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)
March 2011 Meeting Summary

Site Name:	DuPont Pompton Lakes RCRA
Meeting Location:	Carnevale Center, 10 Lenox Avenue, Pompton Lakes, New Jersey
Meeting Date:	March 2, 2011
Meeting Time:	7:00 p.m. – 9:30 p.m. EST, with an EPA and NJDEP Availability Session held from 6:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m. EST

Future CAG Meeting Times
- Wednesday, April 6, 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), Dana Patterson (Edison Wetlands Association), Bill Pendexter (Hydrogeologist and Non-Plume Resident), Lisa Riggiola (Citizens for A Clean Pompton Lakes), Michele Belfiore (Pompton Lakes Residents for Environmental Integrity), Tim Troast (In-Plume Resident).

TASC Team:
Bill Logue, Melinda Holland 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
New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP): Stephen Maybury, Anthony Cinque, Anne Pavelka, Rob Lux
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR): Christa Fontecchio
New Jersey Department of Health and Senior Services (NJDHSS): Somia Aluwalia

Public Present:
Cheryl Rubino, Diana Rubino, Debbie Preesthir, Daria A. Sweeney, Ed Meakem, Bern Weintraub, Helen Martens, Sue Recca, Darlene Monica, Merwin Kinkade, Rich Lombardo, T. Reicher, John Soojian, Regina Sisco, Karen Magee, Jacky Grindrod, A. Ioneseci, M. Simone, Mike Keough, Gitte Curtiss, Evelyn Proffit, Karen Dean

I. Welcome and Administrative Updates
Bill Logue welcomed everyone, reviewed the agenda and explained that the evening's presentation was the first of a two-part series on ground water. He informed meeting participants that questions would be compiled at the meeting to present to EPA's ground water experts from Ada Oklahoma who will be answering ground water related questions as the second part of ground water at the April CAG meeting.

Mr. Logue explained the availability session that occurred prior to the meeting, from 6:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. where NJDEP and EPA were available informally to answer questions. Mr. Logue reviewed opportunities for members of the public to comment throughout the meeting. He reminded meeting participants that the CAG's purpose is to represent the interests of the community, provide a forum to receive and share information between the community and the agencies, and to provide input regarding the remediation of the DuPont Pompton Lakes Works site. The CAG meetings are open to the public, but are not traditional public meetings. Mr. Logue noted the public has opportunities to speak during specific times set aside throughout the CAG meeting. He explained to meeting participants that many CAGs have public comment for five or ten minutes at the end of the meeting. Mr. Logue reminded everyone of the Conduct at Meetings posted on the walls and on the agenda. He stated that interjections or interruptions throughout the meeting violate the CAG Operating Procedures. Mr. Logue concluded by encouraging members of the public to raise issues through CAG members.

The Ex-Officio members introduced themselves. Steve Maybury introduced NJDEP's new case manager, Anthony Cinque.

II. Overview of the Ground Water Pilot Project
Mr. Logue introduced the presenter, Anne Pavelka (NJDEP). Ms. Pavelka's presentation addressed the Interim Remedial Measure Pilot Study near well 128-I. The goal of the Pilot Study is to find a remedial technology or technologies that can be successfully implemented to clean up the shallow ground water contamination, which has migrated off the DuPont site, to meet the Ground Water Quality Standards.

Ms. Pavelka's presentation reviewed the steps necessary to implement the pilot study including a Stratigraphic Study (completed in October 2010), a Ground Water Flow Study (proposed in November 2010) and a Pilot Study Operation Plan (to be submitted August 2011). The Stratigraphic Study investigated the aquifer zones, stratigraphy and concentrations of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) with depth in the area of the proposed pilot study. The three aquifer zones (shallow, intermediate and deep) have varying concentrations of VOCs. The Pilot Study will be conducted in the intermediate zone, 38-78 feet below the ground surface, where the volatile organic contamination is the highest. There is 30 feet of water on top of the intermediate zone to stop any vapor generation that could cause harm to public health. DuPont will be conducting testing in the target treatment area, at the intersection of Barbara Drive and Schuyler Avenue, using injection and extraction wells to create a recirculation cell and monitoring wells and a soil gas probe to measure VOC concentrations.

