



**Technical Assistance Services for Communities**  
**Contract No.: EP-W-07-059**  
**TASC WA No.: TASC-3-R2**  
**Technical Directive No.: TASC-3-R2 DuPont Pompton Lakes RCRA**

**Pompton Lakes Environmental Community Advisory Group (CAG)**  
**January 2011 Meeting Summary**

**Site Name:** DuPont Pompton Lakes RCRA  
**Meeting Location:** Carnevale Center, 10 Lenox Avenue, Pompton Lakes, New Jersey  
**Meeting Date:** January 5, 2011  
**Meeting Time:** 7:00 p.m. – 9:30 p.m. EST

Future CAG Meeting Times

- Wednesday, February 2, 2011, 7:00 p.m. – 9:30 p.m. EST  
Location: Carnevale Center, 10 Lenox Avenue, Pompton Lakes, New Jersey

**Members and Alternates Present:**

Steve Grayberg (Pompton Lakes Lake Restoration Committee), Liz Kachur (In-Plume Resident), Art Kaffka (Chamber of Commerce), Abby Novak (Pompton Lakes Environmental Committee), Dana Patterson (Edison Wetlands Association), Bill Pendexter (Hydrogeologist and Non-Plume Resident), Lisa Riggiola (Citizens for a Clean Pompton Lakes), Michele Belfiore (Pompton Lakes Residents for Environmental Integrity), Tim Troast (In-Plume Resident).

**TASC Team:**

Melinda Holland, Bill Logue, Kirby Webster

**Ex Officio Members Present:**

New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP): Stephen Maybury, Mindy Mumford

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA): David Kluesner, Clifford Ng, Barry Tornick, Adolph Everett

Pompton Lakes Borough Council: Richard Steele

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR): Leah Graziano

New Jersey Department of Health and Senior Services (NJDHSS): Joe Eldridge, Christa Fontecchio

**Observers Present:**

Cheryl Rubino, Deana Rubino, Rich Lombardo, Kathleen Troast, Carl P. Padula, Kathy Roos, Darlene Monico, Sue Recca, Helen Martens, Ruth Paez, Gary Charyak, Jefferson H. LaSala, John Soojian, Carolyn Fefferman, Edward Meakem, Karen Magee, James Tacinelli, Anne

Tacinelli, Mike Simone, Michael A. Keough, Joseph Intintola, Jr., Bernard Weintraub, Lloyd Kent, Peter Roos, Gitte Curtiss

## **I. Welcome and Administrative Updates**

Mr. Bill Logue, facilitator, welcomed everyone and explained that under the Operating Procedures the first CAG meeting of the calendar year is an organizational meeting. He encouraged the group to stay on topic and use the “parking lot” to track items for later discussion. He reminded all of the behavioral conduct expected at meetings. Ms. Michele Belfiore was welcomed as a new CAG member representing Pompton Lakes Residents for Environmental Integrity (PLREI), replacing Mr. Jack Sinsimer.

The December Meeting Summary was approved with corrections. The corrections were: two observer comments that were not recorded in the December notes because of a computer malfunction will be recovered from the audio recording.

## **II. CAG Annual Organizational Meeting**

### CAG Survey

Mr. Logue reviewed the CAG survey conducted to determine how CAG members view the functioning of the CAG, and their suggestions for improvements. For presentations, initial presentations on an issue should be concise and complete with brief updates thereafter. When possible, handouts at meetings should have overviews of presentations and all acronyms defined. CAG members would like timely updates on site activities and neutral technical expertise on the current state of the science in ground water contamination remediation and meeting agendas with fewer topics to allow more time for balanced discussion so that everyone is heard. The survey indicated CAG members sensed some tension in CAG discussions. To address this, the facilitators encouraged the CAG to listen carefully to each other and work to understand and meet other members’ needs through productive conversations. The goal of the CAG, as part of the Operating Procedures, is to provide recommendations to the agencies. CAG members see public comments as important, however, the survey revealed different opinions about the best way to incorporate the timing and method (oral or written) of the comments into the time allotted for the CAG meeting. Several members suggested starting the meetings earlier to provide more time. The survey also highlighted the need to track questions that are asked of the CAG and the agencies and determine a response process for questions. Mr. Logue noted that there has been very good attendance at CAG meetings.

