



# cleanupnews

## inside

News	2
Co-Located Sites in Lowell, MA Offer Opportunity for Coordination	3
In the Courts:	4
Kayser-Roth Corp.	
3M, Krejci Dump Site	
V-1 Oil Company	
Private Lawsuits	
Calendar	8

## President Signs New Brownfields Legislation

**O**n January 11, 2002, President Bush visited the Millennium Corporate Center in Conshohocken, Pennsylvania to sign bipartisan legislation that will encourage the cleanup and redevelopment of old industrial properties. Congress approved the bipartisan bill without opposition in December 2001. The Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act will help clean up the environment, create new jobs, return productive property to local tax rolls, and protect small businesses from frivolous lawsuits.



WHITE HOUSE PHOTO BY ERIC DRAPER

*Looking on as President Bush signs the Brownfields legislation are (L-R): Rep. Paul Gillmor, R-OH; Rep. Robert Borski, D-PA; State Attorney General Mike Fisher; EPA Administrator Christine Todd Whitman; Rep. Joseph Hoeffel, D-PA; and Pennsylvania Governor Mark Schweiker. (AP Photo/Ron Edmonds)*

Brownfields are abandoned or underutilized industrial or commercial properties where redevelopment is hindered by possible environmental contamination and potential liability under Superfund for parties that purchase or operate these sites. EPA estimates that between 500,000 and one million

*continued on page 6*

## EPA Signs Final Cleanup Plan for Hudson River

### *Plan Makes Public Involvement a Top Priority*

**O**n February 1, 2002, EPA Administrator Christine Todd Whitman and Regional Administrator Jane Kenny took a major step toward a healthier Hudson River by signing a Record of Decision (ROD) on a cleanup plan for the river. The final plan calls for dredging 2.65 million cubic yards of contaminated sediment from a 40-mile stretch of the upper Hudson to remove an estimated 150,000 pounds of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). EPA also announced that it will establish a field office in the upper Hudson region staffed by an experienced senior manager to coordinate design activities in concert with the community.

“The Hudson River is a national treasure and this plan brings us closer to one of my overall goals – leaving our water purer for future generations” said Whitman. “We are moving ahead with this cleanup using an open process and

*continued on page 2*



CleanupNews is a quarterly newsletter highlighting hazardous waste cleanup cases, policies, settlements, and technologies.

## “Fundamentals of Environmental Justice Workshop” Train-the-Trainer Forum

**A** November 2001 “Train-the-Trainer” forum brought together 35 people representing EPA, state partners (California, Florida, Minnesota, Missouri, New York, Rhode Island), and diverse stakeholders (community, tribal, and faith-based organizations, academia, and industry) to learn the fundamentals of environmental justice. The forum was held in Boston at the EPA New England offices, capping a year-and-a-half effort to develop and implement the workshop. Participants are trained to identify and address environmental justice issues at work and in communities, and to promote col-

laborative partnerships. In the next 12 months, trainers will lead more than 140 workshops and train more than 3,000 people from EPA, other federal agencies, states, tribes, communities, and industry in this nationally consistent, high quality curriculum. At the conclusion of the forum, Regional Administrator Robert Varney announced that his 800 employees will participate in an appropriately tailored version of the workshop. For more information, contact Nicholas Targ at 202-564-2406.

## \$2 Million in Brownfields Job Training

In December 2001, EPA Administrator Christine Todd Whitman announced \$2 million in grants to provide environmental job training at brownfields sites

in nine states and Washington, D.C. Job skills learned in the course of brownfields cleanup will help participants pursue careers in the environmental field, noted Administrator Whitman. The ten new Job Training Demonstration Pilot Projects — in the District of Columbia, Ohio, Rhode Island, Montana, Iowa, Indiana, Delaware, South Carolina, Washington, and New York — will be funded at \$200,000 and are targeted at individuals living in low-income areas in the vicinity of brownfields sites. Most participants who successfully complete the training program go on to pursue careers with environmental firms and organizations. Since the program started in 1998, 566 trainees have been hired at an average hourly entry-level wage of \$12.12. For more information, contact Doris Thompson at 202-260-4483.