Ground Water Flow Study
Ms. Pavelka stated that the purpose of the flow study, and the subsequent data analysis using a ground water model, is to determine the rates and amounts of amendments (chemicals) to add to the different zones of the intermediate aquifer so the pilot study will proceed efficiently.
The Ground Water Flow Study will:

- Determine the distribution of the hydraulic conductivity in the vicinity of the injection wells.
- Determine the pumping rates that can be used for the ground water withdrawal.
- Use a tracer to determine flow path of the water from the injection wells to the extraction well.

The Ground Water Flow Study and subsequent data analysis using a ground water model will be used to determine:

- The optimum locations for the monitoring wells and soil gas probe.
- Parameters for injection rates, extraction rates, timing of injection and extraction periods, and the timing of amendment additions.

Ms. Pavelka presented a map showing the proposed locations of the Pilot Study injection wells, extraction wells, monitoring wells and soil gas probe. The Pilot Study will be conducted under the street so that it will not be under homes. Ms. Pavelka explained the need to have a detailed understanding of the geology and locations of high contaminant concentrations to ensure the remedial technology works. Local and state permits will be needed. The Ground Water Flow Study will take about six months to be conducted after agency approval.

Pilot Study
Ms. Pavelka defined the goal of the Pilot Study : "*To show through implementation of the Pilot Study, that Enhanced Anaerobic Bioremediation is capable of reducing the contaminant concentrations in ground water to the Ground Water Quality Standards*." Ms. Pavelka explained the chemical breakdown reaction of the PCE to harmless constituents. There are naturally occurring bacteria which perform the reaction. Du Pont will be adding KB - 1 which is a group of several types of naturally occurring bacteria to push the reaction to completion, along with a bioremediation amendment that feeds the bacteria. The amendments will be a combination of lactate, which is fast acting, and emulsified vegetable oil, which is slow acting. The timing and rate of amendment addition will be based on the results of the Stratigraphic Study, the Ground Water Flow Study and ground water modeling to be performed.

Questions from the CAG. (Due to time constraints all questions were asked and some answers were provided. This section has been reorganized for answers to follow the questions to provide information in a question answer format. Questions that remain unanswered will be answered during the next CAG meeting by EPA's Ada Oklahoma ground water experts.)

<u>Michele Belfiore</u>
Question: Will the wells be 38-feet deep, i.e., at a depth below gas lines, sewer lines, etc? Is it possible more contamination could be pushed down the line when the water comes out? Could the contamination be spread by the pressure from injection wells?

Answer: Ms. Pavelka responded that the study is designed to recirculate water from the injection wells to the extraction wells and it is unlikely to migrate beyond that. However, the system will not necessarily be working all the time and some contamination could migrate but this would be identified with the monitoring wells. Steve Maybury (NJDEP) explained that from the Ground Water Flow Study NJDEP is learning how much amendment needs to be added which is why the study is being conducted.

Lisa Riggiola
Question: Will the results be made readily and easily available to the public?
Answer: Once a report is submitted it will be made available to the public and provided to the CAG.

Question: Who will be handling the day-to-day activities of the pilot study and ensuring it is done properly?
Answer: EPA and NJDEP will be providing oversight. Barbara Finazzo (EPA Region 2) explained that once the schedule is known, oversight by EPA and NJDEP will be circulated to everyone.
Concern: Ms. Riggiola expressed concern that if something goes wrong, people could be not in a safe place.

Dana Patterson
Question: Will the studies and plans be made available to the public prior to the study happening?
Answer: NJDEP and EPA committed to providing draft documents once they are received.

Question: What is the reason for using the intermediate aquifer instead of the shallow aquifer?
Answer: Ms. Pavelka explained that the contamination concentrations are higher in the intermediate aquifer zone. She noted that there is a good chance that this remediation technology is going to work but that NJDEP wants to gain more experience before testing the shallow aquifer zone where the vapors pose a more immediate health threat if the reactions do not occur as anticipated. Mr. Maybury explained that one of the concerns is safety. Injecting in the intermediate aquifer zone is safer. Testing in the shallow aquifer zone could be the next step.

Question: Will soil samples be collected?
Answer: There is not currently a plan to collect soil samples.

Question: Vertical or horizontal injection?
Answer: Vertical injection wells will be used.

Question: What determines if the tracer study happens or not?
Answer: If the other tests provide enough information about the hydraulic conductivity in the target treatment area, then the tracer study will not need to be conducted.

Question: The well injection permit has been obtained. How long does it take to obtain permits and will that affect study?

