



New York – New Jersey  
Harbor & Estuary Program

# CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

---

of the New York – New Jersey  
Harbor & Estuary Program  
[www.HarborEstuary.org](http://www.HarborEstuary.org)

---

## NY-NJ Harbor & Estuary Program Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting

June 12, 2014  
Van Buren Branch Library  
Newark, NJ

### MINUTES

#### 1. Introductions

Valerie Gores welcomed attendees to the Library and encouraged all to visit the picture exhibit on the history of environmental justice in Newark. She also announced that the Library holds Ironbound Community Corporation's archives.

#### 2. Public Access

##### Hawk Rise Sanctuary.

**The Mayor of Linden, Richard Gerbounka** summarized the history of the Sanctuary, which is located in the NE of the city. It was a landfill since 1942. In 2000, an Administrative Consent Order with EPA led to its cleanup and closedown, with a slurry wall installed all around. Leachate is collected and pumped to the Linden Roselle Sewerage Authority plant. After the closedown, trails were installed in adjacent areas, which included a tidal and forested wetland. Abundant wildlife can be found in the area, even though it is in the midst of an urban, industrial area. There are plans to install solar panels in part of the previous landfill and to create an exhibit on the history of the place. There is also a desire to develop a boat ramp in the Rahway River. This story was featured in a recent issue of the NJ League of Municipalities publication.

**Dolores Maslo, Hawk Rise Liaison with the City of Linden**, provided more info about the sanctuary. Dolores got involved in 1999 when she was the Director of Science in Linden public schools and was trying to promote outdoor education. Although Linden had 37 parks, no park included estuary habitat. She approached the Meadowlands Environmental Commission to bring students before realizing the potential of the areas surrounding the landfill. The Administrative Consent Order (ACO) was executed by NJDEP and City of Linden on April 25, 2007. Highlights of the ACO can be found in Kelly Wenzel's presentation.

##### Programming at Hawk Rise Sanctuary.

**Kelly Wenzel of New Jersey Audubon** gave an overview of programming at the site provided by Audubon. Linden's vision for the site is "A greenway along the Rahway River that provides wildlife habitat as well as accessible open space for passive nature recreation and ecosystem study." NJ Audubon has a Memorandum of Agreement with the City to bring programming to the site addressing four focal areas:

1. Public Access & Interpretive Trails: Existing trails go over the saltmarsh and next to the landfill, and provide access to mudflats. There is a new proposed trail to go through the saltmarsh. Trails are handicap-accessible and have interpretive signs. Two additional signs are now in construction featuring the girl scouts geocaching trail and work on deer exclusion in a newly planted area.

---

#### Citizens Advisory Committee Co-Chairs

Meredith Comi, NY/NJ Baykeeper ✧ [meredith@nynjbaykeeper.org](mailto:meredith@nynjbaykeeper.org) ✧ 732-888-9870  
Rob Buchanan, Village Community Boathouse ✧ [avironvoile@gmail.com](mailto:avironvoile@gmail.com) ✧ 917-656-7285

2. Habitat Stewardship: Audubon created a 5-acre deer enclosure where volunteers recently planted. It will be monitored for 5 Yrs. Audubon continues to seek funds for marsh restoration.
3. School-based Programming: This program has full support of the Linden Board of Education and the local industry. Over 900 students visited the Sanctuary in May as part of their normal curriculum. All grade levels include Hawk Rise curriculum, while 5<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> grade students actually visit the site.
4. Community-based Programming: A number of hikes, events, and programs are offered year-round.

Other activity at the Sanctuary includes the City installing 6 benches sponsored by local businesses, development of a teaching station, Olivia's geocaching trail, and training on invasive species identification and management.

Funding for restoration projects came from a number of sources, including: the Administrative Consent Order with NJDEP (leftover funds were used for trails), tipping fees charged to other towns disposing of trash in the landfill, a prior NJDEP fine for \$ 1million, fines to corporations that were rolled to the Sanctuary, and some donations.

