



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)
February 2011 Meeting Summary**

Site Name: DuPont Pompton Lakes RCRA
Meeting Location: Pompton Lakes Civic Center, 25 Lenox Avenue, Pompton Lakes, New Jersey
Meeting Date: February 23, 2011
Meeting Time: 7:00 p.m. – 9:30 p.m. EST, with an EPA Availability Session held from 6:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m. EST

Future CAG Meeting Times

- Wednesday, March 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), 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:

Bill Logue and Kirby Webster

Ex Officio Members Present:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA): David Kluesner, Clifford Ng, Barry Tornick, Barbara Finazzo, Adolph Everett, Michael McGowan
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR): Elena Vaouli

Public Present:

Abe Goll, Ken Snowe, Helen Martens, Regina Sisco, Gitte Curtiss, Edward Meakem, Michael Garbe, Dennis Caufield, Dorothy Caufield, Bern Weintraub, Leiry Gonzalez, Jacky Grindrod, Carl P. Padula, Cheryl Rubino, Karen Magee, Michelle Lee, Mary DeMarco, Rich Lombardo, Bruce Weiner, Carolyn Fefferman, Daria A. Sweeney, Aurelia Ioneseci, Michael A. Keough, John Soojian

I. Welcome and Administrative Updates

Bill Logue welcomed everyone to the rescheduled February 2 CAG meeting. He reminded everyone about the conduct for meetings and Commitment to Civility. He reviewed the documents distributed for the meeting.¹ In response to feedback concerning his statements at the January meeting, Dave Kluesner stated that the community has suffered from pollution for a long time. He noted EPA's mission is to ensure DuPont conducts the cleanup. He expressed regret if his statements had taken the focus away from that and committed to working with everyone at the table.

Barbara Finazzo, EPA Region 2, introduced herself. She explained that she currently works directly with Judith Enck and will continue to support communications among EPA staff, New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) and CAG members. The CAG members all introduced themselves.

Mr. Logue asked for January meeting summary corrections other than the one received via e-mail. Bill Pendexter discussed a comment made in the January Meeting Summary on Page 4 that suggested that Lisa Riggiola's question about affiliation with DuPont was directed at him. Ms. Riggiola believes that she was addressing the entire CAG, not just Dr. Pendexter. The audio recording will be reviewed to clarify the statements. In response to a CAG member question, Mr. Logue noted that potential conflicts of interest were reviewed during the assessment process. The CAG unanimously accepted the January summary, once the changes are made to accurately reflect the comment concerning DuPont affiliation. Mr. Logue asked members to e-mail comments and corrections in advance of meetings to make effective use of meeting time. Mr. Logue explained that comment cards are available for the public and the agenda for this evening's meeting allows for public comment period after each topic.

II. Committee and Work Group Updates

Each Work Group provided a written summary of activities and the chairs made brief presentations. A request was made for more details in the work group summaries.

Technical Work Group

Dr. Pendexter, chair of the technical work group, described the two technical work group meetings that have occurred since the last CAG meeting. The first was by conference call regarding topic interests of the members, and the second was held in person. CAG members then discussed the type of information that could be gathered for the CAG through the technical work group (e.g., the work plan for the pilot test). The work group is circulating questions and will bring them to the CAG when ready. Dana Patterson will gather information on bioremediation, what a pilot test is, and what the test will hope to accomplish in a general sense. Dr. Pendexter plans to briefly present on the Pilot Study work plan to the CAG in the future and will make the work plan available to the CAG via e-mail.

¹ Listed at the end of this summary and available at http://www.epa.gov/region2/waste/duPont_pompton/cag.html
Summary of Pompton Lakes Environmental CAG February 23, 2011 Meeting

Property Valuation / Realtor Outreach Education Work Group

Michele Belfiore, chair of the property valuation / realtor education work group, described the work group's meeting that occurred on January 21, 2011. She explained the need for accurate information noting, for example how Art Kaffka described how a local restaurant customer would not drink water because of contamination concerns. The work group discussed a DuPont program 20 years ago which provided for some buyouts, diminution in value protection and below market rate loans. On April 7, 2011, the Board of Realtors (which includes 2,700 realtors) has been invited to a meeting where DuPont can explain the vapor mitigation systems and the pollution (TCE and PCE). With this knowledge, realtors can provide more information to buyers, including a brochure from DuPont and explanations on exactly what remediation is taking place. The work group will meet again soon; its work will not duplicate the Mayor's efforts with regard to educating realtors.