Answer: Ms. Pavelka responded that she does not know how long it will take to obtain the local permits and that the re-injection permit will likely take a couple of weeks so it will not be a major hold up.

Question: Is the plan for the ground water flow study already approved? If so, is there still an opportunity to comment and how will comments be incorporated?
Answer: This plan has been approved.

Bill Pendexter
Question: The work plan that was obtained did not have a lot of detail but generically explained one monitoring well with seven screens which is not typical. He asked if alternative approaches will be considered to avoid creation of a vertical pathway for contamination.

Question: If the goal is to identify what will decrease contamination in general, why is this study not focused on the shallower aquifer zone since this is where vapors are coming from? Is this more challenging because of the presence of oxygen, and if it is more challenging would it be a more important place to conduct a pilot study?

Liz Kachur
Question: How does our site compare with the Raritan Arsenal site and the study that was recently conducted there? Was the Raritan Arsenal study conducted in the shallow aquifer zone?
Answer: The Raritan Arsenal Study is very similar to what DuPont is proposing and there was very good success in the shallow aquifer zone.

Public Comment on Pilot Study
Ed Meakem asked what the concentration levels of TCE are in the shallow zone, he would like to know if they are over 1,000 ppb total VOCs. Ms. Pavelka explained that in well 128 in the intermediate aquifer the concentration of total VOCs are over 1,000 ppb. In the shallow and deeper aquifers it is closer to 50 ppb. Mr. Meakem asked if vinyl chloride is more toxic than TCE. The answer was "Yes." Mr. Maybury explained that the importance is to make the chemicals run all the way through the breakdown cycle. Mr. Meakem has heard that the existing pump-and-treat system moves contaminants to concentrate into one corner/bend on Barbara Drive – and asked if that corner might want to be targeted. Ms. Pavelka explained that it is 52 ppb in the well that Mr. Meakem was talking about.

Regina Sisco asked what the risks of the technologies are. Mr. Maybury explained that generally, different technologies have different risks and the technologies could increase the vapors. Therefore the technologies being reviewed for use are those that do not create vapors. The pilot will be conducted at depth to reduce risk.

Ms. Belfiore asked whether residents have a vapor mitigation system. Ms. Belfiore asked if residents are at risk if they do not have a vapor mitigation system or if they are in the process of putting a system in. Mr. Maybury explained that they do not believe the technology will increase vapors. Anthony Cinque (NJDEP) explained that there is 30 feet of water above the level at which the pilot tests are being conducted. This creates a barrier to vapors entering homes. Data

needs to be gathered before the shallow zone aquifer is remediated. He also reminded everyone that a vapor mitigation system is recommended for everyone in the plume.

Karen Magee asked whether advance notice would be given to inform community members that the Pilot Study will be conducted.
There will be notice and the enhanced bioremediation pilot study is likely to start in October.

John Soojian stated that in the degradation path vinyl chloride is the last chemical in the chain that he has seen; he asked if ethane is safe. He also understands that the pump-and-treat system results in a concentration of contaminants in the bend of Barbara Drive and would like to know if there is an extraction well there. He also asked if the flow rates among the three aquifers are similar or different.

Agency members responded that vinyl chloride breaks down to ethene and then ethane. Ethane is safe.

Michael Keough asked if there a potential for a delayed reaction from the Pilot Study to result in adverse effects and asked if a similar test has been conducted anywhere in the country.

Daria Sweeney asked which chemicals have shown highest concentrations during testing?
Ms. Pavelka responded that TCE, 1-1 dichloroethene, cis-1, 2 dichloroethane, trans-1,2 dichloroethene, and vinyl chloride are the five chemicals that had the highest concentrations in monitoring well 128-I in the May 2009 sampling.

III. Agency Response to CAG Resolution on Unannounced Audits
The agencies presented a draft response[1] to the January CAG resolution[2] on unannounced audits. Mr. Maybury explained that NJDEP looked at current audit inspection procedures and explained five options in response to the CAG's resolution. These include:

- NJDEP will collect ground water split samples as part of DuPont's semi-annual ground water sampling event and have the samples analyzed at a separate laboratory. NJDEP will observe DuPont sampling methods and procedures during the split sampling event.
- EPA will collect split samples focusing on the ground water treatment system influent and effluent. Samples will be analyzed at separate laboratories and EPA will observe sampling methods and procedures performed by DuPont.
- NJDEP will observe sampling methods and procedures performed by DuPont on ground water sampling for total organic carbon from Monitor Well 107R as part of the bioremediation pilot study.
- EPA will observe vapor mitigation system post-remediation sampling events conducted by DuPont.
- EPA and/or NJDEP will observe field sampling methods of soil sampling activities conducted by DuPont at appropriate times of the year when remedial investigation work occurs.