Regarding public safety, water quality is monitored and reported to NJDEP. The municipality has a mosquito spray program and additional details for spraying at the Sanctuary should be available from the Mosquito Control Commission. Methane is currently flared at the landfill but will be mined for energy. After nature walks all children receive a mosquito talk and are taught to look for ticks.

Regarding access, the train station is one mile away and some people walk or bike to the Sanctuary, though the best way to get there is by car. A boat ramp on the Rahway River is planned for the next phase of improvements.

In terms of Superstorm Sandy impacts, the site suffered \$30,000 in damage to the boardwalk and there were some downed trees. But, because of the wetland, it fared quite well.

To spread the word about activities at the site, NJ Audubon features the Sanctuary on its website and monthly e-blast. In addition, information is conveyed via word of mouth, through schools, through the Citizen Science program, and talking to groups like this one. The Mayor encouraged everyone to visit the Sanctuary.

#### Municipal Public Access Plan.

Dolores then talked about the development of Linden's Municipal Public Access Plan—the first completed plan in the state. NJDEP has administratively accepted the Plan, which means it is under a 60-day review and DEP will be asking for clarifications and/or minor changes (results are expected in a couple of weeks). Linden will then resubmit for final approval.

Linden started working on a Plan early on and when regulations changed had to re-do it. Only two people were involved in developing the plan (Dolores and a staff from the engineering department), which made the task difficult as they had a steep learning curve (requirements, ordinances, etc). Dolores suggested applying for one of the NJDEP grants and hire expert help. NJDEP was very helpful throughout the process. Another difficulty was the need for high-speed computers to transfer documents, photos, and other large files. The new regulations called for ordinances to be passed for things that were already covered in the city. For example, there was already an ordinance for sign maintenance throughout the city but a separate one was needed specifically for

the Sanctuary.

The development of a Municipal Public Access Plan calls for:

1. Identification of all access areas in the community. Linden had 7, 6 of which were in unsuitable, highly industrialized areas.
2. A community needs assessment for their only suitable area by the landfill. Among those providing input were local industries like Infineum and ConocoPhillips, the Linden Industrial Association, Kiwanis Club, the environmental community, and the Chamber Of Commerce. The process was time-consuming but successful.
3. Develop an implementation plan (including signage, roads, how to attract the public, enhancement plan for public access, kayaking facilities, benches) and find funds to implement it.

Additional information was provided in response to a number of questions by CAC members.

- Linden is looking at options to power a bathroom facility that will not be hooked to the grid.
- The City bought special utility vehicle to use in case of a health emergency to move people out of the trails.

In response to questions about development, access and NJDEP requirements, **Meghan Gosselink** from NJDEP indicated that each municipality decides whether a developer needs to provide public access or contribute to a fund. The Rules allow restrictions for ecological reasons. Kelly added that the need for restrictions is determined on a case by case basis. At this time, the deer exclusion area is closed to public as well. Nelly added that the site has good habitat quality and 140 bird species have been found; the trails allow for enjoyment of this area while keeping the habitat intact.

Meghan provided more information about NJDEP's Municipal Public Access Plan Grant Program (deadline was June 5<sup>th</sup>). These grants do not cover the full cost of developing a Plan. Last year, each municipality was eligible for \$10,000 (more if resiliency was addressed). This year, \$15,000 were available for public access and \$15,000 for full city assessments (or \$25,000 if applying for both). NJDEP has received 28 submissions and has a total of \$200,000. Meghan indicated that NJDEP helps municipalities as much as possible; for example, with mapping, which can be challenging.

