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)
April 20, 2011 Meeting Summary

Site Name:	DuPont Pompton Lakes RCRA
Meeting Location:	Civic Center, 25 Lenox Avenue, Pompton Lakes, New Jersey
Meeting Date:	April 20, 2011
Meeting Time:	7:00 p.m. – 9:30 p.m. EDT

Future CAG Meeting Times

- Wednesday, May 4, 2011, 7:00 p.m. – 9:30 p.m. EDT
  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), Robert Spiegel (Edison Wetlands Association, alternate for Dana Patterson), 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).

Technical Assistance Services for Communities (TASC) Team:
Bill Logue

Public Present:
Helen Martens, Rich Lombardo, Ellie Lombardo, Edward Meakem, Lucille Pepper, Karen Magee, Gina Sisco, Karen Dean, Eu Proffit, Abe Gole, Jimmy Rose, Cheryl Rubino, Jefferson H. LaSala, Gitte Curtiss, Anne Tacinelli, Don Tacinelli, Auselia Ioneseci, Sandy Mancini, Dorothy Mancini, Floyd Kurt, Mike Simone, Lisa Kihlberg, Michael Keough, John Soojian, Kevin Harrison.

One name was not legible.

I. Discussion Related to Removal of CAG Member

Facilitator Bill Logue opened the special meeting which was requested by the Administrative Committee to address membership composition and issues related to the CAG Operating Procedures. He stated that because he was facilitating and taking notes the meeting summary would be brief.

Mr. Logue asked if there were any proposed changes or amendments to the agenda circulated prior to the meeting. Liz Kachur said that she had sent a notice to Lisa Riggiola regarding Ms. Riggiola's removal as a CAG member and asked that this be considered at the outset of the meeting. Robert Spiegel, citing his lengthy experience with multiple CAGs, asked why the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was not present at the meeting. He stated that he thought EPA's absence from the meeting was unusual and the first time such circumstances had occurred in his experience. Mr. Spiegel also inquired as to who at EPA made the decision not to attend. Mr. Logue replied that, to his knowledge, EPA regards CAGs as community-driven and because this meeting was about membership and administrative issues they decided not to attend. Mr. Logue explained he was not aware who at EPA made the decision and encouraged Mr. Spiegel to contact EPA directly. Mr. Spiegel later asked about members' experience sitting on other CAGs. A member replied that they did not sit on other CAGs but had reviewed meeting minutes and videos of other CAG meetings.

Ms. Riggiola asked why the removal issue was not included in the Administrative Committee summary. She was told that the removal was an added issue. Ms. Riggiola asked that a letter and e-mail sent to her by Mrs. Kachur be read aloud, because she felt she and the public had been attacked in the letter and e-mail. Mrs. Kachur read the letter and the e-mail.[1] both items are attached to this meeting summary.

Mrs. Kachur articulated some of the reasons she was requesting Ms. Riggiola's removal.[2] These include that Ms. Riggiola did not adhere to the CAG's Operating Procedures. According to Mrs. Kachur, Ms. Riggiola's actions included:

- Not being prepared for CAG meetings and using meeting time to correct Meeting Summaries. The Facilitators requested that suggested corrections be made via e-mail and this was not done.
- Responding slowly concerning resolutions thereby slowing work of the CAG.
- Not participating in any work groups and speaking disparagingly with an expletive about the formation of the work groups.
- Not behaving with appropriate conduct at meetings, i.e., not in accordance with the "member expectations" portion of the Operating Procedures.

[1] The letter and e-mail can be found at the end of the summary.

[2] A full list can be found at the end of the summary.

Mrs. Kachur further noted that she felt that Ms. Riggiola had not been transparent about input from Bill Wolf in submitting comments leaving the impression the comments were from community members.