## EPA Signs Final Cleanup Plan for Hudson River

*continued from page 1*

will incorporate performance standards that promote accountability and ensure that we are protecting human health and the environment.”

A 200-mile portion of the Hudson River was declared a federal Superfund site in 1984 because of widespread PCB contamination over a 30-year period from two General Electric plants in Fort Edward and Hudson Falls, New York. The PCBs have bioaccumulated in fish and pose a potential risk of cancer and other health problems for the people who eat them. The final ROD on a plan to clean up the river was developed after years of scientific study and with extensive public input. Continuing discharges of PCBs into the river from General Electric facilities remain a concern. General Electric is expected to take actions to control a major source of PCBs coming from its Hudson Falls plant during the design period for EPA’s cleanup plan.

The design phase of the project — expected to take three years — will include the development of performance standards and the siting of dewatering facilities in consultation with a broad range of stakeholders. Two standards — for air quality and noise — are included in the

ROD, consistent with state and federal law. Enforceable performance standards for re-suspension and production rates during dredging will be developed in the first year of the design phase, with input from the public, in consultation with state and federal natural resource trustees, and subject to an independent scientific peer review. In addition, EPA will monitor PCB levels in fish and restoration of aquatic vegetation. The standards will promote accountability and ensure that the cleanup meets the human and environmental protection objectives of the ROD.

A key element of the ROD is the commitment to a rigorous and meaningful community involvement program. EPA will bring together elected officials, community groups, key environmental organizations, and members of the public to take a fresh look at the community involvement process. EPA will hold a series of facilitated sessions to develop a workable process. Jane Kenny will host public meetings in Saratoga Springs and in Poughkeepsie to discuss the ROD and next steps. EPA will continue to keep the public informed throughout the project through a list server, public meetings, fact sheets, and regular updates to the EPA Hudson River Web site. Copies of the final ROD and a summary of responses to the 70,000 public comments are available at [www.epa.gov/hudson](http://www.epa.gov/hudson) and at 16 information repositories listed on the Web site.

# Co-Located Sites in Lowell, MA Offer Opportunity for Coordination

**W**hat happens when a brownfields site is located near a Superfund site? You get a “co-located” site and a lot of interesting things can happen. With a pilot project in Lowell, MA, EPA is exploring whether facilitators can help galvanize a community in planning for the redevelopment of Superfund and brownfields sites together.

From a holistic point of view, there are often obvious advantages to considering co-located sites at the same time. Until now, however, EPA’s brownfields and Superfund programs have avoided overlap and communities have understood that the government’s grant funding process keeps the programs separate. The result has usually been an active focus on redevelopment of the brownfields property, while reuse of the nearby or adjacent Superfund site is not addressed at all.

At the Tanner Street industrial area in Lowell, MA, EPA is aiming to change that pattern. The project has two broad goals:

- To demonstrate how a facilitator can bring together community interests in developing brownfields and reuse of Superfund sites.
- To examine what synergies emerge in the reuse of a Superfund site, and the development of a brownfields site.

As part of the pilot project, the facilitator was charged with interviewing key influential leaders, convening community groups to build a coalition for action, facilitating a dialogue between the groups, and identifying other resources that could assist an emerging coalition accomplish its mission. Lee Scharf, EPA coordinator for Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) pro-



*Tanner Street, Lowell, MA.*

jects, noted, “This is an important opportunity for two programs to coordinate.”

Facilitation has frequently been used at both brownfields sites and Superfund reuse sites to work with community groups to help resolve differences. Facilitation is often a reactive activity, however, brought into the redevelopment efforts to assist groups in moving past a sticking point. Facilitators usually end up assisting the community in modifying, rather than developing, proposals. By contrast, in Lowell, facilitators have been involved from the beginning of the project to identify alternative pathways that have the greatest likelihood of success.