**Rob Pirani, NY-NJ Harbor & Estuary Program Director** highlighted the concept of quality public access spaces, which had been suggested by NJ Audubon in a previous conversation. He suggested that HEP staff with CAC help could map the type of existing access, building on the access inventory that the Metropolitan Waterfront Alliance and NY/NJ Baykeeper did 10 years ago. A potential partner could be the U.S. Forest Service that developed the STEW-MAP (a map that is part of the OASIS map and displays stewardship organizations in the NY-NJ metro area—HEP partnered with the USFS back in 2011 to expand STEW-MAP to New Jersey). Rob reminded the group that HEP will not be able to provide grants this year but the grants program is expected to resume in 2015. Creating this map can help target funds for the next grant cycle to places where funds are most needed.

The map could look at the type of physical access, whether the land is public or private, type of access (to the water edge, onto the water), water quality at the site, whether there are stewardship groups caring for the site, kind of stewardship available (maintenance, ecologic stewardship), degree of political support. HEP will be working on this over the next few months, building on existing resources rather than re-inventing the wheel. Rob Asked the CAC to provide input on this project.

Meghan indicated that NJDEP has created many maps (which are in draft form). She suggested that as access plans are adopted, NJDEP would like to see some of the grants given to municipalities that have adopted plans so they can start implementing those plans (NJDEP grants are for plan development, not implementation).

Harvey Morginstin reminded the group that he has been advocating for access to the waterfront from the water, and he circulated an article he wrote on the topic.

Shino Tanikawa suggested considering crowdsourcing to create a real-time map of what's on the waterfront.

Eymund Diegel indicated that flicker and twitter geocoding data shows where people take pics on the waterfront. This is a new, free data resource that could be tapped.

### **3. Passaic River Superfund**

#### EPA Proposed Cleanup

***Alice Yeh, Remedial Manager of the Diamond Alkali Superfund Site at EPA***, gave a presentation on the site and EPA's proposed cleanup.

She started with an overview of the site, which is contaminated with a variety of toxic chemicals, including dioxins, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), pesticides, metals, and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). It comprises the lower 17 miles of the river plus Newark Bay, and the cleanup is planned in phases. The Lower Passaic River project grew out of the Diamond Alkali Superfund Site in Newark, NJ. The Focused Feasibility Study comprises the lower 8 miles. Smaller scale dredging was conducted in 2011 (phase 1 of the "Tierra Removal") to remove a hot spot containing the most heavily-contaminated sediments by the former plant. Another removal action was conducted in 2012 at a mudflat in Lyndhurst (River Mile 10.9 Removal). Cleanup of the remainder of the 17 miles and of Newark Bay is being evaluated as part of future phases.

Waste water has been historically discharged in the Passaic and other rivers until the 1970s. The navigation channel in the Passaic River was maintained until the 1950s for the full river and until 1983 for the lower portion. As a result, the channel filled in at the same time that wastes were being discharged, so it filled with polluted sediments.

Why only 8 miles? The proposed cleanup addressed only the lower 8 miles of the river because that's where the most contaminated sediments are. This stretch is also dominated by fine sediments, to which most pollutants stick. This plan will not be meeting all cleanup goals. This is a start. Cleanup decisions for the 17 miles and Newark Bay will be needed to meet the goals.

Why is the cleanup needed?

- Sediments and the attached contaminants spread. The Lower Passaic is tidal and so the surface sediments move. During bigger storms, deeper sediments move as well. In the lower 8 miles, the river is contaminated bank to bank.
- Over the last 15 years, contamination has declined very little; the river is not recovering by itself.
- Data from incoming sources to the Lower Passaic show there are no major sources of new contamination (in terms of the toxic chemicals that are the focus of the cleanup) but rather the existing contaminants in the river are being remobilized.

- The existing levels of contamination in sediments, fish and crab pose a significant risk to humans (mainly from eating fish and shellfish) and wildlife; action is required to lower the risks. While there is a consumption advisory in effect, some people are still eating what they catch from the river.