Ms. Riggiola explained that her actions are on behalf of the people, particularly residents living in the plume. She continued that it takes time to gather their input and that this input had added value to the resolutions. She noted that Mr. Wolf is an advisor to CCPL. It was her understanding from meetings with EPA, that the CAG was convened because of the actions of plume residents and that it was formed to assist plume residents. She expressed disappointment that more CAG members had not participated in the EPA vapor intrusion listening sessions about adding vapor intrusion as a Superfund listing criteria. Mrs. Kachur noted that she had submitted comments online. Bill Pendexter noted his support of the criteria and asked Mr. Spiegel if he had heard opposition from any communities. Mr. Spiegel said he had not.

Michele Belfiore stated her concern at EPA's absence from the special meeting. She stated her opinion that unproductive disagreements among CAG members are largely personality-based, and are shifting the focus away from ensuring DuPont meets it cleanup obligations. Ms. Belfiore encouraged all CAG members to set aside their differences, follow the Conduct at Meetings and move forward together in making suggestions to solve the problems facing the community. She said she felt that everyone shares the same goal: cleanup. She stated that Ms. Riggiola had valuable information to contribute. In response to a comment, Ms. Riggiola provided information that there are 22 Superfund sites nationally where DuPont is the responsible party.

Steve Grayberg said that, even if Ms. Riggiola is removed, he hoped that she will continue to provide input because of her knowledge and background. He articulated his concerns with respect to her participation, noting Ms. Riggiola's actions in: extending discussion of the Operating Procedures; demanding that CAG members resign because they did not participate in the permit-change public meeting; stating distrust about DuPont's sampling methods, but then speaking against the resolution on unannounced audits; stating concern about the number of contaminants, but not participating in the TASC request for technical assistance in understanding the number of contaminants until after the date for input passed; and requesting names of people who withdrew their names from consideration as CAG members. Mr. Grayberg noted that he has a sense that there is an alternate agenda that is not transparent, which is creating friction and adversarialness.

Ms. Riggiola stated that she reads information in advance of meetings and that the corrections made during meetings of the summaries are to inform the public. Her goal is transparency with respect to this and nominations. Ms. Belfiore suggested several options for handling meeting summaries more expeditiously while maintaining transparency. This included sending corrections via e-mails and providing red-line versions at the meeting for the public.

Ms. Riggiola was asked why she did not participate in work groups. She said she was uncomfortable that Community Outreach Work Group members had been voted in and a meeting had been scheduled without Dana Patterson's presence. Mr. Logue clarified that under the

Operating Procedures participation in all work groups is open to members and alternates on a volunteer basis not by voting and that several e-mails had been sent to Ms. Patterson over the course of a week trying to schedule the meeting to ensure her attendance. When there was no response, the teleconference meeting was scheduled and Ms. Patterson, CAG members and alternates were informed of the date and time.

Public Comment

Michael Keough: believes that Ms. Riggiola has been making the point that the public and town are important and her points are not personal in promoting a group. He feels that there may be personal agendas from others, although he hopes not, based on past membership in CCPL of Mrs. Kachur and that after her departure from CCPL her name remained on forms filed with the IRS for a Federal ID number and that this had not been brought to the attention of the IRS or CCPL. He has expressed to EPA the need for efficacy for the public to make progress, including addressing the negative to make positive progress, and not filtering or suppressing the public voice. He feels that other CAGs do not allow the polluter to keep in control. Mrs. Kachur replied that she had not finished the process with respect to the IRS.

Cheryl Rubino: stated there would not be a CAG without the actions of Ms. Riggiola. The group should have the same agenda of cleanup. Without Ms. Riggiola's advocacy there would not be testing for 61 chemicals or independent contractors. In addition, Ms. Riggiola has continued to voice the public's concerns and requested that the CAG allow for extra time for Ms. Riggiola to gather input on the public's concerns.

Karen Magee: asked if the CAG's Operating Procedures provided an opportunity to correct behavior, similar to corporate employment situations, before a person can be voted off. She suggested that if the procedures do not allow this, they should be adjusted to do so.

Regina Sisco: stated that the CAG is for the residents.

Ed Meakem: stated he is troubled that the CAG's Operating Procedures do not require an explanation be given for a drastic step such as in the notice of removal. Without Ms. Riggiola and Mr. Spiegel the CAG would not been formed. The CAG needs to move forward.

