



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 2011 Meeting Summary

Site Name: DuPont Pompton Lakes RCRA
Meeting Location: Carnevale Center, 10 Lenox Avenue, Pompton Lakes, New Jersey
Meeting Date: April 6, 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), Jimmy Rose (In-Plume Resident, alternate for Liz Kachur), 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)

Technical Assistance Services for Communities (TASC) Team:

Bill Logue and Kirby Webster

Ex Officio Members Present:

Pompton Lakes Borough Council: Richard Steele

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA): David Kluesner, Clifford Ng, Barry Tornick, Barbara Finazzo, Adolph Everett, Michael McGowan, Steve Acree

Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc., Ada, Oklahoma: Daniel Pope, Bruce Pivetz

New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP): Mindy Mumford, Anthony Cinque, Anne Pavelka, Rob Lux

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR): Elena Vaouli

Public Present:

Helen Martens, William D. Baig, Ruth Paez, Katie Cole, Cheryl Rubino, Darlene Monico, Diana Rubino, Regina Sisco, Merwin Kuekale, Edward Meakem, Mike Simone, Carolyn Fefferman, Ella Filippone, Bern Weintraub, Carl D. Padula, Michael Keough, J. H. LaSala, John Soojian, Jacky Grindrod, Zoe Baldwin, George Popov, Vojo Cogura

I. Welcome and Administrative Updates

Bill Logue welcomed everyone and reviewed the meeting documents.¹ He noted that a vapor intrusion listening session will be hosted by EPA at their Edison Facility on April 6. On April 12, 2011 EPA will also host sessions about the differences and similarities of oversight under Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and Superfund for Pompton Lakes. Barbara Finazzo and Walter Mugdan will be available from 3 p.m. to 5 p.m., and from 7 p.m. to 9 p.m. at the Carnevale Center for this information. They will be providing a short presentation and answering questions.

The CAG February and March meeting summaries were reviewed and approved with insertion of clarifications.

II. Ground Water Cleanup Technologies for the Plume: Part II; An in-depth Question & Answer (Q & A) session on Enhanced Anaerobic Bioremediation and Chemical Oxidation

CAG members and EPA's ground water experts from Ada, Oklahoma EPA Office of Research Development with National Risk Management Research Laboratory introduced themselves. They included: Steve Acree, an EPA hydrologist with 20 years experience on RCRA and Superfund sites, and contractors from Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc., Dr. Daniel Pope, a biologist and Dr. Bruce Pivetz, a hydrogeologist. Mr. Logue noted that questions gathered from the CAG and the public at the March meeting had been sent to Mr. Acree and his team. During the discussion, responses were given to those questions and new ones raised at the meeting.

Anne Pavelka (NJDEP) gave a presentation on the ground water cleanup technology for the site, which supplemented her presentation at the March 2, 2011 CAG meeting.² The remediation goal for off-site ground water is to find a technology that will clean the water to ground water quality standards. The necessary steps to implement the Pilot Study are: the Stratigraphic Study (completed and report submitted in October of 2010); the Ground Water Flow Study (proposed in the November 2010 Interim Remedial Measure (IRM) Workplan); and the Pilot Study Operation Plan (to be submitted August 2011). The Pilot Study Operation Plan will include a detailed description of the pilot study implementation.

The Stratigraphic Study describes the depth of each aquifer zone with detailed stratigraphy, and the approximate concentrations of total volatile organic compounds (VOCs) with depth. The stratigraphy is coarser near the surface and becomes finer with depth. The shallow aquifer zone is 7 - 38 feet below the ground surface, consists of coarse to medium grained sand and some gravel and has VOC concentrations of less than 50 parts per billion (ppb). The intermediate zone is from 38 - 78 feet, consists of fine to medium grained sand and has VOC concentrations between 100 and 1000 ppb. The deep aquifer zone is below 78 feet, consists of fine sand and silt and has VOC concentrations of less than 2 ppb.

¹ Listed at the end of this summary and available online at:
http://www.epa.gov/region2/waste/dupont_pompton/cag.html.

² Available at: http://www.epa.gov/region2/waste/dupont_pompton/cag.html.

