sediment had not been removed.

Member Giacomaro questioned the time frame for applying the Glypro and wondered if there wouldn't be enough time to get more information before it was considered for application offsite.

Skip explained that the time to begin the treatment is usually by mid-September. The reason is because other plants begin to die back and there would be less chance of affecting them during the application process. October 15 is when phragmites start to die back and they no longer can translocate the herbicide to the rhizomes. The decision on whether or not Glypro might be used offsite in Suffolk County parkland won't be made until after the excavation is completed. It will be three to four months before the need offsite can be evaluated and application would not take place until the growing season begins. Skip also said the decision on whether or not to use herbicides in the parkland will be made by Suffolk County.

Members asked if there were any examples where phragmites have been controlled for five years or more, the size of the area that was wicked, why it was done right before it rained, cost, and the acreage cut in Southampton.

Skip that the size of the area was approximately two acres. He explained if the product is applied in daylight it can be applied two – four hours before a rain, the cost was \$6,000. And Member Blumer said the study areas in Southampton were each about one acre.

Member Amper spoke about process and said that at the very least there should be advance notice of these matters and didn't think it was very useful to the CAC to be informed that an action had already taken place. This was a controversial issue, there were strong expressions shared and it's not entirely clear that the need justified the decision-making process. At the very least he'd like the CAC to entertain... (can not decipher the tape)...calendars in enough time that these things can be debated and conclusions can be reached jointly rather than have the CAC learn after the fact of a decision that's been made.

Skip reiterated that at the September 9 meeting the Lab did share the time frame that this would have to be done and had said the Lab needed a decision by the end of the month.

Reed said that at the last meeting there was a discussion about the need for the timing and the Lab indicated they would be making a decision. The CAC asked that the decision be delayed as long as possible. The Lab agreed to delay the decision until the end of September and agreed to hold a special meeting to which members of the CAC and other members could come in order to provide input into decision.

Member Amper replied the he was simply saying ... (inaudible)

Member Walker commented about phragmites and this being an opportunity to learn.

Member Heil asked about the acreage in the Southampton projects. Blumer said they were one acre each. Discussion continued about methods to control phragmites and their success and the possible impacts of removal on soil stabilization in creeks, that physical removal of the phragmites might have dropped the soil/sediment levels and resulted in the need to import soil, and soil monitoring for residue from the Glypro.

Skip introduced Charles Guthrie from the NYSDEC. Guthrie said that he was not an expert, but it has been his observation with how quickly the phragmites are returning to the restored areas and knowing how difficult it is to control them, that he felt the Glypro was a wise way to go. He said the DEC recognized that this was a reasonable treatment and were able to expedite the permit issuance so that it could be done during the time of the year when it's been determined to be most effective.

Reed asked if the CAC wanted involvement earlier in the discussions in the future. The CAC indicated they did. Member Giacomaro asked that the CAC be kept informed on the outcome of this application so that they would have that information available to consider.

6. Discussion on Strontium-90 and Magothy aquifer with EPA and SCHDS participating.

Reed said that at the last meeting the CAC had a thorough presentation and the intention was that the discussion would take place at this meeting. As the CAC did not have a quorum they would not be able to go to a recommendation, but they could do a poll to gather additional information. There was a request at the last meeting to invite the regulators. That was done and Suffolk County and the EPA were present. Reed said that Bob Howe will give an update with the latest information, he would ask the community for any input, and then the CAC would decide how they wanted to move forward.

Bob Howe informed the CAC that they were still working on the Explanation of Significant Differences (ESD) and it is not ready to go out yet. There will still be a 30-day public comment

period. Howe went on to discuss the Building 96 scrap-yard and said the regulators wanted to include documentation on the findings there in the ESD. In 1999, geophysical surveys performed identified several anomalies. In the spring of 2004, 21 exploratory excavations were completed. No sources were discovered. The anomalies turned out to be concrete with steel in it, scrap metal, some piping, and an abandoned cesspool. The OU III ROD did say that the final remedy for these areas should be documented and the regulators agreed that the ESD would be the best way to document this.

Howe said that in response to the request for regulator input, Emmitt Keveney and Doug Pocze with the EPA, and Sy Robbins and Andy Rapiejko with Suffolk County are present tonight. The NYSDEC could not attend.

Reed also indicated that there was a fact sheet in the CAC member's packets that answered the two Action Items from last month.

