

## **Capping Committee Meeting Summary for October 10, 2012**

Attendees: Michael Burlingame (MB), Steve Chranowski (SC), Ken Hart (KH), Kathleen Kunze (KK), Greg Neumann (GN), Howard Nichols (HN), Paul Sanders (PS), Elana Seelman (ES), Ted Toskos (TT), Geroge Vallone (GV), Teruo Sugihara (TS)

Absent: Frank McLaughlin (FM) and Doug Weimer (DW)

1. Sign in and general introduction of committee members. KK introduced as coordinator/facilitator. Rather than restricting a committee member's participation to a particular issue confronting that member, ideally all the skills and experience of each member will be applied to the development of all aspects of the guidance. Additionally, the members are to coordinate with the respective groups that they represent. Greg Giles (Geologist NJDEP), Gloria Grant (Field Office NJDEP), and Steve Kessel (Brown and Caldwell) were identified as external resources available to assist the committee's efforts. A preliminary agenda was circulated.
2. TS discussed initial goals of the committee from the Department standpoint (address a variety of situations and list possible options to be used). A 1 year time frame was established to finish the guidance with a preference to do so sooner rather than later. The members were encouraged to commit to in person participation with remote meeting access to be employed as a limited contingency only. Replacement of a member is only to be considered during the initial phase of the committee's work to facilitate consistency and timely completion.
3. Ultimately the guidance is a product of the Department. While the objective would be to consider all stakeholder input and to get consensus (if not unanimous) approval, the Department retains the prerogative to have the final say as to the guidance content.
4. The committee was polled for meeting frequency, duration, and time preferences. The consensus was to initially meet every 2 weeks preferably on a Wednesday (with Tuesday as an alternative) with the frequency to be adjusted appropriately as the work progressed. Ideally, meetings would last up 1.5 to 2 hours and start times would be either 10:00 or 2:00 (dependent on meeting room availability, etc.). October 24, 2012 is the next scheduled meeting with the exact time and location to be determined subsequently.
5. The meeting summary functions as a record and described the process used to generate that document. Two sets of notes (TS and another selected committee member) would be used by TS to develop a draft prior to the next meeting. Ideally it would be sent out for review to the full committee prior to the next meeting. Edits would be made at the following meeting and the

meeting summary finalized. KK indicated it was the intention to post the meeting summary on the website at some point. These meeting summaries would be the documentation of decisions made. The committee was cautioned that revisiting issues that had already been decided was to be discouraged in order to finish the guidance in a timely manner.

6. The committee is prohibited from developing or changing Department policy. Similarly the initiation or consideration of legislative changes is also prohibited. The topic of impact to ground water policy was specifically discussed. Because of the interest voiced by many committee members, Department management is being solicited by TS to provide instruction as to the extent to which this topic can be discussed.

7. All committee members were solicited for their input as to the goals of the committee and their individual topics of concern.

The predominant thought seemed to be to develop a decision logic (TT) or flowchart (SC) containing the various capping options that incorporated selection and implementation criteria. Specifically, the impact of various parameters on cap design needs to be part of the process as a static “one size fits all” solution is not realistic (MB/TT). Monitoring (GN) and performance criteria (HN) are also to be included in the approach. Compatibility with final site use is another critical element (ES). Consideration of alternatives to clean fill would potentially mitigate cost and material availability concerns (KH). Including an appendix of case studies was suggested to reinforce the concepts (TT). The ultimate goal would be to have a product that facilitated choices made by the users regarding capping (GV).

8. Assignments:

- a. Each committee member was tasked to provide a reference on the subject of capping at the next meeting that was distinct from the preliminary reference list provided at the meeting. It was noted that recent guidance appears limited. Case studies are the most available references.
- b. Each committee member is to define what is a cap and what is the purpose of the capping committee.
- c. Each committee member is to list and prioritize parameters to be considered in developing a decision tree/logic for the selection of an appropriate capping system. All types of caps are to be included.