Rich Lombardo: noted that when the CAG was proposed he welcomed it and was told by EPA representatives that plume residents would form the majority of the CAG. The plume is the top priority. There should be no closed voting and there should be public input in the CAG's decisions. His name should have been submitted for an interview and membership. He thanked Ms. Riggiola.

Jefferson LaSala: stated that without Ms. Riggiola there would not be a CAG and the actions regarding Ms. Riggiola's removal are hypocritical. The residents' voices need to be heard. He noted one member had not spoken at any meeting and he felt this was a neglect of duty. He feels that E^2 made a mistake in recommending people with personality differences to be on the CAG. There are agendas on both sides of the Superfund issue. At the January 2010 meeting with

Regional Administrator Enck those present were informed that there would not be a Superfund designation. The Borough Council has opposed Superfund and a political agenda exists. He believes the polluter should answer. Mr. Wolf speaks for the residents and Edison Wetlands has funded technical analysis.

Helen Martens: emphasized that Ms. Riggiola represents people living in the plume. If Ms. Riggiola is removed then Ms. Belfiore and Ms. Patterson would be the only remaining representatives of plume residents on the CAG. Without Ms. Riggiola's membership on the CAG, she feels the plume residents would not have a voice. People need to work together in the best interest of having a cleanup; homes are losing value.

Gitte Curtiss: The Health CAG has been productive and an open forum. As a recent United States citizen she values freedom of speech; which should not be stifled. Cleanup is the common goal. She questions the motives and agendas of members. Ms. Riggiola has worked on behalf of residents.

John Soojian: noted there are five plume residents or long-term, former-plume residents on the CAG and with Ms. Patterson, who is an advocate for residents, there are six of the nine CAG members representing the plume. He noted that Dr. Pendexter had not had an opportunity to share his expertise because of delays related to procedural issues during CAG meetings.

Kevin Harrison: stated he is a plume resident but not a member of any group. He feels the CAG does not represent him and that things are not getting done because of the people who are on the CAG. Ms. Riggiola is his neighbor, she speaks to him and many people in her neighborhood and collects concerns to bring to the CAG. She is bringing their agenda not her own. She should not be shut down and the CAG's membership should change. He stated he did not know Mrs. Kachur but felt that she did not represent him as a plume resident and asked the public if they thought she should be voted from the CAG.

Jimmy Rose: noted he has attended a number of meetings. In his view, people are not working together. All members speak for plume residents. There are violations of decorum at meetings.

Anne Tacinelli: stated she has attended several meetings and has not spoken to Ms. Riggiola recently but knows of her devotion and the devotion of others. There is a personality conflict. Ms. Riggiola should be part of the CAG.

Dorothy Mancini: (later in the meeting) stated Ms. Riggiola has done a lot, she receives e-mails from Ms. Riggiola and people feel hurt because things are not being done.

CAG Discussion Continued

Abby Novak stated she appreciates Ms. Riggiola's experience and the work she has done but in her own experience on committees feels that the meetings are adversarial and Ms. Riggiola is behind this. She knows many people in the community and encouraged people to call her with issues they wish to raise. The CAG provides an opportunity for positive change. Ms. Novak feels

she was attacked by the public for asking questions about the process by which private contractors work on homes. She was brought up in the plume and has raised children there and she wants it cleaned up. People should not be attacking each other, the CAG needs to be given the opportunity to work for the benefit of people and not be shut down.

Dr. Pendexter noted that he had not been asked any questions concerning his expertise.

Ms. Riggiola stated she had been attacked online in comments and in news articles.

Ms. Belfiore noted her experience on committees and boards in the town and as a business owner and observed that the dysfunction of the group has allowed DuPont to avoid being held accountable.

Mr. Spiegel agreed and noted that the permit-change request was withdrawn by DuPont because the community objected to less monitoring. He then read a letter from Ms. Patterson in which she and Edison Wetlands resigned from the CAG. He stated that another group was forming to represent the community.