EPA evaluated four cleanup options:

1. No action (EPA is required to evaluate “no action”; this serves as a point of comparison with the active options).
2. Deep dredging with backfill: All contaminated fine sediments removed bank to bank and backfilled with 2 ft of sand.
3. Capping with dredging for flooding and navigation: Enough dredging to prevent flooding after cap is in place, navigation channel restored in lower 2 miles, engineered cap maintained in perpetuity.
4. Focused dredging with capping: 220 acres total (about 1/3 of area) of the areas that send the most contamination into the water; no additional dredging for navigation.

Each of the active options involves a good amount of dredging. Option 2 would remove all fine sediments and restore the federally-authorized navigation channel. Option 3 would re-establish the navigation channel only for the lower 2.2 miles.

There are three options for disposal of dredged sediments:

- Method A: Contained aquatic disposal (CAD) cell in Newark Bay. The bottom of the bay is clay, which is quite impermeable. The CAD would additionally be enclosed in sheetpile walls. Sediments would be transported by barge to the cell and then covered with an engineered cap. This option is the only one that does not require a land processing facility.
- Method B: Offsite disposal. A processing facility in the shores of the Lower Passaic or Newark Bay would dewater the sediments, which would then be sent by train to an EPA-approved incinerator or landfill.
- Method C: Decontamination with beneficial use. A barge would take the sediments to a land processing facility where decontamination technologies would be applied. Any contaminants would be disposed in a landfill and sediments would be used to make cement or landfill cover. However, this method has only been tested at bench scale and it is not clear how it would work at the scale needed for this cleanup (4.3 million cubic yards of sediment).

The cost of the different cleanup and disposal options ranges from 0.4 to 3.2 billion dollars (see slide 14). Deep dredging would remove 9.7 million cubic yards over 11 years. Capping with dredging for flooding and navigation would remove 4.3 million cubic yards over 5 years. Focused capping with dredging would remove 0.9 million cubic yards over 2 years. This does not include the design period.

EPA’s proposed plan is capping with dredging (cleanup option 3) with offsite disposal (method B). Fish and crab consumption advisories would remain in effect during construction and for some time afterwards. There would be restrictions on dredging and anchoring to protect the cap.

EPA is particularly interested in feedback regarding CAD vs. offsite disposal options, given the pros and cons: the CAD has lower impact on local community but higher impact on Newark Bay. Dewatering facilities have impact and are more costly. Also of special interest is feedback on the depth that is actually needed for the navigational channel as a deeper channel is more costly.

Then Alice answered questions from the group.

Q: Could a single dewatering facility be built for the Passaic, Gowanus, and Newtown Creek sites?

A: It is possible but it would mean that cleanup at some sites would have to wait until the others are ready to go.

Q: What is the cost for EPA, the states, and other parties?

A: That is not known yet. Once a remedial option is selected, then EPA will negotiate with the Potentially Responsible Parties (PRPs) and they will have a chance to design the cleanup. If the PRPs agree, the cleanup will carry on. If not, there are legal mechanisms that EPA can pursue. The goal is to have PRPs cover as much of the cost as possible. The PRPs are now all private companies and the City of Newark has not been named. About seventy of them formed the Cooperating Parties Group (CPG).

Q: Why not dredge deeper? Deepening later would be more costly. Or go for a hybrid of Options 2 and 3 where 2.2 miles will be dredged bank to bank and to the full depth, and the rest of the lower 8 miles will be capped?

A: None of this is set in stone yet. Please submit a comment so it can be formally addressed.

Q: How do contaminants move into NB and beyond?

A: There are models that show sediment and contaminant movement. We also modeled stirring during dredging. The net movement is into Newark Bay, where it falls into the navigation channel. Appendix B of the Focused Feasibility Study shows the fluxes out of the Passaic River.

Q: How does the contamination spread during flooding?

A: The model concentrates on the river itself, but EPA has taken samples of the mud left behind after storms and found that contamination levels were not that high (though bacteria were not measured).

Q: Why was “decontamination with beneficial reuse” rejected if the cost is lower?