Ms. Riggiola explained that four people have recently bought homes in Pompton Lakes and since been told that they are contaminated. She asked if there is a town disclosure ordinance. Ms. Belfiore explained that she thinks that the agents must become educated on what they are selling and what the vapor mitigation systems do. She explained that not all agents know what vapor mitigation systems are and agents are selling houses without accurate information. Liz Kachur explained that she tried to sell her house in 2005 and filled out a seller's disclosure. She had heard of a situation where no disclosure was made and asked if there is a way to require this. Ms. Belfiore explained that disclosure is not required by law in foreclosure, but most brokers require agents to fill one out. Ms. Belfiore explained that this helps the sellers avoid future liability. Mr. Logue encouraged CAG members to e-mail Ms. Belfiore if they have ideas for this work group.

During discussion, Mr. Logue reminded CAG members that they represent different perspectives of the community. As a result, CAG members are entitled to their own feelings and CAG members should use differences to understand the situation better and to learn from each other.

Lake Remediation Work Group

Steve Grayberg, chair of the lake remediation work group, explained that the lake remediation work group met twice by conference call since the last CAG meeting. The first meeting was to provide general guidance to be submitted to EPA on information that will be covered in the lake remediation presentation. This input was refined during the second meeting, where the work group developed specific requests for EPA to speak to during their presentation at the CAG meeting. Topics included the remediation decision process and involvement of the public at the right time and also public awareness throughout the lake remediation. Because of visibility, noise and the length of time the lake remediation will take, providing public notice and input at the proper time is of critical importance.

Ms. Riggiola provided questions that she would like addressed by EPA or the lake remediation work group including:

- Will all of the contaminants be removed from the lake?
- Will all recreational activities including swimming be able to be conducted once the remediation is complete?
- Is there a way to measure to prevent recontamination?

- How can recontamination be prevented?

Ms. Belfiore agreed that she would like recreation in the lake again and noted that water is entering the lake from Oakland and is not clean water. Ms. Riggiola asked about a communications consultant hired by the town and funded by DuPont. Mr. Kaffka explained that Dot O'Connor was hired to write articles for the newspaper.

Community Outreach Work Group

The Community Outreach Group currently has one member so has not yet met.

Administrative Committee

Mrs. Kachur, chair of the Administrative Committee, explained that over two meetings the Administrative Committee reviewed the role of the committee which includes overseeing nomination and election of new members and reminding members to follow the Operating Procedures. Mrs. Kachur reminded everyone to announce work group meetings in advance so that CAG members or alternates can participate. The Committee discussed public comment, the time for comment, and the need for opportunities to raise questions to the agencies. This resulted in the suggestion of collecting public comment cards and hosting agency availability sessions before the CAG meetings. Ms. Belfiore suggested that public comment could be received via a dedicated e-mail address. This would be for convenience of the public to provide questions to the agencies or the CAG to answer.

The Committee suggested e-mail guidelines:

- All e-mails should remain civil.
- If you are on the "to" line you can reply with comment; if you are in the "cc" line the e-mail has been sent as a courtesy, so please direct any comments through a CAG member.
- The subject line should be adequately descriptive.
- Any e-mail requiring a reply should be answered or at least acknowledged within 48 hours, if possible.

Mrs. Kachur explained that the Committee discussed the process for nominating new stakeholder interests and CAG members. The topic of adding additional CAG members will be addressed during the March CAG meeting.