Ms. Pavelka explained that the Ground Water Flow Study will determine the flow of ground water and the distribution of hydraulic conductivity (the ability of an aquifer to transmit water) near monitoring well 128-I. Mr. Acree explained that ground water moves from areas of high water table elevation to low water table elevation, and water table elevation usually follows topography. Thus ground water will move from Barbara Drive toward the Lake and from higher injection/extraction wells to lower injection/extraction wells. This ground water movement can be monitored. Water moves more easily through coarse materials than fine. Water movement through the soil decreases with depth in the three aquifers at this site because the soil changes from coarse to fine with depth (gravel to sand). The subsurface is not like an underground river, but more like a “drippy sponge.” In the shallow aquifer the ground water flow rate is 0.5 - 2 feet per day. The intermediate aquifer rate is 0.1 to 1 foot per day. Under natural conditions, water moves slower in the deeper aquifer. Injection or extraction of water changes the pressure in the aquifer, which may cause some minor changes in flow rate. The rate of ground water movement also depends on recharge (water reentering the system) through rainfall or infiltration beds. The actual configuration of the injection and extraction wells have not yet been determined; however, injection wells will be upgradient of extraction wells. Once the hydraulic conductivity is determined, the configuration of wells will be determined.

Based on the contaminant distribution, the Pilot Study will be conducted in the intermediate zone. Ms. Pavelka explained that the target treatment area will be at the intersection of Barbara Drive and Schuyler Avenue. The results of the Ground Water Flow Study will determine the optimum operational parameters for remediation including the injection rates, extraction rates and timing of amendment (e.g., chemicals, bacteria, etc.) additions.

Mr. Acree explained a generic bioremediation system. Water is taken out of an extraction well, and brought into an additional tank, where amendments are added to the ground water including: buffers (solutions that can maintain a nearly constant pH) to adjust pH, nutrients as food for the bacteria, and the bacteria, which are a consortia of microbes that degrade contaminant solvents down to ethene or ethane (bioaugmentation). The amendments of nutrients and additional buffers improve the bacteria habitat and population. The amended water is then put back into the system through an injection well. The process takes place under anaerobic (no oxygen) conditions so the reaction is already occurring; these steps help to enhance the rate of the reaction.

Ms. Pavelka explained that the goal of the Pilot Study is to show that anaerobic enhanced bioremediation is capable of reducing the contaminant concentrations in ground water to the ground water quality standards. The chemical reaction changes the tetrachloroethene (PCE) to trichloroethene (TCE) to cis- 1,2 dichloroethene to vinyl chloride to ethene and ethane. Ethene and ethane are harmless. At this site, the contaminant with the highest concentration is cis- 1,2 dichloroethene. The bacteria food source amendments provide an electron donor for the process, with lactate as a fast acting electron donor and emulsified vegetable oil as a slow acting electron donor. The lactate is used up quickly. The oil sticks to the soil particles and provides a longer lasting food source for the bacteria. Within the treatment zone, an increase in vinyl chloride could occur temporarily. If there is excess food for the bacteria, there could be an excess of methane, which would be dissolved in water. If too much food is dissolved, hydrogen sulfide could be produced. The Pilot Study is designed so that production of methane and hydrogen sulfide does not occur.

Ms. Riggiola asked how residents' safety will be ensured during the Pilot Study. She believes that a vapor mitigation survey is necessary to make sure the residents all have vapor mitigation systems and remain safe. Ms. Riggiola also expressed concern that some residents have readings of 1900 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) in soil subslab underneath their houses. Mr. Acree responded that one reason the pilot test is being conducted in the intermediate zone of the aquifer is because there is a buffer of water between the study zone and the homes to ensure areas above the zone are not impacted by the study. The water table (above the intermediate zone) will not be impacted, so the vapor zones will not be influenced. Using a map, Mr. Acree noted that the study will not occur under homes and it will be conducted at a depth well below the water table, therefore it will not have an impact on homes. The study is designed so that pressure does not spread and not to increase concentrations of contaminants in the water table or in the vapors, either in the treatment zone or the surrounding zone. If residents do not have a vapor mitigation system they are not at higher risk. Shallow ground water and soil gas monitoring will be conducted to monitor concentrations of contaminants and impacts of the pilot study. The pilot study wells will be monitored for six months and can subsequently be included in the well monitoring system for the site. The pilot study will be designed so that the wells used for extraction in the study can be used as injection wells in the future.