[1] Memorandum available at: http://www.epa.gov/region02/waste/dupont_pompton/cag.html.
[2] http://www.epa.gov/region2/waste/dupont_pompton/Resolution_by_the_Environmental_CAG.pdf

Ms. Finazzo asked the CAG for clarification of "unannounced audits." Ms. Finazzo explained the facility is not operating and if the agencies show up any time, there may be no activities going on. Coordinating field activities takes time and the agencies want to ensure that resources are used appropriately.

Ms. Riggiola explained that what is most important is to go to DuPont unannounced and conduct a full independent investigation. The unannounced audits are not necessary until a full investigation occurs. She would like someone going on the site other than DuPont. She asked why there are armed guards at the facility.

Mr. Grayberg explained that the essence of the unannounced audits is to make DuPont feel they are being watched and that the agencies could be there any time. He believes that the agencies' response to the resolution will fulfill what the CAG is looking for. He explained that he doesn't think that DuPont can change their sampling or procedures within the timeframe that the agencies would need in order to plan for the sampling.

Dr. Pendexter explained that there seems to be a misrepresentation that DuPont is out there conducting sampling, it is a contractor doing the sampling. The contractor has their own reputation to uphold and works for a variety of companies. It is not in their best interest to not follow the manual. There are practical aspects of not being able to just appear for much of the sampling. Lastly, they are finding contamination. If they were trying to cut corners they would be saying that there is not contamination.

Mr. Maybury explained that during different stages of the sampling it could be easier to have unannounced audits such as when long-term remediation is being conducted.

Ms. Riggiola suggested that the residents would like a technical advisor to watch DuPont or for EPA to have a team in Pompton Lakes to watch DuPont. Mr. Tornick explained that EPA's contractor is arranging to video the tunnels. Ms. Riggiola asked why this has not been done before as DuPont could have moved things out of the tunnels.

Ms. Patterson explained that she is concerned that samples such as soil samples could be taken from the wrong location. She asked the agencies how much notice the consultants give the agencies with their sampling plans. Mr. Cinque explained that when they know what sampling they are doing, they can get a two-week notice and he can call DuPont in the morning to be on site in the afternoon.

Ms. Patterson asked what EPA's procedure will be for advising the CAG of audit results. Ms. Finazzo explained that a site inspection report would be generated and provided to the CAG.

IV. Technical Work Group – Technical Advisor Draft Resolution

Mr. Logue introduced Dr. Pendexter and Ms. Patterson as members of the Technical Work Group who wanted to share information with the CAG. Ms. Patterson provided a summary memo of the Raritan Arsenal Pilot Study in Edison, New Jersey. The Raritan Arsenal site had TCE under several areas. Ms. Patterson summarized the report to explain what is done in a pilot

study. Dave Kluesner (EPA R2) offered to post the report on the EPA Pompton Lakes CAG website.

Dr. Pendexter provided a draft letter from the CAG requesting technical assistance. He explained that the Technical Work Group hopes to produce technical assistance requests on a number of different topics. The current request focuses on the VOCs, asking for an independent review of the information that is available and an assessment to determine whether the 10 identified contaminants of concern are the only ones attributable to DuPont. The Technical Work Group requested comments and suggestions from the CAG for improvement via email. Ms. Riggiola explained that she would like to share this request with community residents via her mailing list to get their input. Mrs. Kachur recommended that the final draft of the TASC technical assistance request come back to the CAG in April for approval and submission to EPA.

Ms. Riggiola noted that she is uncomfortable with the claim the DuPont is only responsible for 10 chemicals. She does not know when the last time ground water plume samples were taken for anyone to be able to say that there are only 10 chemicals that DuPont is responsible for.

Dr. Pendexter explained that the Technical Work Group likes to meet before CAG meetings or Health CAG meetings.