III. Overview of Proposed Lake Remediation Activities

Mr. Logue introduced Barry Tornick, EPA Region 2, who presented on the proposed lake remediation activities.² Mr. Tornick explained that the remediation will address portions of the Lake Delta and immediate uplands. He stated that the goal of the presentation is to help the CAG understand the project and process for public input and provide feedback for how EPA can be responsive to the community. Decisions have not yet been made.

² Presentation is available at: http://www.epa.gov/region02/waste/duPont_pompton/cag.html.

Permit process – permit modification

When NJDEP was lead for the site under their Administrative Order on Consent, dredging was approved as part of the remedy in a Remedial Action Selection Report. EPA subsequently became the lead for the lake remediation. The remedy will be formally selected and imposed through a permit modification. The draft Permit Modification will propose the specific remedial approach. There will be opportunity for feedback from stakeholders on the draft permit modification, and then the final remedy will be imposed.

Objectives of the delta/lake remediation

Sediments and uplands soil exceed ecological standards but not human health standards for mercury and lead. The ecological standards are more stringent. The 2009 Remedial Action Selection Report proposed wet dredging for lake sediments and excavation for soils. DuPont has agreed not to utilize on-site disposal. Mrs. Kachur asked if on-site disposal means on-site processing of the soil and asked where the soil will be treated. Mr. Tornick responded that it is not yet known where or how the sediments will be treated. However, it has been decided that final disposal of the sediments will not be on the DuPont (Pompton Lakes) site. In response to a question from Mr. Grayberg, Mr. Tornick explained that wet dredging was selected by DuPont because of the lack of potential for odors and dust. The CAG and public may still comment on the issue. Mr. Tornick noted that either method, wet dredging or dry dredging, can achieve the same cleanup result.

Mr. Tornick further explained that the mercury impacted sediment will be removed to meet ecological health standards because the mercury compounds in the soil can be converted to another form that bioaccumulates more easily (e.g. builds up in tissues of living organisms). Mrs. Kachur asked who sets the human health and ecological standards. Mr. Tornick stated that NJDEP set this standard, since they were the lead. Mr. Tornick responded that ecological standards are quite a bit lower than human health standards in response to a question from Dr. Pendexter.

The current scope of work for the lake remediation is summarized in the Corrective Measures Implementation Work Plan submitted in 2010. Approximately 68,800 cubic yards of sediment will be removed over 26 acres. Mr. Tornick responded to a question from Mrs. Kachur stating that fecal coliform and other bacteria are why there is an advisory against swimming. Ms. Novak asked if this is a transient situation. Ms. Riggiola noted that the local environmental officer says that the lake is currently clean enough to swim in. Ms. Finazzo responded that post-cleanup traces of mercury will not impact swimming but bacteria could be an ongoing issue. Therefore, DuPont actions alone will not completely clean the lake.

Mr. Tornick responded to Tim Troast that sediment had been sampled throughout the Lake. The determination of the area to be dredged was based on limiting future exposure. Additional detail will be provided at subsequent meetings by EPA and NJDEP risk and dredging staff.

Mr. Tornick continued, noting that rigid barriers would separate contaminated sediment dredging from the rest of the lake. Barrier placement was indicated on a map. DuPont will obtain state and

local zoning, wetlands and other relevant permits necessary to complete the remediation in addition to the permit modification from EPA.

Ms. Belfiore asked why EPA does not spot check information received from DuPont or take its own samples. Mr. Tornick responded that this is not part of the usual RCRA process; however the agency response to the CAG resolution regarding sampling will address some of this. Ms. Finazzo explained that usually just oversight is provided by EPA for these types of efforts and split samples are sometimes analyzed. Ms. Belfiore explained that 20 years ago DuPont performed a cleanup that was insufficient and therefore there is doubt and distrust in the community that this cleanup will be sufficient. Ms. Riggiola explained that EPA needs to have hands on oversight for the town to be comfortable with the cleanup and that DuPont has had the reigns for too long. Ms. Finazzo acknowledged Ms. Riggiola's request for oversight of the lake clean-up effort and also explained that a TASC technical advisor could be requested by the CAG.