Mr. Doug Pocze: Good evening, I'm Douglas Pocze and with me is Emmitt Keveney who will be the project manager for Brookhaven Labs from the USEPA. When we were invited here it was our understanding that you were looking for some feedback from the EPA regarding the ESD. Brookhaven submitted the ESD I guess somewhere around mid-July with regards to the change to the original Record of Decision. It was for the deeper aquifer, the Magothy and basically it's been under review. We have provided some comments to DOE and we are currently evaluating it. However, based upon a preliminary review, we felt the ESD was acceptable to go to public comment and we're currently looking at and expecting feedback during the public availability session - the public comment period, and pending that that's when EPA will make a final recommendation whether we approve it or not.

Sy Robbins: Sy Robbins, Suffolk County Department of Health Services. As Bob and Doug both indicated the ESD is still being revised so Suffolk County hasn't had a chance to make formal comments on a final copy yet. I have reviewed all the drafts. Martin Trent has reviewed the drafts and basically we are in concurrence with what they're proposing. I sent comments up to the Commissioner and the County Execs office and have not received any feedback from them yet. So there is no official County position at this moment. But staff tends to agree with their approach that is basically hot spot removal for the Strontium, removal of the hot spots of the shallower Magothy for VOCs, and this new Building 96 anomaly has just been added to the process in the last couple of days. That stuff has to be reviewed. I think the VOCs as Building 96...be addressed with....There's also PCBs in the soil, but that doesn't contribute to groundwater issues. We'll be looking at what's being proposed for the PCB soils also.

Member Garber: I think that one of the reasons for asking you here, and thank you for coming, was if it's appropriate could you share the areas that you commented about. In other words, what areas do you have concerns about?

Doug Pocze: Pretty much a lot of our comments were standard boiler-plate. The change with Building 96 was something that had not been submitted in the original ESD so that will be looked at technically to see if there's anything outstanding in regards to that. Another issue that's come up a lot is Institutional Control. That's something that we're looking into with DOE specifically for any type of restrictions that are applied to the land or to the area that would have to be carried forward in the future. But technically in terms of the actual alternative there was really none.

Sy Robbins: There are two major groundwater issues in the ESD and that is for the Strontium-90 because the longer you're doing hot spot removal rather than your large volume pump and treat because of the cost of present technologies to remove it by ionic exchange the Strontium-90, the projected time frame in which you will be able to achieve groundwater standards for intended for 30 years. That was the target in the original ROD, now it's projected to be 70 years. That's based in part on the fact that the highest concentrations out there turned out to be

a lot higher than what they had thought back when they did the original ROD so one of the things we're looking at is "Can we live with the 70 years?" How far is the stuff going to move? Can we address that which is not removed by Institutional Control? Will that be adequate? As far as the VOCs in the shallow Magothy we looked at the modeling that was done by the Lab and what the projections are for the concentrations of the contamination that would not be removed by the proposed wells. I also looked at the source water assessment models that were done by the ...??... just last year to see if there were any well fields that might be impacted by the contamination that would not be addressed by the recovery wells. In this case there are two Suffolk County Water Authority well fields in the general area down-gradient from the Lab and where these shallow Magothy plumes are located. One is the Lambert Avenue well field, the other is the Main Street well field. For both of those, groundwater travels by where the contamination is to the well in about 60-70 years. Once it gets into the Magothy it really slows down. So again even if it turns out that additional remediation would be necessary to protect those wells there will be time to review monitoring data that will come in I guess annually. They'll be five-year reviews of the process to see if additional remediation has to be done. In addition we'll be modeling those two well fields again during our coming update of the Comprehensive Water Resources Management Plan. We'll talk to the Water Authority to see if they have any plans for additional wells in those well fields and we will take another look if it turns out that there's something that concerns us. At that point we will bring that to BNL's attention. One other thing, going back to the Strontium-90 contamination, one of the things that we probably will ask to have added to the ESD is some kind of commitment on the part of BNL to implement new technology if it would speed up the process and would still be cost effective. It's sort of implied, but it would be nice if it were spelled out in the ESD.

Member Heil: I was going to ask if both agencies had concerns about the duration of the cleanup. I think you discussed it. How about the EPA?

Pocze: For the original duration there was some review in regards to that but in terms of the overall technical aspects of it, we think ...??... and looking at the time frame versus practicality it's something that we'll be monitoring long-term. It hasn't caused us to stop the process ...??..