Ms. Riggiola resigned from the CAG.

Ms. Riggiola and Mr. Spiegel left the meeting. Due to the resignations no vote was taken on Ms. Riggiola's removal.

II. Other Business

Mr. Logue reminded all present of the importance of working together and the credibility gained from speaking with a unified voice; the CAG will be able to influence decisions regarding the site and assist the agencies and DuPont to prioritize work based on community needs. Several members noted that the CAG has made some progress with the unannounced audit resolution and the TASC request and that they should continue to work together to make progress.

The CAG discussed that, in addition to the former-plume-resident seat, there are now two open seats: one for representing plume residents and the other for broader environmental interests. Members asked Ms. Rubino about her interest in the new former-plume-resident member position given the events of the evening. Several CAG members expressed the sentiment that Ms. Rubino would be a valuable and committed addition to the group. Ms. Rubino stated that she felt Ms. Riggiola was an important member and that the CAG needed to address its functioning at this time and asked that the vote on her membership be tabled for several months.

After additional discussion, the CAG voted unanimously to create a new member position for an additional plume resident. The Administrative Committee will meet to set a timeline for nominations and elections. Members stated the need to identify and actively solicit people who may be interested.

Members will review the CAG's Operating Procedures to consider any amendments and changes.

The proposed agenda for the May meeting was reviewed. It includes an overview of expectations for the site visit; presentation, discussion and public comment on the site areas of concern; presentation, discussion and public comment on the sole source aquifer and lake reservoir status issues; and the Lake Work Group update and discussion. Mr. Logue will review the proposed agenda with EPA and NJDEP concerning presentations and suggested changes.

Attachment 1: Letters read by Liz Kachur during the April 20, 2011 Special CAG Meeting at the request of Lisa Riggiola

February 24, 2011 Letter

To all the members of the Pompton Lakes Environmental Community Advisory Group,

Community advisory groups are convened across the country at various sites dealing with pollution so that the people affected by the pollution can have input on how remediation takes place. These groups are created after a stakeholder's report is completed and submitted to the United States Environmental Protection Agency. In a stakeholder's report individuals are identified, interviewed and potential conflicts of interest are reviewed. The group is assembled to represent a cross section of a community to assure that all sides of an issue are considered. The residents of Pompton Lakes have longed deserved such input in our current situation, but now this input is being disparaged because some feel their concerns are not being heard. I could not disagree more with this statement.

As part of the assessment for the stakeholder's report for our town, the group known as Citizens for a Clean Pompton Lakes (CCPL) was identified as one of the stakeholders. Ms. Riggiola is the CCPL representative appointed to participate on the CAG. It is Ms. Riggiola's responsibility to bring the concerns of her members to the CAG discussions.

At our meeting last night, comments were made by members of the public that they believe "everyone should be a participant on the CAG". Having more than one representative from any organization on the CAG would negate the work done so far to create a diverse representation of the residents. I would even say it would be similar to having two members from the same household on the CAG at the same time. I know this was discussed as a concern for some members last November.

However, later in the same meeting a reference was made to the ineffectiveness of the Health CAG. Unlike the Environmental CAG, the Health CAG was formatted as an open public forum for anyone who wanted to attend. This format may be one of the primary reasons why this group has been unable to accomplish anything to date. To expect a group to be able to come to a consensus or get through items on an agenda without following some formal rules of order is preposterous. As we have witnessed over the previous 2 ½ years of public meetings/forums on this pollution issue, such a forum only leads to long meetings without much to show at the end. Pompton Lakes' residents deserve a more productive form of input.

The Pompton Lakes Environmental Community Advisory Group must be allowed to function and accomplish the tasks we all committed to when accepting our appointment to the group. We have a responsibility to the individuals that we each represent to move the community forward and begin to see real progress for Pompton Lakes. This group has the ability to create a positive outcome resulting from constructive dialog with the agencies. I believe that this can be accomplished, with support from our elected officials and the agencies involved.