### CAG Member Concerns and Suggestions

Mr. Logue invited CAG members to share any concerns and suggestions for improving the CAG process. Ms. Lisa Raggiola described her concerns. She stated the label of “observer” for the public should be “participants” because she believes the CAG was formed to address the contamination affecting the 450 plume homeowners and give them voice. Mr. Logue explained that there is a difference between public meetings and CAG meetings. The CAG is a representative process which focuses primarily on the CAG members as a voice for the community and expects those members to network with their constituencies. Ms. Raggiola believes the community does not feel that they are appropriately represented. Ms. Liz Kachur compared the CAG to Congress and that the CAG members are here to speak for the community

members. Mr. Dave Kluesner (Region 2 EPA) stated that meetings are open to the public and he encouraged everyone to move beyond the small issues such as labels and address the core community concerns. He stated that this is an important process and the CAG needs to start the New Year with more civility. He stated he will be ferociously protective of the process and the CAG members to help the CAG to get its work done. Ms. Raggiola responded that a lot of work has been getting done for the past three years. Ms. Raggiola also stated her concern about two of the observer comments being omitted from the previous meeting notes because of a computer malfunction. [As noted above, these will be corrected in the final December Summary.]

#### Discussion Regarding Survey and CAG Members' Actions Outside the CAG

Ms. Raggiola noted that some of the comments were directed to her by name in the survey and she felt this inappropriate. She stated that when she speaks outside of meetings it as a community and plume resident first and foremost and as executive director of Citizens for a Clean Pompton Lakes (CCPL). Ms. Kachur described that the Operating Procedures on page 9 safeguards the participants. *"All participants agree to act in good faith in all aspects of the CAG's deliberations. In order to encourage the free and open exchange of ideas, views, and information prior to achieving consensus, participants agree not to use specific offers, positions or statements made by another participant outside the CAG process. No CAG member will speak for the CAG without the consensus of the CAG."* Ms. Kachur stated her interpretation of this being "As a citizen I can say anything I want; as a CAG member I can come into this meeting and be treated civilly." Ms. Raggiola explained comments that are against the CAG on the CCPL website may come from other community members, not her.

Ms. Melinda Holland, facilitator, explained that statements in one setting impact the other and the reverse. If a CAG member believes that the commitment to civility is not being followed, they should use the commitment to civility cards, provided on the table, to get the attention of the facilitator and the group. Mr. Logue explained that a lot of dialogue can occur around disagreements but that there is a way to do it civilly. Mr. Logue encouraged the group to work with each other to achieve a unified voice in order to have its suggestions carry more weight.

#### CAG Videotaping and Audio Recording

The CAG discussed video and audio recording of meetings. Mr. Logue explained that these meetings are open to the public and EPA is not going to take a side on the videotaping issue. CAG members have different interpretations of the New Jersey Open Meeting law. Several members wanted to understand how recordings will be used. Ms. Patterson explained that posting full recordings on the Edison Wetlands Association website is technically challenging at this time. She may edit recordings but committed to providing unedited copies to members on request and notify them before posting any edited recordings. She provided CDs of the audio recording of the December meeting to CAG members. In response to a question from Ms. Kachur, Mr. Kluesner explained that because CAG meetings are open to the public, consent is not needed unless it is used for "commercial gain." He noted that videotaping often makes people less candid out of concern about how the tape will be used.

#### Selection of Administrative Committee and Description of Work Groups

Ms. Holland explained that the Administrative Committee manages the process for selection of new members and changing the Operating Procedures. The Operating Procedures state that the

Administrative Committee needs to include at least three CAG members. The facilitators suggested it would be more productive to have a smaller Administrative Committee than the entire CAG. The Executive Committee is composed of the chairpersons of the Administrative Committee and the work groups. Ms. Holland explained that although the Administrative Committee handles administrative functions, all decisions are made by the CAG. The CAG used written ballots to select the Administrative Committee and select a chair. The CAG elected: Michele Belfiore, Steve Grayberg, Liz Kachur, and Tim Troast. Ms. Kachur was elected chair.

Ms. Riggiola expressed concern that the Administrative Committee could prevent nomination of additional CAG members, for example additional plume residents. Ms. Kachur explained that the administrative committee handles the administrative aspects (on the substance and scope of the Operating Procedures and membership replacement functions) and that the CAG would make the decision on a new member as described on pages 3 and 4 of the Operating Procedures, items iii-vii. Nominations for new members must be submitted first to the Administrative Committee as specified in the Operating Procedures.