The effectiveness of the technology will be known once the pilot is conducted. From a technical standpoint, the characteristics of the intermediate zone make it a good candidate for anaerobic enhanced bioremediation. It is unlikely that this technology will be appropriate for ground water remediation across the entire site. The Pilot Study will produce more information about flow rates, etc., which will be available in the remedial action selection report and plan.

CAG members asked about similar studies and the outcomes of anaerobic enhanced bioremediation technology. Dr Acree noted that the Department of Defense published studies within the last 10 years for Kelly Air Force Base in Texas, Cape Canaveral in Florida and Newark Air Force Base in Ohio. At many of these sites, pilot studies have been completed and the projects will soon be conducted at full scale. Mr. Acree and Rob Lux (NJDEP), noted that "published studies" means the studies are published in peer reviewed journals and are therefore expensive and occur infrequently. Results of pilot studies at RCRA and Superfund sites are not formally published but are available in case files; they are not as easily accessible.

With respect to the use of the technology in residential areas, Mr. Lux explained that he was in contact with about 15 people at the bureau who had been involved in cases of anaerobic enhanced bioremediation. He highlighted that techniques have changed and improved, and each site is a little different. He acknowledged that there is no question regarding the success of the process, rather the challenge is figuring out the details to make it successful for a specific site. Mr. Lux offered to find different types of cases and will look into distributing this information.

The DuPont Works site and Raritan Arsenal in New Jersey have similar compounds and concentrations, but have variable geology with depth. At Raritan Arsenal, the finer materials are at the water table and the coarser materials are deeper (the opposite geology from the Pompton Lakes site). At Raritan Arsenal the technology was conducted at shallower depths, roughly half the depth as in Pompton Lakes. The geochemistry is similar to the Pompton Lakes site as the

chemical degradation was already occurring but needed to be enhanced. The Raritan Arsenal case had good results with a very significant decline in VOCs. Their monitoring period was very short; however, they continue to monitor contaminants.

Dana Patterson asked if there will be a pilot study in the shallow aquifer. Anthony Cinque (NJDEP) explained that DuPont will take what they have learned from the current studies to determine what they need to do in the shallow zone. Mr. Cinque explained that this is an iterative process, as information is learned it will help determine the next steps. At this time, Mr. Cinque could not answer whether or not a shallow aquifer pilot study will be conducted. Ms. Patterson expressed concern that if these conversations about next steps occur between NJDEP and DuPont, the public will not be part of the decision-making process.

Ms. Raggiola asked whether the ambient air will be part of the study and if the Trace Atmospheric Gas Analyzer (TAGA) system could be used. Ms. Finazzo was unsure if any ambient air studies will be conducted and clarified that in order to request the use of TAGA there has to be a specific purpose.

Mr. Acree explained that each of the multi-level wells monitor at 14 - 15 feet which is just below the vadose zone (the area between the surface and ground water) with a standard pump and sample bottles. The seven-screen monitoring well cannot provide a vertical pathway because it is not a continuous well that could transfer contamination. It has seven sealed individual compartments and a port is cut wherever a sample is going to be taken. The well is packed and grouted so that no transfer can occur between the levels of the well. The soil gas monitoring will be detailed in the Pilot Study Operation Plan. Mr. Acree explained that vapors will be sucked out of the ground into a holding canister, similar to the current sampling process.

Generally, site reports list only the toxic products, which is why vinyl chloride is reported and ethene and ethane usually are not. For the Pilot Study, ethene and ethane will be reported, as their presence is indicative of a successful study.

The concentration of contaminants at the bend in Barbara Drive has declined over time, after the pump-and-treat system was installed.

Ms. Patterson asked what would happen if significant rainfall occurred and the ground water table rose? Mr. Acree explained that more rainfall will drive water deeper, which will have minimal impact on the Pilot Study or the results.

Public Questions about the Pilot Study

George Papov: Mr. Papov asked the agency officials to elaborate on the fact that several years of studies have occurred and no reports are available.