I am officially requesting that ground rules for conduct and input during the meetings be adhered to, without exception, so we can make progress. There are meetings that occur every day throughout this country that require the public to adhere to guidelines when they are part of the meeting. There are commonly accepted rules for decorum, decency, and courtesy that must be the standard for these meetings as well. The public does not have the right to speak at meetings of the Pompton Lakes Borough Council, the Pompton Lakes Board of Education, the Pompton Lakes Zoning Board, or the Pompton Lakes Planning Board except for specific public comment opportunities. Contrary to recent comments made, this is not a stifling of any one person's right to freedom of speech. It is about respecting everyone's right to assemble and get our work done. When members of the public become disruptive to the meeting (i.e. shouting from the audience, interrupting someone who is speaking, disrespecting facilitators or members of the CAG, loud outbursts, etc) they impede the work of the group. These behaviors border on the legal definition of disruptive behavior at public meetings (N.J.S.A. 2C:33-8). Let's try to remember the CAG is trying to get work done on behalf of the residents.

I am also officially requesting that the representative from the CCPL, Ms. Riggiola, be reminded of her obligations to the Pompton Lakes Environmental Community Advisory Group. These obligations include that all CAG members comply with operating procedures and work civilly and collaboratively with other members. At this point, it is my opinion that Ms. Riggiola's conduct is detrimental to the CAG. Ms. Riggiola's conduct at meetings is adversarial and in direct contrast with the conduct at meetings guidelines that each member agreed to when accepting the position of CAG member (page 6, operating procedures).

There is a place at the table for all views. To remain there, I believe each person must commit to working with others. Anything less would be keeping things as they are, haven't we been stuck in neutral long enough?

Sincerely yours,
Elizabeth Kachur

March 3, 2011 E-mail

Subject: Fair representation or undue influence?

Ms. Riggiola,
I wanted to address a comment that was made by you last night at our P.L. Environmental CAG meeting. Toward the beginning of our Administrative Committee portion of the meeting, you asked what stakeholder interest I represented on the CAG. If it had been a genuine question, I clearly answered you with the response I gave. However, it is my belief that this question was a continuation of your ongoing attempt to disparage me and my place on the CAG.
I will not attempt to explain the importance of diversity on the CAG, since this has already been discussed and discounted by you. I am concerned that your attempt to increase the CAG size has more to do with politicking and playing a numbers game with votes on issues. The pretense is that the plume residents are not represented. However, the number of plume advocates versus outside of the plume interests on the existing CAG do not support your continued diatribe.
The comment that numerous letters have been sent to the agencies about this issue only supports my belief that there is a concerted effort by you to manipulate the procedures and purpose of this group to serve the CCPL's needs, not the entire community's needs. There was a strong push by your group to send such letters to "voice" their concerns. You have never allowed for the possibility that the original group could be effective. You came out of the gates swinging, without a clear reason.

In January 2010, when Lisa Plevin was announced as the new Chief of Staff for the Region 2 Administrator, you made a statement that the Pompton Lakes plume residents had a friend at the US EPA. At a few meetings you have made statements that to some have been seen as veiled threats when things have not gone the way you wanted. I am concerned that you have used your personal connections with staff at the US EPA in an attempt to manipulate our group's membership.

A member of your group has called for a complete "reformatting and restructuring" of the current CAG. Provoking residents with your adversarial manner and your constant plotting to undermine the efforts of the group is in clear violation of everything that the CAG stands for. You have slandered my name and publicly insinuated that my motives are not known. You have maliciously made false claims to others regarding my integrity. I would have to say that your motives are becoming more clear as time goes on.

You have made no secret of your wish to have our neighborhoods, or possibly the entire town, declared a Superfund site. You have spent considerable time telling anyone who will listen about how much everyone is suffering and how no one is helping. I am going to go so far as to say that it is my belief that you are deliberately sabotaging the efforts of almost everyone on the P.L. Environmental CAG to have one of two effects:

1. You intend to alienate everyone on the CAG who does not agree with you so that all that is left are your supporters; or
2. Your efforts officially incapacitate the P.L. CAG, and then you can say that nothing is

getting done and that we need Superfund status NOW!