### Work Groups

Ms. Holland explained the importance of work groups and how they help CAGs accomplish work between meetings and bring recommendations forward for decision by the CAG. Most CAGs form smaller work groups including technical and outreach and education work groups. Membership in work groups should be based on the CAG members interests and strengths, for example, Dr. Pendexter has hydrogeology and hazardous waste site cleanup expertise and would be a good potential member for a technical work group; someone else who is more interested in education and outreach would be a good person for an outreach workgroup. She gave examples of how workgroups help review technical documents and bring questions, issues and suggestions back to the full CAG. Ms. Riggiola requested that anyone on a workgroup should not be affiliated with any contractor or anyone working for DuPont, as an example since Dr. Pendexter works on environmental sites he could have an affiliation with DuPont. In response, Dr. Pendexter explained that he does not do work for DuPont. The following work groups were suggested:

- Technical Work Group
- Lake Contamination Work Group
  - Lake remediation will begin in the near future, and EPA will modify the permit for this work in a few months and will be looking for CAG input and suggestions for public participation methods.
- Property Valuation/Realtor Outreach Education Work Group
  - Address possible educational and outreach programs for real estate professionals (a group is currently working with Mayor Cole on this).
- Community Outreach Work Group
  - Help community residents understand their options and where CAG needs to be a voice in addition to CCPL and PLREI.

In discussion, Ms. Riggiola explained that experts have come in to speak to the residents and environmental advocates and she has invited Lois Gibbs from Love Canal. Mr. Kluesner explained that the agencies also have a responsibility to provide outreach and EPA would assist in this effort.

Alternates may participate on workgroups, or members of the public can be added to workgroups by vote of the CAG, as provided in the Operating Procedures. The CAG agreed to the following as work group membership:

- Technical Work Group: Dana Patterson, Bill Pendexter, John Soojian (CAG Alternate), Tim Troast
- Property Valuation/ Realtor Outreach Education: Michele Belfiore, Art Kaffka, Abby Novak
- Lake Contamination: Steve Grayberg, Art Kaffka, Tim Troast
- Public Outreach: Dana Patterson

#### Discussion Regarding Observer Comments

Ms. Riggiola asked if the observers will have time to speak before the end of the meeting because she feels they have a right to speak. Mr. Logue explained that, because it was an administrative meeting, there was little to comment on at the outset and written comments could be submitted if a member of the public could not stay. The purpose of comments is to inform the CAG on topics that have been discussed at the meeting. Ms. Holland explained that CAG members represent various interests within the community and should bring their constituents' concerns to the CAG. This allows a smaller group of people to work over time on issues and develop recommendations which reflect the interests of the community. Mr. Logue noted that, to discuss site related issues and begin to make recommendations, the CAG needs to determine how it will use its time at meetings.

Ms. Belfiore asked Mr. Kluesner if observer comments are usually at the beginning and at the end of the meeting at other CAGs. Mr. Kluesner explained that at the Passaic River CAG, observer comments are now received throughout the meeting but during the first several meetings the observer comments were held to the end of the meeting. Ms. Patterson explained that from her experience attending and being on other CAGs that the public comment is necessary but individuals need to speak while the topic is relevant. She feels that allowing only 10 minutes for public comment is not efficient or effective. Ms. Patterson explained that on other CAGs on which she has participated, discussion continues until decisions are reached and the CAG should not limit its end time. Mr. Kluesner explained that emotions are running high and a lot of topics are raised in comments that are not on the agenda. EPA wants CAG meetings to be highly productive. Mr. Kluesner explained that the ex officio members cannot stay past 9:30 p.m. but an earlier start time could be an option. Ms. Kachur explained that based on her review of meeting minutes from other CAGs, there are usually observer comments at the end of meetings that vary from 5 to 30 minutes but that they are on topic. Ms. Riggiola explained that she has held public meetings and has been a councilwoman and each person has five minutes for their comment. The residents need to speak and they need to have two sessions. Mr. Kluesner explained there will be other venues for general public comments and he would like them to trust in the process and allow the CAG to do its work.

### **III. Review On and Off-Site Work Timelines**

Adolph Everett (Region 2 EPA) reviewed a handout<sup>1</sup> showing a timeline of major site milestones, including: the timeframe for the soils cleanup in the various manufacturing areas

---

<sup>1</sup> Located at: [http://www.epa.gov/region02/waste/dupont\\_pompton/cag.html](http://www.epa.gov/region02/waste/dupont_pompton/cag.html).

through 2017; site restoration; and the lake sediment cleanup and the ground water contaminant plume cleanup.