Member Esposito: I have two questions. One is for EPA. Do you allow industry to not do cleanup and allow 70 years for their contamination to disperse?

Pocze: In terms of 70 years I couldn't say off the top of my head, but we do have RODs that do leave the waste in place and that do monitor it over the long-term, yes.

Member Esposito: For 70 years, cause I've never seen one.

Pocze: I couldn't say whether 70 years....

Keveney: I can help Doug out. I came from the New Jersey section and unfortunately a lot of times we're not able to cleanup the groundwater. The only option we have is long-term groundwater monitoring and hoping that you're not impacting drinking water and wells or what have you. It depends on geology and the contaminants. Sometimes that is the action unfortunately.

Member Esposito: Ok, this is for both of you. The original ROD stated the objectives were to meet drinking water standards for Strontium-90. To meet those standards within 30 years or less and to stop the migration of the plume or mitigate the migration of it wherever possible. And it seems like what you both said is it wouldn't be a big deal if those objectives were no longer met cause the ROD is going to be rewritten. I don't know how frequent this is, and it may be very frequent, that the original ROD, it seems to me, is being abandoned and a new ROD is taking its place. If you don't meet any of the original objectives then we're really creating a new ROD. I know the original ROD does say modifications may occur, but in my mind modification

doesn't mean that we go from active remediation to natural attenuation. That's not a modification, that's abandonment. So?

Sy Robbins: As far as the ROD process goes, the Health Department is concerned that this is taking longer than the original. There is a practical reason why it may be appropriate in this case. We're dealing with a chemical that does not move very fast in groundwater and also the fact that it's radioactive but it's got a relatively short half-life. It's going to stay on the property that the responsible party controls. So rarely do you have that combination of conditions at an industrial site. It's usually solvents that will go way offsite and end up being someone else's problem. In this case, we have the luxury of being able to say we can control it for a little bit longer time. That doesn't excuse it what I'm saying is that we would like to see the approach that this is the best technology we've got right now. This is the most cost effective way of controlling it at the moment but if something better comes along that can accelerate that cleanup process we'd like the commitment from the Lab to go to that accelerated process. As far as whether this is a provision or if this is normal during the ROD process, you're going to have to ask EPA.

Doug Pocze: (tape switched, response not picked up)

Member Amper: I guess my question is more general but it's short. What I'm understanding is that the contamination is worse than we anticipated. It's going to take more than twice as long to attenuate itself, and our proposed solution to the problem is to do less rather than more? I don't understand.

Reed said that he didn't think that question was appropriate to the regulators.

Amper said the regulators were the ones that were involved in accepting the ROD in the first place. It strikes me as unusual that if you encounter a problem or the situation is worse I can understand why you might want to change your tactics. But you'd want to be more aggressive not less. Yes?

Reed said if you're asking them their opinion, ok.

Pocze: I believe the original ROD looked at and studied the Magothy in terms of obtaining other technical information with regards to that aquifer. Looking at that and seeing if it's migrating offsite, if the concentrations are higher, whether it's technically feasible to change the treatment system, and things like that go into the proposal that BNL recommends in terms of modifying the original permit. Part of it is expanding the time frame of it from 30 years to 60-70 years, yes. But if part of it was migrating offsite and if there was an immediate health threat then that would be something that we would take into account and definitely reject. If there's other cleanup aspects of it and if comments or the public input is such that there's a need to look at other alternatives and there's another alternate that will clean it up cost effectively. We probably...???...and that would be one of the recommendations.

Robbins: When the original ROD was signed they were not aware of the maximum concentrations, the highest concentration out there turned out to be six times what they originally anticipated. But the other thing is that they hadn't done the field testing to see how the ion exchange units would work removing the Strontium-90. They worked but they also exhaust themselves very quickly, much more quickly than anticipated. So the cost of treating large volumes of water shot up astronomically. That's why they're now proposing to do more low flow, hot spot removal. It's an approach that does take longer, and you can certainly argue that they should spend the additional money and be more aggressive but even going to a much higher flow rate doesn't necessarily cut the time to reach drinking water standards that much. Bob I think you gave a breakdown of what the flow rate versus time to drinking water standards would be. They essentially selected a cutoff point where the slope changes and you're getting the best cost-effectiveness.

Reed reminded the CAC that the focus of the evening wasn't a session with regulators.