If these beliefs are not accurate, I am asking you to begin to work with all of us to serve the community and get something accomplished. We do not have to agree, but our disagreements do not have to create a constant diversion at our monthly meetings. If my assumptions are accurate, know that I will ask for your removal from our group if you continue to behave in a manner that is direct opposition to the operating procedures; specifically the Section I. Role, Mission & Goals & Section II. Roles and Responsibilities of the Participants.

Take care,
Liz Kachur

Attachment 2: Mrs. Kachur's reasons for requesting Ms. Riggiola's removal from the CAG

I believe it has come to a point in our group that the call for the removal of one member involved in the Pompton Lakes Environmental Community Advisory Group. From the first paragraph of the operating procedures adopted by the CAG on November 3, 2010:

> *"The purpose of this US EPA group is to represent the interests of the community and the stakeholders, to receive and share information, and to provide advice and input regarding the remediation of the DuPont site."*

As an original member of the Citizens for a Clean Pompton Lakes, I can say with confidence that the group was important for the large majority of residents who felt betrayed and powerless to the situation they were dealing with. As time went on, the group has become more fractured and the true membership of the CCPL is but a fraction of the original people that signed the initial petition to local, state and federal lawmakers asking for help.

People may have different opinions as to why the group has fractured and changed so often, but the fact remains that this community group no longer represents the majority of plume households.

Ms. Riggiola has made it quite clear at numerous CAG meetings that she is not willing to work with other members of the community that have been identified as stakeholders by an independent facilitator. Ms. Riggiola has stated publicly and in writing that the CCPL and its members demand the resignation of CAG members and that they do not trust certain CAG members.

Utilizing the operating procedures that were adopted by the group on November 3rd, the following issues are an ongoing concern in terms of Ms. Riggiola's conduct at meetings:

1. CAG member expectations:

Page 2 of Operating Procedures (O.P.) Regarding the roles and responsibilities of the participants:

> *"The CAG will advise EPA and NJDEP on issues regarding the Site.*
> *To do this, CAG members are expected to:*
> • *Review meeting summaries prior to next CAG meeting.*

Meeting minutes and all supporting documents are sent out in advance from the facilitators. These documents are meant to be reviewed and the member is expected to be ready to discuss the issues at the meeting. Changes or adjustments to meeting minutes should be sent to the facilitators once each member reads through the minutes. This way any & all corrections can be made prior to the meeting. This saves valuable meeting time to discuss important matters, as opposed to clerical issues.

> • *Participate in work group activities.*

Work group membership is expected of every CAG member and is handled on a volunteer basis. Ms. Riggiola has refused to work within the workgroups. A lot of productive work goes on between meetings within the workgroups.

• *Comply with these Operating Procedures.*
• *Work **civilly and collaboratively** with other CAG members and strive towards consensus agreements.*

2. Conduct at meetings:

We all attend these meetings and adhere to the guidelines for conduct, despite the fact that we do not agree on many issues. Each member of this group has the right to disagree. What needs to be understood is that "disagreeing" does not mean "disrespecting and attacking". Encouraging disruptions at the meetings is counterproductive to working civilly and collaboratively.

The level of confusion and mistrust surrounding the installation of vapor mitigation systems has prevented a large number of residents / property owners from putting systems on their homes. This is true even after the third party option was announced. During the December 2010 meeting, the issue of gathering information for resident who have not had a VMS installed yet was initiated by the USEPA's David Kluesner, but summarily dismissed as something the CCPL has taken care of. How is this helping the residents who are still trying to decide what they want to do. We continue to hear references to "shoddy installations" and "lack of proper inspections", yet Ms. Riggiola refuses to give real hard evidence to where these shoddy systems are. It is my opinion that this goes against the agreement to work with the agencies.