A: Nine criteria go into evaluating options, not just cost. Decontamination is not possible at this time based on pilot project results; it is not ready for scale up. If new info shows that it is feasible it could be considered.

Q: CSOs do not contribute toxic contaminants but contribute other stuff.

A: That’s correct. We will make an effort to make it clear.

Q: Are there geological studies of aquifers?

A: According to our calculations, groundwater is not a significant source of contamination. During the design phase we would need to look at this in more detail.

Q: Would shore to shore dredging include mudflats?

A: Yes, it would dredge to remove 2 ft and fill with habitat-friendly material. This is factored into the estimated costs.

Q: What are the provisions for perpetual maintenance of the cap? Would you be able to go after the PRPs 50 years from now if maintenance costs go up or there are other unforeseeable changes?

A: That would be negotiated when a decision is made.

Q: Would EPA require sediment management plans for surrounding communities given that maintenance dredging will take place?

A: the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is willing to maintain the federally-approved channels if they get the funding.

Q: How would contamination from above mile 8 affect the cleanup?

A: We run the model to estimate how the cap would get re-contaminated over 60 years after the cleanup. Even with re-contamination, the proposed cleanup will be meeting target goals.

Q: How do the lower 8 miles interact with the removal action near the Lister Ave site?

A: EPA has overseen the removal near the former site 2 years ago. Phase 2 for this project was contemplated but is now on hold. The sediments would go to a confined disposal facility which has not been sited yet. If this is still on hold when we are ready to clean up the lower 8 miles, it will be folded into the larger plan.

Q: Does the thickness of the cap consider the expected severity of storms into the future?

A: We have simulated the 100-year storm and have a built-in buffer.

Alice stressed that comments have to be submitted in writing or orally at EPA public meetings during the public comment period to be officially considered. There will be one more public meeting on June 23<sup>rd</sup> in Belleville, NJ (see [ourpassaic.org](http://ourpassaic.org) for details). The final Record Of Decision (ROD) will include a response summary. The comment period is open through August 20 and comments can be submitted to:

[PassaicLower8MileComments.Region2@epa.gov](mailto:PassaicLower8MileComments.Region2@epa.gov)

or

Alice Yeh  
Environmental Protection Agency  
290 Broadway, 19th Floor  
New York, NY 10007-1866

The proposed plan is available at [ourpassaic.org](http://ourpassaic.org) with hard copies at the Newark and Elizabeth libraries. Len Werner has been taking notes and will post them at [OurPassaic.org](http://OurPassaic.org).

#### Passaic River Community Advisory Group Perspective

**Debbie Mans, NY/NJ Baykeeper Executive Director** gave a presentation on the CAG and its perspective.

The Passaic River Community Advisory Group (PR CAG) was created in 2009 to provide advice to the EPA and partners to help ensure an effective and timely cleanup and restoration of the river. The group holds monthly meetings and it is co-chaired by Ana Baptista (now transitioning from Ironbound Community Corporation to the Regional Plan Association) and Debbie. It has a varied membership, including residents, academics, environmental organizations, and rowing clubs.

Community priorities include:

- Science-based, protective cleanup.
- Immediate action.
- Comprehensive cleanup that does not hinder recreation and addresses in-water and shoreline restoration, including mud flats, wetlands, waterfront parks, boat ramps and docks.
- Local job creation as part of the cleanup.

The community opposes burying contaminated sediments in Newark Bay and incineration onsite or near site.

The group is generally supportive of the proposed remedy but they have lots of questions (some of which will be answered during project design), such as:

- Disruption of activities during cleanup, especially to boaters and rowers.
- Maintenance of the cap; can you put an anchor to it?
- Does the cleanup go far enough?
- Coordination with other cleanup phases: upriver, Newark Bay.

The community is also concerned about issues not covered by the cleanup. For example, sewer pollution (though not at the same scale as cancer-causing dioxin, it is still important), public access. Another concern is to understand that corporate funding of public projects in townships along the river does not substitute for the cleanup.