## Tanner Street

The Tanner Street area in Lowell, MA is an old industrial road, in the middle of which sits the Silresim Superfund site, considered one of the worst Superfund sites in Massachusetts. Listed in 1983, the Silresim site consists of the original five-acre source site that Silresim Chemical Company occupied, and 22 acres of properties located over a contaminated ground water plume. Extensive removal of

stacked barrels of chemicals took place shortly after the site was listed. A temporary cap is currently on the source site. The original remedy proposed to treat the ground water plume with a soil vapor extraction system to pull back the volatile organic compounds in the plume.

This treatment has not worked, and, in the meanwhile, the plume has expanded. Extraction wells recently installed at the leading edge of the plume are expected to halt the progress of the plume while EPA sorts through the best approach to cleanup. Ground water treatment is likely to be underway on the site for a number of years. The final cap on the land area may not be installed for another three to five years.

The remainder of Tanner Street consists of industrial lands — brownfields sites — that the city of Lowell considers underutilized. This is the last property in the city zoned for heavy industrial use, and it is occupied by a number of small businesses, some of which are heavy polluters. The City has a tax title interest in several Tanner Street properties. Some of the businesses on Tanner Street have been there for some time, including a 127-year old iron and steel fabrication facility, several smaller holdings associated with auto repair, and several junk dealers. Tanner Street is directly adjacent to a major transportation artery (the Lowell Connector) with good access and egress. The Tanner Street industrial area also directly abuts a moderate to low income residential neighbor-

*continued on page 7*





## First Circuit Rules on Liability of Parent Corporation for Contamination Caused by Subsidiary in *U.S. v. Kayser-Roth*

**O**n December 3, 2001, the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit issued a favorable decision affirming a district court's ruling that Kayser-Roth Corporation not be allowed to have a 1990 judgment of liability under CERCLA vacated.

The First Circuit ruled that Kayser remained liable as a direct operator under CERCLA section 107(a) for environmental contamination caused by a subsidiary corporation, despite a change in the law of CERCLA liability for parent corporations since the 1990 judgment. In 1990, Kayser was found directly liable as an operator under CERCLA section 107(a) for CERCLA response costs required to remediate a site in North Smithfield, Rhode Island, which had been contaminated with hazardous wastes by a subsidiary corporation of Kayser. In 1990, a district court had determined that Kayser was liable as an operator under CERCLA section 107(a) because it exercised pervasive control over its subsidiary and because Kayser had the ability to control the release of hazardous wastes by its subsidiary.

Kayser sought to have the 1990 judgment of liability vacated under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 60(b). Kayser argued that a 1998 Supreme Court case, *United States v. Bestfoods*, 524 U.S. 51 (1998), established the standard for direct operator liability under CERCLA of parent corporations alleged to be responsible for environmental contamination caused by subsidiary corporations, and that the 1990 judgement was not in accord with the standard required by Bestfoods. The district court ruled that

Kayser's liability was not affected by the Bestfoods decision and Kayser appealed to the First Circuit.

The First Circuit held that Kayser's exercise of control over its subsidiary's environmental operations and the ability of Kayser to control the release of hazardous wastes by its subsidiary did satisfy the Bestfoods standard for direct operator liability of a parent corporation under CERCLA section 107(a) for a subsidiary corporation's environmental contamination. For more information, contact Clarence Featherson, 202-564-4234. [*U.S. v. Kayser-Roth Corp.* 2001 WL 1504690 (1st Cir. Dec. 3, 2001)]

## District Court Awards U.S. \$23 Million in Response Costs for Krejci Dump Site

After finding Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing (3M) joint and severally liable in a previous decision (*United States v. Chrysler*, 2001 WL 1025335 (N.D. Ohio)), the district court granted the United States' motion for partial summary judgment as to response costs incurred at the Krejci Dump site.