Mr. Tornick continued, discussing the upland soil (lake shore and dry portions of the delta) remedial action objectives. There are separate standards for surface and subsurface soils. The Corrective Measures Implementation Work Plan calls for 7,800 cubic yards of soil to be removed from 17 specific upland areas totaling about an acre. Soil removal depths range from 0.5 to 8.5 feet using conventional excavation equipment. DuPont is required to have permits for this work. Mr. Tornick showed a map delineating where remediation will occur.

The permit modification will address sediment dredging, upland soil excavation, and amounts of material to be removed. The rest of the project information will be in the Project Operations Plan including dredging and excavation methods, material handling and transport methods, dewatering/solidification methods, deposition of sediment and soil, and restoration details. Mr. Tornick responded to a question saying there are a limited number of experienced contractors and each has specific skills in terms of remediation. Mr. Tornick explained that a plan cannot be developed without knowing which technology will be used (specific to contractors) but once a contractor is selected, a direction is set for decisions on issues such as sediment treatment and transport. Mr. Grayberg asked if the community and CAG should provide front end input through DuPont or EPA. Mr. Tornick responded through EPA. The draft of the Corrective Measures Implementation Work Plan has been provided to CAG members. Mr. Grayberg suggested that the Lake Remediation Work Group prepare draft suggestions.

Scope of work

Up to now DuPont has been meeting with the Lake Restoration Committee (of which Steve Grayberg is a member) to identify potential restoration elements. Project information is summarized in the Corrective Measures Implementation Work Plan submitted in December 2010. This includes proposed in-kind replacement with native vegetation, enhancement of aquatic habitat and wetland resources and supplemental upland plantings and erosion control features.

Schedule

In March 2011, DuPont will submit an application for modification to the RCRA permit as discussed earlier in this meeting. Once the application is submitted, EPA will review it and draft

a permit. The draft permit will be released to the public and a public meeting will be held in May or June. The final permit modification is anticipated to be issued in September 2011.

Under the Project Operations Plan:

- DuPont will hire contractors in June 2011.
- In September 2011, DuPont will submit the final Project Operations Plan which will include details mentioned above.
- In October or November 2011, an information session will be conducted to obtain feedback on the Project Operations Plan from stakeholders.
- In December 2011, EPA anticipates approval of the Project Operations Plan.

Mr. Tornick asked for suggestions concerning how EPA can supplement public input into the permit process. Mr. Kluesner explained that EPA will go beyond the minimum required public outreach and welcomes suggestions from the CAG and its work groups. Abby Novak offered to reach out to EPA to discuss how the Project Operations Plan proceeds through the planning board. Mr. Kluesner offered that a DuPont contractor could be available to explain the permitting process. Ms. Belfiore asked if EPA has staff that could explain the dredging processes. Mr. Tornick stated that EPA has experts on dredging. Ms. Finazzo noted that substantive experts are engaged in this project and NJDEP has experts that are also involved. Ms. Finazzo stated it was clear to her that the community would like a more hands on approach for this project by EPA.

Public comments on Lake/Delta Remediation

Mr. Loge asked for questions on this topic from the public.

Bruce Weiner: Mr. Weiner asked what the goal is for lake cleanup, and if there is a point to the cleanup if it still will not be swimmable. He would like to know who did the testing in the lake. He does not believe that DuPont has the community's best interest in their actions. Mr. Weiner would like EPA to do its own investigation. Mr. Tornick explained that the way the RCRA program is set is to have the potentially responsible party pay for and conduct the cleanup. Ms. Finazzo explained that EPA will look into this matter and see what they are able to do. Mr. Kluesner explained that it could be helpful to go through confirmation sampling by EPA.