Natural Resource Damage and restoration is meant to compensate for lost uses of the natural resources. This assessment will start in earnest and we hope to see action in conjunction with the cleanup or soon thereafter.

Debbie encouraged everybody to sign up for the PR CAG listserv and to keep pressure on elected officials.

In response to a question about the fish exchange proposed earlier this year, Debbie said that the Cooperating Parties Group had proposed a pilot program to create an aquaculture facility in Newark in partnership with Rutgers Cooperative Extension to exchange fish caught in the river and see if risk from river fish consumption could be reduced. **Tony Bianchini**, a member of the CPG added that the CPG (which does not include Tierra Solutions as part of its 67 members) is training 15 veterans in aquaculture, marketing, business, and landscaping techniques. The CPG is now preparing a press release.

#### Open Discussion among Community Advisory Groups in the Region

Members of other Superfund CAGs then shared their experiences and engaged in conversation.

**Eymund Diegel, member of the Gowanus Canal CAG.** The Gowanus site is much smaller: 1.8 miles long and 100 ft wide but, in some areas, pollution is more concentrated. Sewer pollution is more of an issue. In our case, CSOs have also been defined as source of toxic contamination. There is more conflict between the City and EPA. One of our CAG roles is putting pressure on the City to make sewage part of the cleanup plan. We have focused more on solutions to sewage. We had various meetings on technical solutions to sewer overflows. Dredging will begin one year from now. The flushing tunnel will bring clean water; this is not related to the Long-Term Control Plan. There is no coordination between the superfund cleanup and the City's stormwater proposal. The work schedule of these two efforts conflict and coordination is badly needed. State participation has not been very strong. We are trying to coordinate all plans together so there is an overarching direction. Also there is the issue of private development.

**Althea Mullarkey, Scenic Hudson and member of the Hudson River CAG.** Althea provided some advice based on the HR CAG experience. Don't just rely on trust; have all details laid out before signing. Understand what will happen after cleanup (we found that fish in the Hudson will be good to eat in 125 years). Our site cleanup involves 40 miles of dredging out of the 200-mile superfund



site. We have seen positive changes (vibrancy and restoration) in areas that were dredged bank to bank. Sections with focused dredging leave highly contaminated areas intact. The navigation channel has not been dredged and companies cannot use river. We won't see Natural Resource Damage work for another 15-20 years. It was hoped this would address the unevenly treated areas. CAGs are uniquely situated to talk to cities, Potentially Responsible Parties, EPA, and contractors. Be aware of letters and comments trustees (NRD, state, Fish and Wildlife Service, NOAA) are sending. Flood management poses conflicting choices. Deeper dredging can accommodate more water but may also allow more water to enter the system and worsen a flood. There may be no universal answer—what's best is site-specific. She urged the other CAGs to start the Natural Resource Damages process now.

***Willis Elik, Newtown Creek Alliance and member of the Newtown Creek CAG.*** We are further behind in the process. Our site is bigger than the Gowanus: 3.8 miles but shares some similar problems. There are six Potentially Responsible Parties: 6 corporations and New York City. There is conflict—much of it due to CSOs. Pathogen contamination was not initially a focus but Judith Enck's interest allowed for this issue to be considered. Our site includes wetlands and industrial areas. There are aeration issues—this is part of the CSO Long-Term Control Plan. There was a pilot project and now there is a plan to expand aeration to most of the creek but there are concerns about the process as it creates aerosols. You can see a white line of bubbles in the water and this is throwing viable bacteria into the air as well as fine particulates that contain contaminants. This is proceeding without studies being done. Also the pipes were laid out and will have to be removed. The various agencies are not coordinating.

***Sean Dixon, Riverkeeper and member of the NC CAG*** added that fish consumption advisories are very weak. They consider the contamination level to be the same as in the East River, though fish from Newtown Creek were not analyzed. The public is not told what is going on because the agencies don't know.

