

**NJDEP Science Advisory Board  
Draft Meeting Minutes  
October 18, 2010**

SAB Members Present: Judith Weis (Chair), John Dyksen, Raymond Ferrara, John Gannon, Jonathan Husch, Robert Laumbach, Peter Lederman, Paul Liroy, Robert Lippencott, Nancy Rothman, Anthony Broccoli\*, Emile DeVito\*, Mark Robson\* and David Vaccari\*.

The full Science Advisory Board (SAB) and Standing Committees began their meeting at approximately 9:00 a.m in the NJDEP public hearing room. Gary Buchanan welcomed everyone on behalf of the NJDEP Office of Science and Commissioner Martin. Dr. Judith Weis then welcomed everyone and had all in attendance introduce themselves.

Cathy Tormey (NJDEP) spoke about conflict of interest, reminded members to complete a supplemental questionnaire and return it by October 25<sup>th</sup>. She pointed out that SAB meetings are considered non-public meetings. She also talked about the open public records act, (OPRA), reminding members that all electronic communication with the Department is subject to this policy.

Larry Ragonese (NJDEP) from the press office talked to the group with suggestions about communicating with the press. Larry requested that members let his office know when they are approached so he can insure the Departments position is clear.

At approximately 9:50 a.m. the meeting was adjourned to allow the SAB and Standing Committees to meet separately. \*The SAB met without the Standing Committee chairpersons who attended their respective meetings.

The SAB meeting was called to order by Judith Weis at approximately 10:00 a.m.

The minutes from the September 8, 2010 meeting were reviewed. John Gannon pointed out that he had asked to be included on the Cumulative Risk workgroup. The minutes were amended to reflect that and approved by the board.

Tom Belton (NJDEP) made a presentation on the Nutrient issue. Some members thought that other members may need to be identified. The board asked that some particular questions could be developed to better address this issue. Paul Liroy pointed out that there were several terms that needed specific definitions, such as impairment. It was pointed out that the issue was so broad that it was difficult to present in a short presentation. A definitive time frame was also requested by the board.

Gary Buchanan made a brief presentation on the emerging contaminant issue. The board asked that staff identify contact people in the department for each class of emerging contaminants. Staff were also tasked with investigating what EPA is doing with some of these contaminants. It was suggested that staff look at EPA Region 9 information. The

board also asked if the DEP had information that could be searched such as the toxics release inventory. Other work by the Department of Defense and Environmental Council of States will also be investigated. The board asked if the DEP was looking for a framework (yes); and asked what is the endpoint(s) of concern. DEP will define the endpoints and respond to the board. John Gannon asked to be added to this working group.

Steve Anderson (NJDEP) made an overview presentation on the cumulative risk issue. In response to a question by Robert Lippencott, Steve indicated this is actually a potential (i.e., risk of) cumulative impact evaluation method and not an indication of actual or confirmed impacts. Paul Liroy indicated the need to separate environmental stressors from other stressors and indicated the National Academy of Sciences was examining this issue. The board asked DEP to develop more specific questions on this issue for them to consider.

Swati Toppin of the NJDEP Site Remediation program made a detailed presentation on the impact to groundwater issue. There was some discussion about some of the default criteria within the model. An informal working group was confirmed with Robert Lippencott leading the group. The group will read through the background information provided and set up conference calls with Dr. Toppin. They will report to the SAB at the next meeting.

The presentations ran longer than planned. Dr. Weis thanked everyone for their work so far. Dr. Weis asked that the next meeting be held in approximately one month. It was agreed that meeting planning software would be used to schedule the meeting date.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:08 pm.