3M argued that the United States had failed to adequately document its costs and therefore, the United States was inconsistent with the National Contingency Plan (NCP). The court disagreed, and found that the NCP does not contain any specific standards concerning the documentation of costs. Rather, all the NCP requires is that the United States provide sufficient documentation that renders an accurate accounting of costs incurred by the federal government. The court found that contractor invoices, Project Officer invoice approvals, and proof of payment by EPA were sufficient to support costs incurred at the site. The court also noted that the United States

was entitled to its annual allocation costs as 3M had failed to identify any provision of the NCP that EPA's annual allocation methodology violated. The court reserved judgment on roughly \$1 million in costs due to apparent mathematical errors and the failure of the United States to provide the court with the applicable indirect cost rate. The court has scheduled a bench trial to address these outstanding costs. For more information, contact David Dowton at 202-564-4228. [*United States v. Chrysler*, 2001 WL 1181135 (N.D. Ohio)]

## V-1 Oil Settlement

On November 28, 2001, the U.S. District Court for the District of Idaho entered as a final judgment a consent decree that incorporates a \$1.2 million settlement between the United States and V-1 Oil Company. The settlement had been reached to resolve a civil action brought by the Department of Justice on behalf of EPA and the Coast Guard against V-1 Oil Company concerning an underground leak of gasoline from its gas station in Preston, Idaho in 1996. The case is the first in which EPA has obtained a penalty for violation of an oil cleanup order issued under section 311 of the Clean Water Act.

The leak from the gas station led to local ground water contamination, dangerous fumes in neighborhood home basements, and potentially explosive levels in sewer lines. When V-1 Oil was identified as the source of the leak, the company denied responsibility and denied access to EPA, state, and local investigators. With the company later refusing to comply with a subsequent EPA cleanup order, EPA conducted a two-phase removal action at the site. During the action, EPA removed hundreds of gallons of gasoline from groundwater and about 200 cubic yards of contaminated soil.

The suit was brought to recover penalties for violation of the administrative cleanup order, which was issued by EPA under authority of both CWA section 311 and RCRA section 7003, and to recover funds expended by the government for the site cleanup. The \$1.2 million settlement includes a \$478,000 penalty for V-1 Oil's refusal to comply with the cleanup order (50% of which will go to the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund for the CWA section 311 order violation and 50% of which will go to the General Treasury for the RCRA section 7003 order violation), and \$722,000 to recover costs expended for the cleanup (which will also go to the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund).

A consent decree incorporating the settlement was lodged with the court on May 2, 2001. A notice of the settlement was published in the *Federal Register* on May 23, 2001, giving the public 30 days to comment. The only public comment received, from an attorney in Preston, Idaho, appeared to approve of the terms of the settlement but expressed concern that the amounts recovered would not be used to fund additional cleanup activities in the town. The commenter also suggested that notice of the settlement provided was inadequate because it was published only in the *Federal Register*. The United States' November 6, 2001, motion to enter the proposed consent decree addressed both of the commenter's concerns, and the court found that the consent decree incorporating the settlement was fair, reasonable, adequate, and consistent with the goals of the Oil Pollution Act, CWA, and RCRA. For more information, contact: Keith Cohon, EPA Region 10, 206-553-2149; Bob Kenney, EPA/OSRE, 202-564-5127; or Mary Andrews, EPA/ORE, 202-564-4011.

## Private Lawsuits:

► **Crofton Ventures Ltd. Partnership v. G & H Partnership, 258 F.3rd (4th Cir. 2001):** The current landowner brought a contribution action under CERCLA section 113(f), against former owners and operators to recover CERCLA response costs incurred in cleaning up a contaminated site and state common law claims for fraudulent misrepresentation and breach of contract. The district court entered judgment in favor of former owner and operators on the common law claims and the CERCLA contribution claim. The district court held that the present owner failed to prove that the former owners and operators actually dumped hazardous substances or had knowledge of dumping or leaking during their ownership or operation of site.