Mindy Mumford (NJDEP) explained that the sites that Mr. Acree mentioned earlier are not New Jersey sites. Mr. Cinque explained that any documents, reports and letters submitted to NJDEP are available to the public and will be provided to the CAG as they become available.

Ed Meakem: Mr. Meakem stated that at the last CAG meeting the concentration of VOCs at Schuyler and Barbara Drive was discussed, and he had asked if there were any places in the area that were above 50 ppb. He stated that his question was answered and the concentration was 52 ppb. Mr. Meaken expressed concern that he heard the number 1900 in the sub slab today, and asked whether injection caused off-gassing?

Mr. Acree explained that ground water (with amendments) will be injected and that no off-gassing would occur.

Mr. Meakem asked if anyone has determined the depth of the sewer lines. He also suggested that EPA and NJDEP have a suggestion box and that they have information more readily available for vapor intrusion sites.

Mr. Lux explained that the data from the March presentation was from a specific report, the Stratigraphic Study, and that concentrations can change. Mindy Mumford explained that vapor gases would be different than ground water 50 ppb total VOCs that were identified in a particular well on a particular date.

Cheryl Rubino: Ms. Rubino stated that the residents want “hard proof” that the technology works and it is safe. She asked if the community will be told in advance which company will be contracted to execute this study. Ms. Finazzo responded that the community would be notified.

John Soojian: Mr. Soojian stated that the reports show an order of magnitude decrease in concentration of contaminants. If that data is available, there must be reports out there, and he has been unable to find them. He asked if there are documented failures of these types of studies. He asked the Ada, Oklahoma ground water experts if they were conducting the pilot plan, would they do anything differently?

The experts responded that the plan that has been presented so far is a conceptual plan, it is reasonable. The full pilot plan that will be available in August will show the details.

Michael Keough: Mr. Keough asked where the study was conducted in Newark. The answer given was: it was conducted in Newark, Ohio. Mr. Keough asked if the reports can be ordered. He is concerned that other studies have taken a lot of time and would like assurance that this study will not take too long.

Ms. Mumford answered that once the documents are available they are posted online.

Jefferson LaSala: Mr. LaSala stated that he heard that the pilot study injections will not result in consequences in the homes. He is concerned about this because engineers have told them the opposite. He would like verification. He stated that the residents are enormously concerned since more than half of the homes do not have vapor mitigation systems. Another option he suggested is it to move people to safe housing. He asked why the study isn't occurring in an area where there aren't any residents.

Mr. Acree explained that technically the off site area is the most representative. He stated that he is not familiar with on-site conditions. The Pilot Study Operation Plan (to be submitted in

August) should predict what the increases in water levels will be, and he assumes that is what the engineers anticipate would impact the residents.

Dr. Pendexter stated that the technology is very well known in Air Force bases and in New Jersey and is standard practice. He explained that in his work he has had at least six dry cleaners use the same type of remediation for reductive chlorination of the contaminants. The State has extensive documentation which can be found by entering the facility address, name, etc. through *Data Miner* (NJDEP's Record Access Program). In addition, a request can be made to the State for the files.

Ms. Patterson asked for a comprehensive list of vapor intrusion sites in New Jersey. Ms. Finazzo and Mr. Cinque will see if this information has been compiled.

Ms. Raggiola explained that the community needs a technical advisor to help them understand large documents and other technical information.

III. Work Group Reports and Proposals

Lake Remediation Work Group

The Lake Remediation Work Group Chair, Steve Grayberg, explained that the Lake Remediation Work Group reviewed the Acid Brook Delta Corrective Measures Implementation Work Plan and recommends some opportunities for improvement. The basic points that they found in need of addressing in the document are:

- Contractors are selected before public opinion is sought. With a little education, the community could provide input on the contractors. Once the contractor is selected, there are limits in the activities the contractor conducts.
- Contractors determine if they have met their own objectives. There is concern about such self monitoring.
- No mention of restoration of private property. DuPont has been working on plans such as Rotary Park, but the private property should be discussed.
- In the past, DuPont has not provided as much public information as they should.