V. Administrative Committee – CAG Discussion on Additional Members and Stakeholder Interests

Mrs. Kachur, as chair of the Administrative Committee, reviewed the section on work group members from the CAG's Operating Procedures. Mrs. Kachur explained that Ms. Belfiore wanted to propose Kathy Oliva and Anne Tacinelli as new members to the Property Valuation Work Group. This would require CAG approval under the Operating Procedures. A conversation about the differences between being a realtor and a tax appraiser ensued. Ms. Riggiola proposed Michael Keough as a new member for the Property Valuation Work Group. The CAG voted on the three new members of the Property Valuation Work Group and Ms. Oliva and Ms. Tacinelli were added to the work group and Mr. Keough was not. Ms. Riggiola asked why Mr. Keough was not added to the CAG since he has good credentials. Ms. Belfiore explained that it is her understanding from the letter that she received that he did not want to be a member of the CAG or an alternate of a CAG member. Mr. Keough explained that he could be on the work group and not a member of the CAG. He explained that he is a certified appraiser. Mrs. Kachur explained that in the operating procedures a "¾ vote" is required for someone to be added to a work group and that Mr. Keough did not receive votes from ¾ of the CAG members.

Mrs. Kachur noted that the Community Outreach Work Group currently has only one member, Ms. Patterson. She proposed Paul Narvez as a new member to the Community Outreach Work Group. Ms. Patterson and Ms. Riggiola explained that they could not make any decisions without additional information about a nominee with whom they were unfamiliar. Mrs. Kachur explained that the Community Outreach Work Group needs more members and that a work group cannot make decisions, only the full CAG can. It was decided that Mr. Narvez would attend the April meeting to introduce himself to the CAG.

Mrs. Kachur brought up the fact that a nomination for a new CAG member had been received by the Administrative Committee (Cheryl Rubino was proposed by Ms. Riggiola). Mrs. Kachur continued that in the absence of a vacancy, under the Operating Procedures, the first step is to determine if there is a stakeholder interest that is not currently represented. Ms. Riggiola responded by asking Mrs. Kachur what group she represents. Mrs. Kachur responded that she represents the interests of plume residents. Ms. Riggiola explained that the new stakeholder interest she was proposing to be added is former plume residents.

Mr. Grayberg explained that it seems as though there are two CAGs: the Environmental CAG that is working on current and future environmental issues and the Health CAG, which seems to be addressing what happened in the past. Mr. Grayberg suggested that this newly proposed stakeholder interest could be important for the Health CAG.

Ms. Patterson explained that having a former resident on the CAG for a historical perspective is important. She disagreed that the Health CAG is only looking at the past because they are addressing current concerns about vapor intrusion. Ms. Patterson believes having a former resident would be helpful in providing community awareness and outreach to former residents.

Mrs. Kachur explained that she is not sure she understands the difference between long-term residents and former residents. She thinks that community outreach would reach former residents.

Ms. Patterson stated that community members feel more plume-resident representation is needed. Ms. Riggiola explained that in letters to senators and congressmen residents have expressed concerns about needing more plume residents on the CAG. She noted that many CAG members serve on other politically appointed committees. She explained that the plume residents need to be part of the CAG. Abby Novak noted that she lived in the plume for 24 years.

Ms. Patterson explained that the stakeholder interest of unaffiliated plume residents could be a stakeholder interest that is not currently represented. This potential additional stakeholder interest was deferred for discussion at a later meeting.

After further discussion, Mr. Logue clarified that the proposed additional stakeholder interest is former plume residents who are still active and aware of activities in the community.

Public Comment on the New Stakeholder Interest

The facilitators asked for public comment on the additional stakeholder interest, reminding those present that there was no individual nomination under consideration at this meeting.

Gitte Curtiss stated that she was frustrated by the meeting, people are dying and sick so personal agendas should be put aside. She would like the group to work together to find a solution to the issues. She believes that Ms. Rubino is an intelligent person so she should be allowed to join the CAG.

Ed Meakem stated that if a new member is considered, the fact that he/she participates in community meetings and has had relevant things to contribute should be important. As a community, there should not be a problem adding an additional CAG member.

Rich Lombardo stated that he supports adding a plume resident and he thinks Ms. Rubino would be a good CAG member.

John Soojian stated that he thinks two new CAG members should be added.

Michael Keough explained that the stakeholder interest is the people of Pompton Lakes. He believes that Ms. Rubino is rational and level-headed and would help the CAG. He concluded by saying that if the CAG wants to be what it claims to be, then Ms. Rubino should be added.