Edward Meakem: Mr. Meakem asked Mr. Tornick if the criteria for soil removal for lead has changed. Mr. Tornick responded that the cleanup criteria have changed. Mr. Meakem asked if any level of lead is safe. He stated that DuPont petitioned the State of New Jersey to have the criteria changed so half of town got cleaned to the new criteria which was not as stringent. He believes that Oakland needs to be talked to about contaminants coming into the Lake so that total daily maximum loads are reduced so that the lake can be cleaned up. Mr. Meakem wants to make sure there is an emergency plan in place in case the dredge barge has a major malfunction. Mr. Tornick explained that there is a contingency plan as part of the health and safety plan. Mr. Meakem wants to make sure the community is able to put in a request for a public hearing so that nothing is delayed. Ms. Finazzo explained that it is a requirement for EPA to have a public hearing, EPA suggested that the community make a request for additional meetings. Mr. Meakem suggested that notice be given to anyone who is within 500 foot of the area to be

disturbed by the lake remediation. He believes neighbors should be notified and transportation of children and emergency service vehicles not stopped by the remediation.

Gitte Curtiss: Ms. Curtiss stated that she lives near the plume. She would like to know why the lake remediation is being conducted when there are people that still have to live in the plume and sleep in the plume. She would like to be bought out. Mr. Logue responded that next week's agenda addresses the plume area. Mr. Tornick responded that there are quite a few different pieces of remediation that are moving forward at the same time.

Rich Lombardo: Mr. Lombardo stated that he does not trust data submitted by DuPont; he would like DuPont to pay an independent contractor to verify information. If decisions were made without public consent they will not be honored. He asked the CAG if they are aware that the lake has reservoir status and is used for drinking water Mr. Grayberg responded that it does have reservoir status. Mr. Lombardo would like the public to be able to speak throughout the meeting.

Daria Sweeney: Ms. Sweeney stated that she has been a resident since 1968. She wants to know who decided that the lake needs to be dredged and why. Mr. Tornick responded that contaminant concentrations are above ecological standards so the lake needs to be remediated. She wants to know what the positive health preventative result of dredging the lake is. Mr. Tornick responded that it is an ecological health hazard. Mrs. Kachur explained that this is part of environmental laws. Ms. Sweeney thanked everyone for their passion.

Cheryl Rubino: Ms. Rubino asked if there a possibility that Lakeside Park has contamination, and asked if it will be closed during this process. Mr. Tornick explained that this has not been decided yet, and that the staging for the remediation may occur in Rotary Park.

Helen Martens: Ms. Martens stated that we are cleaning the Lake to get rid of chemicals but asked if the delta continues to add pollution to the lake. She asked to where the ground water empties out.

Mary DeMarco: Ms. DeMarco stated that if the lake is safe for people, why are those performing the sampling wearing white protective suits? She would like to know if they will continue to test and still wear white suits when it is cleaner.

IV. EPA Accepting Public Input on Using Vapor Intrusion Threats as Criteria for Superfund Sites

Ms. Finazzo explained that in late January, EPA announced listening sessions about adding vapor intrusion as a factor for scoring possible Superfund sites. There are currently four pathways to determine if a site belongs on the Superfund National Priorities List (NPL). These pathways include exposure through drinking water, air, soils and ecological affects (eating fish tissue). EPA is looking at vapor intrusion as an additional possible pathway. EPA is holding listening sessions around the country to hear from the public. There is a 75-day public comment period ending in mid-April. Comments may be submitted in writing and over the phone. This is a

pre-rule making process, so EPA is in the very early in stages of this process. It would take around 24 months for the process to proceed through formal rule making to become a rule.

Ms Finazzo explained that a mathematical formula is used to measure exposure pathways. If a site scores 28.5 points in the hazard ranking system process then it is acceptable for listing on the NPL. If the site gets a score of 50 for any one exposure pathway it may be placed on the NPL. Just performing the hazard ranking scoring does not make a site a Superfund site. The state also needs to agree if the federal government is paying for a cleanup without a responsible party. EPA will also look to see if there is an active RCRA corrective action ongoing because that would mean that a response process is already in place using a responsible party. The Superfund and RCRA laws have different terminology but are very similar. Mr. Kluesner explained that the press release has been sent to the CAG members about EPA accepting public input on vapor intrusion as criteria for Superfund sites. This will be also be posted on the CAG website. There is a listening session in Virginia tomorrow held by EPA on this topic (February 24, 2011).