The Fourth Circuit affirmed the district court's ruling on the common law claims but vacated and remanded the district court's ruling on the issue of liability. Consistent with the Fourth Circuit's opinion in *Nurad, Inc. v. Hooper & Sons*, 966 F.2d 837 (4th Cir. 1992) (CERCLA liability imposed for passive migration), the Fourth Circuit held that a former owner or former operator is liable under CERCLA for response costs incurred in cleaning up hazardous waste at a site, if hazardous substances were either placed on site or leaked into the environment from a source on site (liability for disposal under CERCLA encompasses passive migration), whether or not the former owner or former operator was the cause of disposal or even had knowledge of the disposal.

For more information, contact Clarence Featherson at 202-564-4234.

► **Aviall Services, Inc. v. Cooper Industries, 263 F.3d 134 (5th Cir. Aug. 14, 2001):** On August 14, 2001, a panel of the Fifth Circuit in a 2-1 decision ruled (over a vehement dissent), that a person responding to a contaminated site has no right of contribution against liable parties for its response costs under CERCLA unless that responding person is already the subject of an action under CERCLA section 106 or 107. In this case, Aviall Services, Inc. discovered contamination at industrial facilities the company had purchased from Cooper Industries, Inc. Aviall notified the Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission, and conducted a decade-long cleanup cost-

ing millions of dollars. Aviall sought contribution from Cooper under CERCLA section 113 and state law. The district court dismissed Aviall's CERCLA claim and declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims. A panel of the 5th Circuit affirmed the district court's ruling. Aviall subsequently filed a petition for rehearing *en banc*, which was granted by the Fifth Circuit.

For more information, contact Clarence Featherson at 202-564-4234.

► **The Port of Redwood City v. Gibson Environmental, Inc., No. C98-3501 TEH (N.D. Ca. Nov. 27, 2001):** The Port of Redwood City brought a CERCLA contribution action against several parties, including the United States. The government filed a motion for summary judgment (as did other parties) requesting that the district court dismiss the Port's action. The court granted the government's request, holding that the Port had not followed the NCP when it cleaned up the site.

The Port claimed its response action was a "removal" under CERCLA while the government claimed it was a "remedial" action (thus requiring a more rigorous decision and public notification process). In deciding that the Port's action were "remedial," the court looked at the complexity, cost, and duration of the operation. The Port's cleanup was over \$10 million, the investigation and response actions are expected to take over six years to complete, and the cleanup operation involved removal of numerous tanks as well as soil and ground water remediation. (In a footnote, the district court declined to follow *Aviall Services, Inc. v. Cooper Industries, Inc.* (see above — no right of contribution unless plaintiff's response action was subject to a section 106 or 107 action).)

► **Kalamazoo River Study Group v. Rockwell International Corp., 2001 WL 1602705 (6th Cir. Dec. 18, 2001):** The Kalamazoo River Study Group brought a CERCLA contribution action against Rockwell. The appellate court upheld the district court's ruling that Rockwell had contributed only minuscule amounts of PCBs (20 lbs) into the Kalamazoo River when compared to the Group's contribution of 100,000 lbs and that Rockwell should receive a zero allocation of response costs.

## Brownfields Legislation

*continued from page 1*

brownfields tarnish the landscapes of communities across America, typically in urban areas.

The new brownfields law reforms one of the major hindrances to brownfields cleanup — liability provisions under the federal Superfund law. The new law provides liability protection for prospective purchasers, contiguous property own-

ers, and innocent landowners. It also authorizes increased funding for state and local programs that assess and clean up brownfields, and relief from Superfund liability for small business owners.

In his remarks, the President noted that the Millennium Corporate Center, where the signing was taking place, had been the site of a steel foundry that sat in disrepair for years until the county began to redevelop it with a grant from EPA. The 1,000th site redeveloped under Pennsylvania's Land

Recycling Program, the Center is built on the former site of the Schuylkill Iron Works, and, when completed, it will be the centerpiece of a 40-acre, \$115 million office, recreation, and residential development. More than 500 people already work at the new development.