Member Guthy: I like the idea that something is going to come along in the next 70 years, or before 70 years, that might be able to be used to speed up the process. If there is, who makes that decision when to start it or whether to use it?

Pocze: It could come from BNL, EPA, DEC.

Robbins: Under the CERCLA process there are five-year reviews on all RODs so at that point if there is new technology available, again if there's a commitment in this amendment to the original ROD to say that it would be implemented if cost effective, I think that's where the change would occur.

Guthy: Would that again go to public comment or just be made among the people who are doing the cleanup?

Unidentified speaker: The CERCLA process I presume that there is some input when a ROD is changed.

Member Sprintzen: Am I correct in assuming that neither of you see any conceivable situation in which the Strontium-90 that is here on the Lab would get offsite and become available in... ?? ..(can't hear tape). There is no feasible way that it could leave the site?

Robbins: Given the monitoring data that we have til now and the modeling that's been done, based on that monitoring data I would say no. But it will continue to be monitored and if something new shows up and changes...

Sprintzen: Are there things that might occur that might change that perspective?

Robbins: It's highly unlikely that we've missed anything that will allow this to get away from us, get offsite.

Sprintzen: Is that just your point of view of what we're talking about here is simply a process which takes longer to cleanup what's there but that is not all....that thedifference with respect to the extent in which people would be in any way exposed to that material or....

Robbins: It's the Health Department's concern and position that no one will be exposed to this so whatever remedy is implemented, one thing that has to be sure is that there will be no exposure.

Pocze: And I think the continuing modeling and reviews of it would show that if the modeling is wrong, if it's being detected earlier, we have to go back and re-evaluate the alternatives. And that would be done before anyone would be exposed.

Member Esposito: If the pilot ionization project had been more successful and if the maximum Strontium-90 level stayed at 540 pc/l instead of 3450 pc/l would you have agreed to natural attenuation or would you have said we're ...??.(can't understand)

Robbins: It was always the Health Department's position that hot spot removal be done as part of this project. Again, we don't have any formal say in this process, you have to understand that we are not equal participants in the CERCLA process. We make comments and then they have responded to our comments and we advise the State Health Department and they concur and refer to the State DEC so indirectly yes we have been involved. But to answer your question No, monitored natural attenuation was never deemed acceptable for the Strontium-90 or the Magothy VOC.

Esposito: What about the EPA?

Pocze: I believe the same thing.

Member Amper: Does the CAC attain some legal expert on CERCLA in connection with this thing that's moving forward? I'm really concerned about the direction we're taking here and I'm not an expert on CERCLA myself but what we're doing here has got to have fairly significant implications and I wonder is that something that the CAC has access to? Is that a resource that we can obtain?

Reed said he would hold that question until the CAC was done asking questions of the regulators.

Member Heil: Did the Lab provide you with any more detailed economic analysis besides what we got which was essentially the cost of one system. If they went to a second onsite system to shorten the process, maintenance costs would be cheaper, have they gone into that kind...?

Unidentified speaker: We did get a more detailed cost analysis with various pumping alternatives. You saw a summary that came from that analysis that's in the Administrative Record, it's available if you want to look at it.

Reed advised the CAC that there were several routes they could follow. You are 15-20 minutes past the time you were scheduled to end this discussion and you don't have a quorum. Having said that I go to Les.

Les Hill: I heard some questions about natural attenuation. I just want to emphasize that the remedy that we've prescribed in the ESD is not natural attenuation. We are pumping and treating. So I just wondered if there was some notion that we were looking to not pump and treat, that's not true. We are pumping and treating to control the plume growth and to hold back the???? Under natural attenuation this plume would go out past 110 or 120 years. This is not natural attenuation. There is a treatment system involved, there's??? I just wanted to clarify that.

Reed said you're past the time that you were going to end this and you don't have a quorum. Options that you have at this point. You can defer the conversation to your next meeting and continue it at that point. You can start the conversations, spend a certain amount of time on it and then pick it up again at your next meeting. You can do an initial poll that is part of your decision-making process here and go around the table at this point to see where each member of the group stands as part of starting the conversation. How would you like to proceed?

Member Esposito: When does the official document come out?

Howe: It's still being reviewed, we don't have a date.

Reed said his recommendation is to defer until the next meeting and get on with the agenda because there isn't a quorum. It would be really good for the members who are not here tonight and who will be part of the quorum to be part of whatever discussion the CAC has..