We all come to the table from very different areas of our town, bringing with us the opinions and concerns of those "stakeholders" whom we represent. Somehow there is the impression that Ms. Riggiola represents every plume resident and the rest of the CAG members are political appointees. There has been a concerted effort to give misinformation to rally support for this concept. At more than one CAG meeting, Ms. Riggiola has publicly stated these same comments.

The facilitators are chastised when they attempt to enforce the rules outlined for the meeting in our operating procedures. It is my opinion that these rules allow for a productive, respectful meeting. Without adherence to these rules, there is chaos.For example, from page 6 "Conduct at Meetings":
Participants agree to follow the facilitator's guidance regarding conduct at meetings and agree to adhere to the following guidelines:
Listen as an ally, not as an adversary. Listen with an open mind and heart.
*Speak one at a time; **interruptions and side conversations are distracting and disrespectful.***
Disagree respectfully and openly, not in private.
Focus on the issue, not the speaker.
Treat each other with respect as you would like to be treated.
Allow all members to participate equally; avoid dominating
Honor time limits.

Threatening "problems" if personal requests are not honored, threatening quitting the CAG if a vote does not go her way, willfully disrespecting people that have committed themselves to this process. Threatening behavior is not civil.

In one meeting Ms. Riggiola was creating a lot of disruption during the CAG meeting and can be heard on the audio version of the meeting repeating that "this is b*******" and went so far as to physically move her seat to where she wasn't even facing the group anymore, but having side conversations instead. This continued behavior get in the way of the group having open communication.

3. Personal Attacks
from page 9 of O.P.:
"Personal attacks and prejudiced statements will not be tolerated. As provided in Section II. 4, A CAG member (or work group member) whose conduct is detrimental to the CAG process may be considered for removal."
When members of the CAG are questioned in such a way as to create suspicion or imply ulterior motives, it is my opinion that this is a personal attack. Considerable effort has been put into this line of behavior. It is counterproductive.

4. **Refusing to work with the CAG**
Ms. Riggiola usually does not communicate with the CAG members, unless it is in an attempt to slow down any requests to the agencies. There have been numerous occasions when resolutions have been delayed for MONTHS because of last minute objections. The material that is often being rejected had previously been requested by many CAG members (once or twice by Ms. Riggiola herself) and there was plenty of time to respond in a meeting, but asked for more time. If Ms. Riggiola were truly conferring with her CCPL members, then she should have circulated the resolution when she first received it for input, or at the very least brought the concerns of the group back to the CAG when requested and then the CCPL concerns can be incorporated into the resolution.

Often the reaction from Ms. Riggiola is one of mistrust or suspicion when all of her requests are not accepted without question. Working with a group of individuals means we all need to give and take and learn to communicate through the disagreements. It is my belief that Ms. Riggiola has no intention of working with the CAG this way. Often a request to delay the resolution happens in the last few minutes of a decision deadline. It gets to a point where nothing is able to move forward, no requests to the agencies overseeing the project are finalized, and all progress stops. Personally, I have come to believe that is the sole intention of Ms. Riggiola/CCPL.

Leaving the CAG out of the discussions with agencies and facilitators has continued to be a stumbling block for me. Many emails are sent directly to USEPA personnel each month, in my opinion to circumvent the CAG and leave the community out of decision making. The only opinion that Ms. Riggiola believes has merit is those who agree with her/her group. A request for specific people to handle an independent investigation (David Folkes of EnviroGroup Ltd out of Colorado) when the CAG was actively trying to request a TASC grant for this same purpose from the US EPA? When the CAG's TASC request finally was formalized, there was unnecessary conflict and confusion surrounding that vote.

Continuing to call for more plume representation, but not submitting names of actual plume residents to be considered, is another example of how our valuable meeting time is being sidelined by the confusing behavior of Ms. Riggiola.

The most important point I want to make about this entire issue is that the needs and concerns of the entire community of Pompton Lakes are not being addressed in a timely manner because we have spent considerable time debating issues that move Pompton Lakes no further towards a full cleanup. We can each have our own opinion of how that cleanup needs to be addressed, but to stand in the way of this community group, comprised of a cross-section of our town residents, is detrimental to the function of the group.