President Bush said, "As the employees here know, when a business develops a brownfield, it turns a stagnant plot of land into a productive neighborhood. What we ought to be asking in America is, what does it take to create more jobs? ... Public policy ought to figure out ways to make sure that the entrepreneurs can succeed, so that there is job creation taking place all over the country. This is a good jobs creation bill.

"Further benefit will come as businesses recycle older properties and spare surrounding lands from development. There has been a lot of talk about urban sprawl. Well, one of the best ways to arrest urban sprawl is to develop brownfields, and make them productive pieces of land, where people can find work and employment. By one estimate, for every acre of redeveloped brownfields, we save four and a half acres of open space.

"This legislation will also protect small business owners from unwarranted Superfund liability. Lawyers and governments used to tell small business owners that because they sent their trash to a landfill — and because that landfill became contaminated — they were potentially liable for cleaning up the entire site.

"When government acts in such a heavy-handed way, it hurts a lot of people, and works against its own purposes. It discourages small business growth. With this bill, we are returning common sense to our cleanup program. We will protect innocent small business owners and employees from

*continued on page 7*

### New Brownfields Legislation Highlights

Here are highlights of Public Law 107-118, the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act:

#### *Small Business Liability Relief (Title I)*

- Exempts certain small volume contributors from Superfund liability
- Exempts certain contributors of municipal solid waste from Superfund liability
- Shifts court costs and attorneys fees to a private party if a private party loses a Superfund contribution action against de micromis or municipal solid waste exempt party

#### *Brownfields Program (Title II - Subtitle A)*

- Provides legislative authority for brownfields program including grants for assessment and cleanup
- Expands current brownfields program by increasing funding authority up to \$200 million per year including up to \$50 million per year to assess and cleanup brownfields with petroleum contamination
- Expands eligibility for assessment and cleanup grants
- New provision for direct cleanup grants of up to \$200,000 per site
- Streamlines current requirements for the brownfields cleanup revolving loan fund and makes funding available to nonprofits
- Applies Davis Bacon Act on same terms as authority for current program
- Makes funds available for technical assistance, training, and research

#### *Brownfields Liability Clarifications (Title II - Subtitle B)*

- Exempts certain contiguous property owners from Superfund liability
- Exempts certain prospective purchasers from Superfund liability
- Clarifies the innocent landholders defense to Superfund liability

#### *State Response Programs (Title II - Subtitle C)*

- Supports state and tribal response programs and preserves federal safety net
- Provides \$50 million per year for state and tribal response programs
- Expands activities available for funding of state programs
- Provides Superfund liability relief for certain properties cleaned up under state response programs



## Brownfields Legislation

*continued from page 6*

unfair lawsuits, and focus our efforts instead on actually cleaning up contaminated sites.”

EPA Administrator Christine Todd Whitman noted, “With this new law, we are better able to undo the errors of the past and replace them with environmental partnerships that engage the imagination of the American people. Together, we will clean up brownfields and provide a greener and healthier future for our children and grandchildren.” Whitman expects that the new law will help reduce litigation as well as removing barriers to redevelopment, by differentiating between large contributors of toxic waste and small businesses who disposed of only small amounts of waste or ordinary trash, and should not be considered responsible parties.

At the signing, President Bush also announced that his FY 2003 budget will double the funds available through EPA in FY 2002 — from \$98 million to \$200 million — to help states and communities around the country clean up and revitalize brownfields sites. Another \$25 million in funding is included in the budget for urban redevelopment and brownfields cleanup through the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The proposed FY 2003 budget would permanently extend the Brownfields Tax Incentive. According to government estimates, the \$300 million annual investment in the Brownfields Tax Incentive will leverage approximately \$3.4 billion in private investment and return 8,000 brownfields to productive use.

For more information, contact KC Schefski at 202-564-8213 or Matt Sander at 202-564-7233.



*Tanner Street*

## Lowell, MA

*continued from page 3*

hood, and backs onto a creek that feeds into the Concord River.