Member Giacomaro: Defer it until the next meeting.

Member Amper: My organization has been complimenting the Laboratory on doing more than the minimum required for the basis of the support and appreciation we shared, I'm concerned about this. This seems to be something that wasn't ok when it wasn't as bad and now is. I'm concerned that in this particular case we may be not doing what we ought to be doing in the interest of saving money and I'm very concerned because at every turn I've been impressed

that this Laboratory has done more than it originally thought it had to do and we complimented it. This looks like we may be heading down a slippery slope and doing less. That's why I think the subject is so important.

Reed: It will be a top item on the agenda for your next meeting and I presume when we talk about it part of the decision about what we do in November will be contingent upon when the ESD comes out for public comment. I think the anticipation is that it's not going to be an issue in November but you'll want to put that into your thinking.

Member Blumer: When do we discuss the possible legal input from someone?

Reed: We'll pick the conversation up at your next meeting. One of the things you might want to do is examine what you might want to bring to the group as a suggestion from the legal side ...?...I know you brought that question up earlier, what action for the group to take.

Amper: Ought we not have a CERCLA expert at that meeting is my question. Is that a resource that we can obtain?

Reed: Are you looking for a CERCLA expert from EPA or a CERCLA expert of a different sort?

Amper: That's a good question, I don't know the answer.

Reed: When I hear CERCLA expert I normally think of the branch of the regulatory agency that oversees the law.

Unidentified speaker: EPA sounds right.

Reed: Is that something that from that standpoint you'd like to have when you have your discussion again, is to invite EPA back to advise you on CERCLA and how it's applied in this case?

ACTION ITEM: Invite CERCLA expert from EPA to next meeting.

7. Community Comment

There were no comments from the audience.

8. Additional Administrative Items

With the arrival of an additional CAC member a quorum was reached. Reed said that Sarah Anker had petitioned the CAC for membership and stayed with the group for a long time to get in a position to where she was ready to sit at the table. There was a discussion last month however, the CAC could not vote because of the rules. Reed asked Sarah to leave the room while the discussion and vote took place. Jeanne D'Ascoli reported on the openings in the membership categories in the draft Charter. There are openings in the Health, Environment, Business and Civic categories. John Hall was added to the Other category. I'm assuming that Sarah would fit into the Health category. After several comments in support, the issue of membership for Sarah was moved and seconded and the CAC voted unanimously to include her as a member.

Reed asked the CAC to review the October notes. He asked if there were any additions, deletions, or corrections. The notes were approved as written with one abstention.

9. Prescribed Fire Plan, Tim Green

Tim Green informed the CAC of a prescribed fire that was planned onsite in conjunction with the New York Wildfire and Incident Management Academy at the end of October. He gave background information, talked about the planning process including reviews and approvals, gave the location of the burn, talked about the field characteristics, and described the process that would be used to conduct the burn. He also explained the post burn monitoring that would occur.

Green said that the Department of Energy, in 2003, added the requirement (DOE Executive Order 450.1) that calls for the contracting organization to have a Wildland Fire Management Plan. He reminded the CAC that he had spoke about the plan last year.

CAC members asked questions about sustaining the fire, how long it will burn, what happens to the animals, about burning phragmites and what is left, about the rare plants, when the last wildfire actually occurred, and what the expectations are for the wetlands.

Green said the larger animals will run out of the area and this time of year most of the slower moving animals have burrowed into the ground. He said that the last natural fire was probably in the late 1800's.

The CAC agreed they would like an update on the burn.

10. ESH & Waste Management Update, George Goode

The CAC agreed to have this presentation at their next meeting.

11. Agenda Setting

December Agenda

Environmental Update

Membership

Groundwater ESD

Phragmites Treatment

Coordination of restoration projects

CERCLA education presentation by EPA (law & practice)

The CAC discussed re-scheduling the November meeting. Jeanne D'Ascoli said that the end of the public comment period for the ESD would not fall before the December meeting. She agreed to send out the ESD as soon as it became available.