Ms. Riggiola asked Ms. Finazzo why a hazard ranking system scoring has not been done in Pompton Lakes. Ms. Finazzo explained that a hazard ranking has not been done because there is a responsible party, who is under permit with EPA and is doing the cleanup. Ms. Finazzo believes that the CAG should have a discussion about the pros and cons of listing versus not listing the site as a Superfund site. Because this site started as an active RCRA site, and the facility is under corrective action at this time, EPA believes that RCRA is the correct regulatory program to use for the cleanup. EPA tends to defer where there is a current RCRA corrective action.

Mr. Logue asked if the CAG would like to have a future discussion of the pros and cons of RCRA versus Superfund, and if such a discussion could be during an availability session before a CAG meeting. Ms. Finazzo offered that EPA can attend and she would bring one of her colleagues. Ms. Belfiore asked if EPA could tell the CAG why Superfund has been a designation for other sites. Ms. Finazzo offered to look into examples. In response to a question from Ms. Riggiola, Ms. Finazzo explained that the number of people that are living in the contaminated area would be considered in a hazard ranking scoring. Mrs. Kachur asked if the hazard ranking system prioritizes risks from the site. Ms. Finazzo explained that imminent risks are looked at and decisions are made based on pathways.

Public comments on EPA Accepting Public Input on Using Vapor Intrusion Threats as Criteria for Superfund Sites

Bruce Weiner: Mr. Weiner stated that he is not convinced that Superfund is the way to go. He would like to know if this could delay cleanup efforts. He believes it will lower property values. EPA will distribute a fact sheet explaining the differences between Superfund and RCRA. Ms. Finazzo responded that if there is a decision to change the site from a RCRA corrective action site to a Superfund site it will take some time, up to two years. She explained that the cleanup activities which are going on now would not stop. But there would have to be a renegotiation of agreements under Superfund with DuPont which will slow things down. Once the decision for the site to become a Superfund site was made, it would change all of the agency people who are working on it and the new people would need to be brought up to speed.

Maria Kent: Ms. Kent asked if there is priority funding among all the Superfund or RCRA sites. She believes there are many Superfund sites where remediation studies are conducted but treatment systems are pulled because funding ran out and more money is not available. Those sites are eyesores with open trenches and wire conduits. She is against changing because we have a company that is paying. Ms. Finazzo explained that for this particular site DuPont would still be required to pay if it became a Superfund site. Under the Superfund program, DuPont would still clean the site themselves with agency oversight. Ms. Kent asked why DuPont isn't fined. Ms. Finazzo responded that they are on a compliance schedule and they have complied.

Gittee Curtiss: Ms. Curtiss asked how much the lake remediation costs. She would like to know where the soil is dumped. She is also wondering why Ms Kachur and Mr. Troast are on every work group. She is concerned that there is a limited forum for speaking that is dominated by two people that she does not know. She is not happy with the CAG set up and she does not trust the CAG.

Liz Kachur responded that the Administrative Committee was decided by vote of the CAG. For every other group CAG members sign up; all CAG members or alternates can be on work groups. Mrs. Kachur stated that she is not on other work groups but as a CAG member participated in the calls. Every CAG member except for one person is on a work group.

Ms. Curtiss asked if there was any nuclear testing on the site. Mr. Tornick responded no. Ms. Curtiss explained that in the annual report there is a reference to nuclear testing. Ms. Finazzo asked the information be sent to her.

Michael Keough: Mr. Keough stated that there is no conclusive evidence that property values would change if the Site turned into a Superfund Site. Mr. Keough stated that he believes that NJDEP and EPA do not have any teeth in enforcement. He believes that if something could get done more quickly maybe property values could be saved. He immensely appreciates that Lisa named him as her alternate but he cannot in good conscience accept. He believes the CAG needs to be reformatted, reorganized and replaced. The people need to be asked their opinions and observers should be participants.

Helen Martens: Ms. Martens stated that she thinks the CAG needs to be expanded with more people from the plume with more input. She believes people should have greater abilities to talk and speak during meetings.