The agency approval for the Corrective Action Permit for the delta/lake remediation is going to occur in spring 2011 and the agencies see upcoming meetings as a good time for CAG involvement on this topic. Mr. Barry Tornick (Region 2 EPA) explained that public input is part of EPA's permit modification process. EPA will publish a public notice on the availability of the draft permit. The delta/lake sediment cleanup permit is going to address standards that need to be met, how dredging will occur and where dredged material will be stored, staged, etc. The agencies are concerned that the regular agency public involvement process may not meet the needs and desires of the community. Therefore, EPA would welcome the CAG's suggestions on how to structure public involvement on this permit and a CAG Work Group on Lake Sediment is a good start. EPA requires a formal request for a public meeting or public hearing.

Mr. Tornick noted that the ground water pilot program starts this February or March. A CAG member suggested that the CAG receive information on this pilot program at the February meeting. The CAG agreed that having a webinar, on this or other topics, in between regular CAG meetings was a viable option. In response to a question, Mr. Kluesner explained that EPA staff will do their best to provide documents on request.

#### **IV. Develop and Prioritize Topics and Goals for the Next Six Months of CAG Meetings**

The facilitators guided CAG members through an exercise to identify agenda topics and when they should be addressed between February and June. The CAG members spent time discussing and organizing the most important topics, which were written on large sticky notes, that were gained from the exercise and organized them on a timeline so that topics will be discussed during appropriate time periods based on the schedule for site related reports and other activities.

Mr. Tornick suggested that lake delta remediation activities be discussed in February and revisited periodically because of planned activities and the permit modification. The Ground Water Cleanup Pilot Project will be starting in February or March and EPA noted that a high level overview could be discussed in February. Mr. Tornick reminded the CAG that the EPA ground water experts from Ada Oklahoma are available to provide presentations. The facilitators suggested that this type of information could also be provided during a webinar in-between regular CAG meetings.

Important future CAG meeting topics, decided by CAG members, and a possible timeline for addressing them is shown in the table below.

#### **2011 CAG Meeting Topics Timeline**

<b>Month</b>	<b>Major Topic</b>	<b>Subtopics (CAG Member Suggestions)</b>
February	Lake Remediation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Discussion and understanding of sediment remediation.</li><li>• Presentation by DuPont on entire lake remediation effort (with NJDEP present).</li><li>• Review and offer comment and suggestions concerning work on the Acid Brook Delta.</li><li>• Lake sediment cleanup.</li></ul>

Month	Major Topic	Subtopics (CAG Member Suggestions)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on Lake permit modification.</li> </ul>
February	Ground Water Cleanup Pilot	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodegradation options.</li> <li>Ground water reports, finalize the COCs.</li> <li>Presentation by an expert on the state of science of ground water remediation.</li> <li>More information on pilot.</li> <li>Pilot study test results.</li> <li>Presentation on pilot test of enhanced anaerobic bioremediation.</li> <li>Presentation on pilot study of ground water – anaerobic bioremediation.</li> </ul>
March	Community Outreach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve communication and education with public and realtors.</li> <li>EPA’s community involvement plan detailed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When will we see this?</li> <li>Will there be a formal plan?</li> </ul> </li> <li>Community outreach program.</li> <li>General information on results of findings to public.</li> </ul>
March	Education – Realtors/Property Values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact of values of all properties.</li> <li>Property valuation protection program.</li> <li>Tax relief.</li> <li>Develop sheet with facts as to where Pompton Lakes stands at other sites in state (with Plumes).</li> </ul>
April	Vapor Intrusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Soil cleanup in plume areas.</li> <li>Evaluation of relative severity of vapor intrusion versus other sites.</li> <li>Continue to be updated on the vapor remediation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current status of quantity of systems installed.</li> <li>Buffer area expanding.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
April / May	Site Visit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DuPont Site(s) Inspection/Tour.</li> <li>Site visit.</li> <li>Pompton Lakes Works site visit.</li> </ul>
May	Site Cleanup	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation on DuPont’s 205 Areas of Concern (AOCs) and sampling results.</li> <li>Video of blasting tunnel – presentation to CAG and sampling results.</li> <li>Clean up on areas with potential to re-pollute clean areas.</li> <li>Full independent investigation of the DuPont Sites/ Neighborhoods supporting Michael Keough’s Petition.</li> </ul>

The following issues were raised during discussion:

- Ms. Kachur asked that during the lake/delta remediation presentation that areas where residents will be impacted be identified.