There was some discussion about whether models needed to be updated nationwide, and whether HEP and other National Estuary Programs could or should play a role. Many models were developed in the 1960s and it is uncertain whether they accurately depict how aquatic systems work and if modifications are needed in light of climate change.

#### **4. HEP Updates**

Rob Pirani announced that the Hudson River Foundation has hired Kate Boicourt and Gabriela Munoz and the HEP office has been operating at the Foundation since May.

During the last Management Committee meeting in April, Rob summarized HEP budget plans for Fiscal Year 2014. Though there are fewer funds to distribute, HEP will be supporting sediment sampling in the upper Hudson River.

The work plan for FY 14 also includes broad goals based on HEP's Action Plan. HEP will be working on these broad ideas to sort out how exactly these will be approached. HEP will be reaching out to the CAC and others for input. In 2015 HEP may be able to resume some version of a grants program. Rob encouraged participants to contact him with suggestions or questions.

Rob also mentioned the HEP Restoration Symposium that was held on Tuesday, June 3rd. The Symposium was very successful and approximately 200 people attended. We had great speakers, moderators, and volunteers. Rob thanked Future City Inc., NJ Audubon, EPA, and others that helped at the conference. One of the main foci of the symposium was to explore how to continue

implementing the restoration plan and how it meshes with resilience and available funding. HEP will be posting proceedings, videos and presentations online shortly.

Bob Alpern pointed out two potential topics that HEP could play a role in: 1. Modeling issues. 2. Conflicts between Superfund and Clean Water Act actions. He indicated that this hasn't been discussed as part of Long-Term Control Plan meetings even recently.

Rob Pirani indicated that, given the limited resources available to HEP, the Program may be able to leverage activities that help ensure that Long-Term Control Plans move forward and are implemented. MS4 permits focus on municipalities in New Jersey or sewer basins. These can include Superfund and public access, and that's a potential angle for HEP. Modeling may be an issue more appropriate for the Hudson River Foundation, which could convene a panel to assess the quality of current models. This can be further discussed and Rob will be following up with the Foundation. Shino Tanikawa suggested that if this is a role for HEP, the CAC can work with CACs from other NEPs and put pressure to get resources so the NEPs can tackle this issue.

The meeting was adjourned at 5 PM.

**ATTENDEES**

Robert Alpern  
Tony Bianchini, H&G Public Affairs  
Don Chesley  
Peter deFur, Eac, LLC.  
Eymund Diegel, Gowanus Dredgers  
Sean Dixon, Riverkeeper  
Sarah Durand, LaGuardia Community College  
Willis Elkins, Newtown Creek Alliance  
Maggie Flanagan  
Valerie Gores, Newark Public Library  
Meghan Gosselink, NJDEP  
Abigail Jones, Riverkeeper  
Louis Kleinman, Metropolitan Waterfront Alliance  
David Kluesner, US EPA Region 2  
Debbie Mans, NY/NJ Baykeeper  
Dolores Maslo, City of Linden  
Janine MacGregor, NJDEP  
Laura Morales, PSEG  
Harvey Morginstin, Passaic River Boat Club  
Althea Mullarkey, Scenic Hudson  
Gabriela Munoz, NY-NJ Harbor & Estuary Program  
Robert Pirani, NY-NJ Harbor & Estuary Program  
Manuel Russ, Concerned Citizens of Bensonhurst  
Doug Sarno, Forum Facilitation Group  
Bill Schultz, Raritan Riverkeeper  
Clay Sherman, NJ DEP DWM  
July Suarez, Future City, Inc  
Bill Surena, Future City, Inc  
Shino Tanikawa, NY Soil & Water Conservation District  
Nellie Tsipoura, NJ Audubon Society  
Evelyn Vivianco, Future City, Inc  
Len Warner, Louis Berger, Inc.  
Kelly Wenzel, NJ Audubon Society  
Alice Yeh, US EPA Region 2