Daria Sweeney stated that she does not care if 10 more people are added to the CAG. She does not think that four out of nine is too many members from the plume.

Helen Martens noted that she thinks more people should be added to the CAG.

Darlene Monica informed meeting participants that she has known Ms. Rubino since she was 3 years old and Ms. Rubino would be a great addition to the CAG.

Cheryl Rubino clarified that she has been coming to the CAG meetings and she represents a diverse group. She does not just come here for Pompton Lakes, her mother still lives in Pompton Lakes. She represents her mother as a plume resident, is a former resident with an interest in health issues and she has an interest in real estate values as executor for her mother.

Mrs. Kachur explained that it could be important to have a CAG member who also attends Health CAG meetings. This could also be a new potential seat at the table.

Mr. Keough asked if the new CAG member would be a full CAG member. Mr. Logue responded that a new member would have full voting rights. He expounded that if a stakeholder interest is settled on, nominations are then made and nominees present their qualifications at the next meeting and afterward, the CAG votes.

CAG discussion continued:
Ms. Riggiola noted that the way that Health CAG meetings are run means that only one person that was originally on the CAG is still on it. She explained that Cheryl is more involved in the community than a lot of people here. She disagreed with having a CAG member be the liaison to the Health CAG.

Ms. Patterson asked for clarification of the stakeholder interest. Mr. Logue explained clarity on the stakeholder interest is important because the criteria for filling a future vacancy needs to be understood.

Ms. Riggiola expressed frustration with the process as she had nominated an individual some time ago. Mr. Logue explained the process of adding a new CAG member. First a new

stakeholder group needs to be identified and then specific people are nominated to represent this new stakeholder group.

Rick Steele noted that if one more person is added to the CAG there would be a total of 10 CAG members which is an even number which could be a challenge for voting. The Operating Procedures do not specify how many people need to vote, so a majority vote has been used since it is mostly used in the adding new members section of the CAG Operating Procedures.

The CAG approved the addition of a new stakeholder interest of former plume residents.

The Administrative Committee will accept nominations to fill this new stakeholder interest within two weeks pursuant to the Operating Procedures. At the next CAG meeting, nominees who are willing to run will give a brief presentation to the CAG.

Ms. Riggiola expressed concern that someone else will be nominated because she proposed the original nominee. Ms. Riggiola stated that if her nominee is not approved that CCPL will not be involved in the CAG. Ms. Patterson asked Ms. Finazzo whether since observing how the CAG works if Ms. Finazzo finds this to be too bureaucratic. Ms. Patterson explained that she knows that EPA has received numerous letters about the CAG. She asked if there is something that EPA can do to make the nomination of a CAG member less bureaucratic.

Ms. Finazzo respectfully disagreed with Ms. Patterson. She explained that a CAG needs procedures and has to operate on the procedures that they have agreed on. Ms. Finazzo understands that there is interest in adding an additional plume resident to the CAG, but that the CAG needs to follow their own procedures. Mr. Logue explained that having the process protects all CAG members, so that all members are able to be a part of CAG decisions.

Mr. Logue explained that the additional stakeholder conversation would be tabled until next meeting.

Ms. Finazzo asked about having EPA's Ada Oklahoma ground water experts available in the afternoon of April 6. The CAG agreed this would be useful. EPA will publicize the session including placing an advertisement in the newspaper.

The meeting was adjourned.

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

Item	Who; Date
Receive nominations for CAG membership in the new stakeholder interest "former plume residents."	Administrative Committee; 3/16/2011
Notify CAG members and nominees for CAG membership of the election process provided in the CAG Operating Procedures.	Administrative Committee; 3/25/2011
CAG questions for EPA's Ada, Oklahoma experts.	Webster; 3/14/2011

Documents Distributed

Document Description	Generated by; Date
Meeting Agenda	Logue; 3/2/2011
Agency Presentation	NJDEP; 3/2/2011
CAG Resolution	CAG; 1/12/2011
Response to CAG Resolution	EPA and NJDEP; 3/1/2011
Summary of Raritan Arsenal Final Remedial Action Report Groundwater Treatment Pilot System	Technical Work Group; 3/2/2011
Draft Request for Technical Assistance	Technical Work Group; 3/1/2011
Qs and As on RCRA vs. CERCLA at the DuPont Pompton Lakes Works Site	EPA; February 2011