- In response to a question, Mr. Kluesner explained that DuPont is paying for the cleanup under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) very similar to how cleanups are performed under federal Superfund law where polluters pay for cleanup; this means the tax payers are not paying for the cleanup. DuPont's activities are overseen by EPA and NJDEP. This oversight issue could be a topic in conjunction with the site tour.

#### **V. Final Decision/Language on Resolution Concerning Unannounced Audits**

The CAG reviewed the most recent draft of the resolution on unannounced audits. Ms. Kachur voiced concern about Item #2 (Inspect the installation of vapor mitigation systems (VMS) installed at plume residents' homes) in that it seems redundant with the ongoing inspection program. She asked if the inspections were going to be performed twice a year, and wanted to understand why inspections were added to the resolution. Ms. Patterson explained that inspections were added because there was concern from the community that some systems that were installed by DuPont contractors had problems and there are going to be additional systems installed by third party contractors. Mr. Kluesner responded that EPA has already committed to inspecting all systems. Mr. Grayberg suggested that this clause be in a different resolution. Dr. Pendexter said that he thinks it is more similar to sampling – it is not an inspection, just stopping by not on an exact time table. If it is known when they are installed – inspectors could stop by to check on installation and see it as it is going on. A discussion occurred about potential language for #2. Mr. Tornick explained that EPA will spot check VMS installations until they are comfortable with the contractors work. Mr. Logue asked if the agencies could write a letter to the CAG describing their current VMS inspection procedures or protocols, then the CAG could evaluate their interest in an additional resolution. The agencies confirmed they would draft a letter to the CAG on this. The CAG agreed to remove item #2 from this resolution. With this change, the resolution was approved and Mr. Grayberg agreed to send the resolution to the agencies on behalf of the CAG.

The CAG may revisit the option of a resolution on VMS inspections in the future after receiving the letter. During the discussion Mr. Steve Maybury (NJDEP) noted that water sampling would be conducted in May or June.

During the discussion on unannounced audits, Ms. Riggiola stated that the contractor Langan Engineering donated \$25,000 to Reform New Jersey, a political action committee. Ms. Riggiola explained that out of 136 homes, only 100 received interior electrical inspections; she is concerned that Langan may not be able to inspect appropriately. Mr. Kluesner asked Ms. Riggiola to bring any specific facts to EPA and asked Ms. Riggiola not to make unsubstantiated statements. Ms. Riggiola said that it is not specific to this site but it is a concern of the residents. She would like to know if the contractors know New Jersey building codes.

#### Goals for Site Tour

During the meeting, CAG members were asked to write down their goals for a tour of the DuPont site so that the site tour can be planned. Site tour goals listed by CAG members included:

- See each area as defined in the remediation plans.
- Hear about the history of that area and the contamination that was created.
- See the actual remediation processes for the area or hear about planned processes.



- See the tunnels that have come up in discussion (but not necessarily go in them).
- Ensure that the tour guides are subject matter experts.
- Include CAG alternates in site tour.
- Understand the lay of the land with respect to the 205 AOCs.
- Visit a home or a building with a working vapor intrusion system.
- Drive the perimeter of the ground water plume.
- For those who have had the 40 hour OSHA training, arrange a tour of those areas that require certification.
- See the areas that no one wants to show.
- See the areas of monitoring wells throughout areas of concern.
- See the site area across Lake Inez and behind senior housing.
- Get an overview of property.
  - To understand the operation layout when the site was active.
  - To highlight point areas of contamination when possible.
- Ensure good weather.
- Get a general idea of site layout and spatial distribution of impacted sites.

Due to a lack of time, the last agenda item, a presentation by Ms. Kirby Webster (Region 2 E<sup>2</sup> Inc. Work Assignment Manager) regarding the TASC technical advisor assistance process was postponed until the next meeting.