Edward Meakem: Mr. Meakem asked if all off-site contamination beyond the Dupont fence has been investigated and cleaned up. Mr. Tornick responded that it has been investigated.

Daria Sweeney: Ms. Sweeney asked if people have say for how DuPont allocates funds. Ms. Finazzo responded that the remediation work is all going on simultaneously, and if all efforts are put into one remediation it is not going to make it go faster. DuPont is addressing all potential pathways. Ms. Finazzo explained that they are trying to come up with a final solution to deal with ground water. Ms. Sweeney explained that she lived on Barbara Drive and found that six

people died of brain tumors on Barbara Drive. She asked if the cancers can be connected to the contamination. Mrs. Kachur asked if it was connected with the Site, would anything be different. Elena Valouli, ATSDR, explained that health data has been collected and the most recent data is being reviewed.

Mr. Weiner: Mr. Weiner asked who did the investigation. Mr. Tornick responded that DuPont did the investigation. Mr. Weiner believes it is polluted data. He was a member of Health CAG and it is ineffective and is not as well put together as this. He does not believe that you can separate the Environmental and Health CAGs because they are cause and effect. Mr. Weiner believes that the Health CAG and Environmental CAG should be combined.

Helen Martens: Mr. Martens asked why DuPont is making it so impossible for independent contractors to put vapor systems in. Mr. Tornick explained that programs are in place for third party sampling and installation, and both EPA and NJDEP are overseeing it. It was a complicated process, but it is now in place and available. Ms. Martens says that she was tested by O'Brien & Gere, but only had sub-slab testing conducted and now indoor air sampling was denied to her. She would like to know how they can be sure when a system is installed correctly if going on old data. She would like to know what is underneath her house because she had cancer. She is petrified when she uses fans and the dryer. Ms. Finazzo asked Ms. Martens to talk with her after the meeting so she can better understand the situation.

Mrs. Kachur suggested the CAG consider moving the April 6 CAG meeting to the following week because that week is spring vacation for schools. Mr. Kluesner explained that EPA has asked EPA's Ada Oklahoma ground water experts to participate in the April CAG meeting, so he will ask if they can come the following week. The facilitators will poll the CAG.

Written Comments from CAG Suggestion Cards

Regina Sisco: "Regarding the Pilot study that DuPont plans to perform, can you tell me what affect this will have on the health of the Plume Residents? And also the affect it will have on the vapors coming into the homes that do not have a vapor mitigation system on their home.

** Please answer in writing."

Karen Magee: "Regarding sediment and uplands soils and not exceeding human health standards: when was the property last tested, who performed the testing, where are the results of the testing?"

Mary DeMarco: "Will the Lake continue to be tested after sediments are removed? Will testers and removers be required to wear white protective gear during and after the work? Currently testers wear white protective gear. When lake is environmentally and humanly safe will protective gear be necessary."

Bruce Weiner: "I heard that soil was pumped at the Broad Street of Ringwood Avenue, has that ever been tested?"

Bruce Weiner: “Bylaws should be changed to allow greater time for public comment at several points during the meeting.”

Daria Sweeney: “Advertise these CAG meetings more effectively through the Town website and Pompton Lakes Cable Channel.”

Action Items

Item	Who; Date
Post meeting documents on EPA Pompton Lakes CAG website.	Kluesner; 3/2/2011
Prepare and circulate draft meeting summary.	Webster; 3/23/2011

Documents Distributed

Document Description	Generated by; Date
Meeting Agenda	Logue; 2/23/2011
Agency Presentation	EPA; 2/23/2011
Draft Meeting Summary from January 5, 2011	Webster; 2/7/2011
Two Technical Work Group Summaries	Work Group; 1/30/2011 and 2/16/2011
Two Lake Remediation Work Group Summaries	Work Group; 1/25/2011 and 2/16/2011
Property Valuation / Realtor Outreach Education Work Group Summary	Work Group; 1/21/2011
Two Administrative Committee Summaries	Work Group; 1/11/2011 and 2/5/2011