Mr. Grayberg explained that in the past few days he has thought about whether or not DuPont would be willing to come to the table. He explained that Barry Tornick (EPA Region 2) agrees that this would be useful and Mr. Tornick has already discussed this with DuPont. Mr. Cinque explained that EPA has the lead on the site, but that NJDEP would not have a problem with it. Mr. Grayberg recommended having EPA, NJDEP, the Lake Remediation Work Group and DuPont meet for direct discussion instead of through resolutions written by the CAG. Mr. Tornick suggested that an agenda would help ensure that the appropriate people attend the meeting.

Ms Raggiola stated she would rather not have a meeting with DuPont and would prefer resolutions.

Ms. Patterson asked if the DuPont meeting would be open to the CAG. Mr. Logue responded that all work group meetings are open to CAG members. Ms. Patterson would like to be able to record it and is not sure if she would be allowed to if it is held in the DuPont Welcome Center.

Mr. Grayberg, noted that EPA will manage communications, and asked about how the public will be involved. Mr. Grayberg asked for enhanced communication for the people directly affected and another level of communication for the people in the community. Ms. Mumford explained that the New Jersey state law requires notification in the newspaper, distribution of a fact sheet, and people within 200 feet of the work zone be notified. She explained that DuPont has provided brochures in the past. Dave Kluesner (EPA) explained that EPA will go above and beyond legal requirements and DuPont will put out materials. This will be a collaborative process among everyone involved to be sure that information is distributed. He explained that at other sites, the contractors have provided information and presentations about the activities that will occur at the site. Mr. Grayberg asked if there was any input from the outreach group. Ms. Patterson reminded Mr. Grayberg that CCPL and PLREI also distribute information.

Mr. Grayberg asked the CAG if they have specific input to the draft resolution. Ms. Riggiola asked to have time to ask her constituents. The CAG was asked to provide comments on the resolution by April 13, 2011. Mr. Grayberg will explore having a meeting with DuPont.

During the discussion, Ms. Riggiola added that residents have been asking about the lake remediation and restoration and the fact that the lake is a reservoir owned by the North Jersey District Water Supply Commission (NJDWSC). She would like a representative from NJDWSC at the meeting and have meetings cease until NJDWSC is present. Mr. Grayberg explained that the Lake Restoration Committee has been trying to involve NJDWSC without success. Adolph Everett (EPA) explained that EPA is proceeding with a permit modification and will be reaching out specifically to NJDWSC to meet with them.

Abby Novak added that as part of the planning board, she is under the impression that permits would need to be reviewed by the planning board.

Technical Work Group

Bill Pendexter, Technical Work Group Chair, informed the CAG that their letter was sent in late March to EPA requesting a technical advisor to assist in understanding more information about the 10 contaminants of concern at the site, if there could be more than 10 or if there is a reason to look into other contaminants. Seven of the CAG members supported sending it out as revised through e-mail exchanges. Mr. Kluesner explained that EPA will respond to the letter by the May meeting.

Outreach Work Group

Mr. Logue explained that the Outreach Work Group had their first meeting by conference call and that a summary was provided in the materials distributed at the meeting by the outreach work group chair, John Soojian. The Outreach Work Group is looking for input from community members about how to reach out to the community.

Other Business

Mr. Kluesner explained that CAG members and alternates received the proposed agenda and release form in order to go on the DuPont Site Tour. The facilitators clarified that the site tour is for CAG members *and alternates*.

Mr. Logue reminded everyone that the CAG is holding a special meeting on April 20 to address membership issues.

During the break Carl D. Padula provided New Jersey Local Government Ethics Law financial disclosure forms to Mr. Logue and asked him to distribute them to CAG members.

Ms. Riggiola received two letters from one specific CAG member that were addressed to the CAG. In these letters, she felt the CAG member was directly attacking her and attacking the public. Ms. Riggiola would like these letters read in a public forum. Mr. Logue responded that what he is hearing Ms. Riggiola say is that there is an issue of appropriate conduct.

IV. Public Comment

Mike Keough: Mr. Keough asked for clarification from the previous meeting summaries about an information seminar that is going to be held for realtors.

Ms. Belfiore explained that an information seminar is being offered to realtors about the plume to educate them. It will occur on April 7 at the state county board office. Mayor Cole was invited by Kathy Oliva.