### **Comments from the Public**

#### *Oral Comments*

Ms. Karen McGee: Ms. McGee stated that she is concerned about the timeframe for the ground water pilot test, beginning in February. She asked if there are impacts or risks associated with the pilot test for residents without vapor mitigation systems. She asked if the residents have been informed about the pilot test. Mr. Kluesner stated that the residents in that area will be informed about the upcoming pilot test. Mr. Maybury explained that the ground water pilot injection of treatment chemicals will occur in the intermediate aquifer about 40 feet deep in a very small area on Barbara Drive. Ms. Mindy Mumford added that this will likely occur later than February.

Mr. Jefferson LaSala: Mr. LaSala asked where the microphones were. He does not think that people can hear the CAG. Mr. Logue responded that at future meetings at the Carnevale Center they would try to use microphones. Mr. LaSala explained that the idea of 10 to 15 minutes for observer comments at the end of the meeting is not enough time. Mr. Kluesner explained that there will be other public sessions and meetings. Mr. LaSala continued by stating that the independent contractors should be offered the addresses of all of the plume area residents. He believes it is unfair and biased to not share the addresses with independent contractors because DuPont contractors have the addresses. In order for residents to make decisions, they should have all of the information available. Ms. Kachur responded that she receives all of the information. Mr. LaSala continued that CCPL put out documents that DuPont should have to pay taxes on the plume area homes until lake cleanup and bioremediation have occurred. Injection should not be conducted during the winter because homes are generally closed during that time and this would exacerbate the problem. He reiterated that the CAG does not have enough plume members. He believes that the lake cleanup is important but the people breathing in the filth are more important.

Mr. Ed Meakem: Mr. Meakem stated that the statutory authority mentioned by Mr. Grayberg and Dr. Pendexter states clearly that you can make an unannounced site visit but a warrant is required to do an unannounced visit (if access is denied) or test unless the owner is a willing participant. On the topic of the public hearing about the lake cleanup, he stated that the town planning board will need to approve staging and truck routes and another public comment period should occur during this time period. He does not want a repeat of the mistake made in the Wanaque River cleanup where the contaminated material was not stored in a high area as promised and spread the material downstream. He would like the CAG to agree to a resolution before the ground water pilot injection begins, asking that all residents within 500 feet of the injection area be notified. He also asked for a guaranteed public comment period on the lake cleanup and stated that we need you to go to the planning board. Mr. Kluesner responded that the public is going to be involved early and often. EPA is committed to a full public process. Mr. Meakem said that when NJDEP did an inspection at the Wanaque River Site, NJDEP found that they were not supposed to be building a road where they were. Mr. Kluesner responded that the agencies are going to avoid this.

Mr. Michael Keough: Mr. Keough stated that he was unhappy that his comments were not reported in the December meeting summary [this error has been corrected]. He repeated what he said last month that he would like to know the amount of state and federal tax dollars being paid to the facilitators to support the CAG. He believes that the groups is more of a gag than a CAG. Mr. Kluesner asked Mr. Keough to stop attacking the CAG. Mr. Keough said that he was not able to hear when the CAG was talking about their topics for future meetings. He believes they should use microphones. Observers were allotted one minute last time. He believes that a full and thorough federal investigation is needed of all of the DuPont property and of all of the 61 chemicals.

Ms. Ruth Paez: Ms. Paez believes it is imperative that all residents sub slabs be tested for 61 chemicals. She does not think it should be an option. Her home was only tested for 10 instead of 61 chemicals. She believes that right now the plume residents are underrepresented on the CAG. More plume residents on the CAG will help the residents know more about what is going on. The meeting minutes need to be completely accurate and unedited.

Ms. Cheryl Rubino: Ms. Rubino agrees with Mr. LaSala and thinks that the CAG meeting start time should be moved forward so that observers can have two times to comment during the CAG meeting. At the last meeting, she asked about retesting being conducted on homes that were only tested for 10 contaminants instead of 61 and her question has not been answered. Mr. Tornick responded that if sub slab testing occurred for only 10 contaminants, there will be no more testing. Ms. Rubino said that she thinks that they should all be tested again. Mr. Kluesner responded that the test results in the plume do not determine if a vapor mitigation system is needed. Within the plume, regardless of the sampling results, a vapor mitigation system should be installed. Ms. Rubino continued that for the Barbara Drive injection pilot all residents within the vicinity should be notified of the activities.