The meeting adjourned at 9:22 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	X		
ABCO		Alternate	Richard	Johannesen	O		O	O	O	O		O	O	O		
Brookhaven Retired Employees Association		Member	Graham	Campbell	O		O	X	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		X	X	O		
CHEC (Community Health & Environment Coalition (added 10/04)		Member	Sarah	Anker											X	
Citizens Campaign for the Environment		Member	Adrienne	Esposito	X		X	X	O	X		X	X	X		
Citizens Campaign for the Environment (Ottney added 4/02)		Alternate	Jessica	Ottney	O		O	O	O	O		O	O	O		
E. Yaphank Civic Association		Member	Michael	Giacomaro	X		X	X	X	X		X	O	X		
E. Yaphank Civic Association (J. Minasi new alternate as of 3/99)		Alternate	Jerry	Minasi	O		O	O	O	O		O	O	O		
Educator		Member	Audrey	Capozzi	O		O	O	X	O		O	X	X		
Educator (B. Martin - 9/01)		Alternate	Bruce	Martin	O		X	O	O	X		O	O	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	O		
Environmental Economic Roundtable (Berger resigned,Proios became member 1/01)		Member	George	Proios	X		O	X	X	X		X	X	O		
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	O		
Fire Rescue and Emergency Services		Alternate	James	McLoughlin	O		O	O	X	X		O	O	O		
Friends of Brookhaven (E.Kaplan changed to become member 7/1/01)		Member	Ed	Kaplan	X		O	O	O	O		O	X	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		O	O	O		
Health Care		Member	Jane	Corrarino	X		O	O	X	O		O	O	O		
Health Care (as of 10/02 per JD)		Alternate	Mina	Barrett	O		O	O	O	O		O	O	O		
Huntington Breast Cancer Coalition		Member	Mary Joan	Shea	X		X	O	X	X		X	X	O		
Huntington Breast Cancer Coalition		Alternate	Scott	Carlin	X		O	O	O	O		O	O	O		
Intl. Brotherhood of Electrical Workers/Local 2230		Member	Mark	Walker	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X		
IBEW/Local 2230		Alternate	Philip	Pizzo	O		O	O	O	O		O	O	O		

2004	Affiliation		First Name	Last Name	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
L.I. Pine Barrens Society	Member	Richard	Amper		O		O	X	O	O		X	X	X		
L.I. Pine Barrens Society	Alternate	Jane	Geary		X		X	O	X	X		O	O	O		
L.I. Progressive Coalition	Member	David	Sprintzen		X		X	O	O	X		O	X	X		
L.I. Progressive Coalition	Alternate	None	None			No Mtg.					No Mtg.					
Lake Panamoka Civic Association (Biss as of 4/02)	Member	Rita	Biss		X		X	X	X	X		X	O	X		
Lake Panamoka Civic Association (Rita Biss new alternate as of 3/99)	Alternate	Joe	Gibbons		O		O	O	O	O		O	O	O		
Long Island Association	Member	Matthew	Groneman		O		O	O	O	O		O	O	O		
Long Island Association	Alternate	William	Evanzia		X		O	X	X	O		O	X	O		
Longwood Alliance	Member	Tom	Talbot		X		O	X	X	X		X	X	O		
Longwood Alliance	Alternate	Kevin	Crowley		O		O	O	O	O		O	O	O		
Longwood Central School Dist. (switched 11/02)	Member	Barbara	Henigin		X		X	O	X	X		O	X	X		
Longwood Central School Dist.	Alternate	Candee	Swenson		O		O	O	O	O		O	O	O		
NEAR	Member	Jean	Mannhaupt		X		X	X	O	O		X	O	O		
NEAR (prospect taken off 3/4)(blumer added 10/04	Alternate	Karen	Blumer		O		O	O		O		O	O	X		
NSLS User	Member	Jean	Jordan-Sweet		X		X	O	O	X		X	X	O		
NSLS User	Alternate	Peter	Stephens		O		O	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	X	X		
Peconic River Sportsmen's Club	Alternate	Jeff	Schneider					X	X	X		O	O	O		
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	O	O		
Town of Brookhaven	Alternate	Anthony	Graves		X		X	O	X	X		X	X	O		
Town of Brookhaven, Senior Citizens	Member	James	Heil		X		X	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	X	O		
Town of Riverhead (K. Skinner alternate as of 4/99)	Alternate	Kim	Skinner		O		O	O	O	O		O	O	O		
Wading River Civic Association	Member	Helga	Guthy		X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X		
Wading River Civic Association	Alternate	Sid	Bail		O		O	O	O	O		O	O	O		
Yaphank Taxpayers & Civic Association	Member	Nanette	Essei		O		O	O	O	-						
Yaphank Taxpayers & Civic Association	Alternate	None	None		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-