Jefferson LaSala: Mr. LaSala asked why this community has not heard of the anaerobic enhanced bioremediation technology if it has been around for decades. He stated that the community was promised a TAGA bus by Lisa Jackson. He explained that the community has needed it for a long time, so there is no question about its use. He asked if there would be a public comment period about the bioremediation phase before any physical work is done. He asked that if the pilot program and remediation works as expected, how long it would be until residents don't need vapor mitigation systems. He asked why the pilot study is not going to be conducted on the site first if the situation is similar to what is going on in the residential area. He asked why DuPont is not at the meetings. He believes that DuPont should come to explain the science. He asked what the other sources of contamination are in the Lake, and asked whether these sources are being managed, such as the contamination coming from Oakland.

Ms. Finazzo explained that there will be opportunities for public comment. She isn't sure that there is consensus as to what the group wants.

Mr. LaSala responded that the community would like an invitational meeting with a Robo call (an automated phone call) at the high school.

Mr. Acree responded that part of the answer concerning duration will come from conducting the Pilot Study, and how effective the different pilot studies are (different technologies for different parts of the site). Mr. Acree stated that at other sites of similar size, remediation to drinking water standards takes years to decades. This is not necessarily what will happen at this site, but this timeframe is what he would estimate from his experience.

Ella Filippone: Ms. Filippone explained that this area is considered a sole source aquifer under the U.S. Safe Drinking Water Act Section 1424e, and the community is supposed to be protected

under the act so that the water meets drinking water standards. The Safe Water Drinking Act states that if EPA invests money in remediation or investigation, the water has to be cleaned to drinking water standards. She explained that there is no secret to public disclosure and public participation and there has been volumes written on the topic. She suggested the CAG and community would benefit from someone helping to interpret the reports for them. She stated she heard a lot of confusion expressed at the meeting, and that technical assistance would be really useful, especially if the community can build a relationship with the technical advisor and trust them. Contaminants are present at that site that may or may not be harmful. The CAG should ask EPA how much flushing of the contaminants has already occurred, and how long it will take to flush out contaminants from the first zone. She also explained that she has two goals: one is to make sure that every house has a vapor mitigation system and the other is to determine what process is necessary to improve the ground water. She has held a ground water protection meeting for a while and invited anyone to join her at Willow Hall for the meeting.

Cheryl Rubino: Ms. Rubino asked if the special meeting on the April 20, 2011 is open to the public. Mr. Logue responded that it is open to the public.

Ed Meakem: Mr. Meakem commended Mr. Grayberg on his presentation and for looking out on behalf of the residents. He explained that everything can be done to educate people but the access agreement is what protects the homeowner. Residents might be able to negotiate some things but if the access agreement that says that they are going to remove six inches and then they remove six feet, that is what happened to him.

Mr. Logue thanked the experts Mr. Acree, Dr. Pope and Dr. Pivetz for traveling long distances to present information to the group. The meeting was adjourned.

Written Public Comments

Carl P. Padula: #1 I would like all on the CAG to sign a local government ethics law, financial disclosure statement. #2 Who does the CAG answer to? #3 Who appoints the members?

Action Items

Item	Who; Date
Post meeting documents on EPA Pompton Lakes CAG website.	Kluesner; 4/15/2011
Prepare and circulate Draft Meeting Summary.	Webster; 4/20/2011
Provide information about other sites where enhanced anaerobic bioremediation has been used.	EPA and NJDEP; 5/4/2011
List of sites in New Jersey with vapor intrusion.	EPA and NJDEP; 5/4/2011
Response to the CAG’s request for technical assistance.	EPA; 5/4/2011

Documents Distributed

Document Description	Generated by; Date
Meeting Agenda	Logue; 4/6/2011
Draft February Meeting Summary	Webster; 3/30/2011
Draft March Meeting Summary	Webster; 3/30/2011
Lake Remediation Work Group Summary	Work Group; 4/6/2011
Lake Remediation Work Group Resolution	Work Group; 4/6/2011
Final Request for Technical Assistance	CAG; 3/29/2011
EPA/NJDEP final response to January 12, 2011 Resolution	EPA; February 2011
DuPont Site Tour Agenda and Release Form	DuPont; 4/6/2011
Flyer about public information session about RCRA and Superfund	EPA; 4/6/2011