Ms. Kathy Troast: Ms. Troast asked if vapor mitigation systems are retested after they are installed and if re-sampling occurs to compare the chemicals present before and after the system

is installation. Ms. Mumford responded that 30 days after the vapor mitigation system is installed, the air is re-sampled (indoor air). The sampling results are provided to the homeowner. Every property gets a letter from the department as well as a remedial measures report which looks at all of the post mitigation testing that occurred. All of the results are put in one document sent to NJDEP and EPA. If the system is determined to be functioning appropriately, the homeowner will receive a report and the system will be tested annually – this document can be provided to the buyer when selling. Ms. Troast added that she does not want her name or address given out to anyone.

Ms. Gitte Curtiss: Ms. Curtiss stated that she lives near the vicinity of the plume, and wonders if she is safe. She stated that there seems to be an adversarial quality between the community and agencies and that the government employees are civil servants and paid by the community. She believes that all should be more united. Mr. Kluesner responded that he is going to be ferociously protective of the CAG because he thinks that this CAG is going to be beneficial to the community and it is going to be a little bit of tough love.

Ms. Helen Martens: Ms. Martens stated that she understands all of the time put into the CAG effort. She believes that people are making a big thing of this and the comments and everything. It isn't just about the people of the plume, it is about the whole town. It is DuPont that is making a big stink – she didn't ask for this problem. This CAG needs to be supportive of this and of each other and be made up of caring people. This is about the whole town.

Mr. Kluesner responded to all present that the personal verbal attacks have occurred for too long and this needs stop. Ms. Martens responded that the community has nowhere else to speak so if we can't complain here where are we supposed to complain? Mr. Kluesner said that this is a place where community members can speak but that there will also be other opportunities for public comment.

Ms. Kachur responded that it is acceptable that CAG members have different opinions, but that doesn't mean that the CAG members don't care. Ms. Kachur said that if she doesn't agree with someone then that is okay. We all believe in this town.

Ms. Belfiore said that every resident is taking his or her own time to make the situation better, to educate the public and help with tax abatement. She's new on the CAG and the CAG is new but she believes that it is moving forward. There are nine people on the CAG with different opinions and different values. Ms. Kachur responded that 50 percent of the CAG members are plume residents but 50 percent of the residents of the town do not live in the plume. Mr. Logue responded that we need to find ways to make those that are unrepresented feel represented.

#### *Written Comments*

Mr. Rich Lombardo: Mr. Lombardo stated that he cannot wait until 9:20 p.m. to speak. He would like the following points included in the summary:

- Langan Engineering should be removed as the primary oversight group in approving O'Brien & Gere and other mitigation systems. Their recent behavior in contributing to special interest groups does not make plume residents comfortable as they do not represent a "neutral" professional group. The representative Anastasia has openly

admitted to several residents that she has no engineering skills/training and “no idea whatsoever of NJ based building codes and regulations.”

- Third party testing agreements are only for limited testing not full spectrum (61) chemicals as we were promised. This is as of 12/30/10! (Not 1 third party system installed yet!)
- Public comments should be held early. Many residents cannot stay late. Also we need adequate time to convey our concerns!
- Plume residents do not constitute the majority on the CAG. Plume residents are a top priority as they are most at risk. Other areas e.g. Lake can come later.

Ms. Holland provided a quick recap of the meeting. She reiterated the formation of the Administrative Committee with Ms. Kachur as the Chair. Ms. Holland asked Ms. Kachur to contact the other members of her committee between this meeting and the next. Ms. Holland reviewed the composition of the work groups. Ms. Webster was asked to e-mail information on the TASC technical advisor selection process to the CAG.

### Action Items

Item	Who; Date
Post meeting documents on EPA Pompton Lakes CAG website.	Kluesner; 1/14/2011
Prepare and circulate draft meeting summary.	Webster; 1/26/2010
E-mail information on TASC technical advisor selection process.	Webster; 1/21/2011
Prepare letter describing agency inspection protocol.	NJDEP/EPA; 2/2/2011
Provide overview of lake remediation activities.	EPA; 2/2/2011
Provide overview of ground water pilot.	EPA; 2/2/2011

### Documents Distributed

Document Description	Generated by; Date
Meeting Agenda	Logue; 1/5/2011
Draft Meeting Summary from December 1, 2010	Webster; 1/5/2011
CAG 2010 Survey	Logue/CAG; 1/4/2011
Operating Procedures	Logue/Holland; 1/5/2011
CAG Member List	Webster; 1/5/2011

<b>Document Description</b>	<b>Generated by; Date</b>
Project Timelines	EPA; 1/5/2011
Resolution: marked up and clean versions	Webster; 1/5/2011