In a series of interviews with local government officials, business owners on Tanner Street, residents of the surrounding neighborhood, and local and regional lenders, a number of views and concerns emerged. First, there was widespread support for Tanner Street remaining an industrial area and interest on the part of some local businesses in participating in reuse efforts. Based on this initial assessment, a strategy was developed for a facilitated effort that included creation of an advisory committee, outreach to the banking community and surrounding neighborhoods, continuing outreach to business owners on Tanner Street, and development of a widely accepted master plan for all of Tanner Street.

Since April 2001, the city of Lowell has been meeting with the Citizen Advisory Board. With the help of a visioning exercise of what the residents and industrial owners on Tanner Street wanted the street to become, the group collectively envisioned an industrial use area with some recreational uses and amenities (such as trails), repair of the street and side-

walks, and screening of the messier industrial areas from view. This vision has been incorporated into the plan prepared by the Superfund reuse planner for all of Tanner Street, not just the Silresim site. Reaction from the community has been generally very positive. The next step will be to present the plan to the City Council. Meanwhile, a participatory evaluation is underway. Lee Scharf points out that the citizens will be highly involved in the ongoing evaluation of the project. “The citizens will create measures of success, they’ll check in the middle on where things stand, and evaluate the effort at the end,” she said.

While it’s too soon to call it a success, the elements for success seem to be in place. The city envisions a public-private partnership, and expects a lot of support from industry in the area. An ongoing steering committee is under development to guide the implementation of the plan. In retrospect, most participants agree, there would have been no way to address the brownfields problem effectively without considering the Superfund site, or addressing the Superfund site without looking at the whole street.

For more information, contact Lee Scharf, EPA, at 202-564-5143, or Brian Connors, Lowell Dept. of Planning and Development, at 978-970-4276.

**March 19-20, 2002**

**4th Biennial Freshwater Spill Symposium**

Cleveland, OH

Beatriz Oliveira, 703-603-1229,  
oliveira.beatriz@epa.gov

**March 10-13, 2002**

**14th Annual UST/LUST National Conference**

Kissimmee, FL

Sammy Ng, 703-603-7166,  
ng.sammy@epa.gov

**June 25-28, 2002**

**National Community Involvement Conference**

Portland, OR

Helen DuTeau, 703-603-8761,  
duteau.helen@epa.gov

**Let CleanupNews Come to You on E-MAIL!**

To subscribe to *CleanupNews* via e-mail, please send your name and e-mail address to Debra Kemp at [dkemp@scicomm.com](mailto:dkemp@scicomm.com) or fax to 301-652-7001.

**Glossary**

<b>CEPPO</b>	Chemical Emergency Preparedness and Prevention Office	<b>PCB</b>	Polychlorinated biphenyls
<b>CERCLA</b>	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (Superfund law)	<b>PRP</b>	Potentially Responsible Party
<b>CWA</b>	Clean Water Act	<b>RCRA</b>	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (hazardous waste)
<b>EPCRA</b>	Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act	<b>ROD</b>	Record of Decision
<b>NCP</b>	National Contingency Plan	<b>RSD</b>	Regional Support Division (OSRE/EPA)
<b>NPL</b>	National Priorities List (Superfund)	<b>SREA</b>	Superfund Recycling Equity Act
<b>OERR</b>	Office of Emergency and Remedial Response (EPA)	<b>TBA</b>	Targeted Brownfields Assessment
		<b>UST</b>	Underground Storage Tank

**cleanup**news

[www.epa.gov/oeca/osre](http://www.epa.gov/oeca/osre)

**CleanupNews** is a quarterly publication of EPA's Office of Site Remediation Enforcement, in cooperation with the Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, Office of Underground Storage Tanks, Chemical Emergency Preparedness and Prevention Office, and the Technology Innovation Office.

**Richard W. Popino, Ph.D.**, editor

EPA Review Board: **Paul Connor, Karen Ellenberger, Kenneth Patterson, Helen DuTeau, Jeff Heimerman**

**Gilah Langner**, writer

**Robin Foster**, SciComm Inc., designer

To comment on the newsletter, contact Richard W. Popino at MC-2271A, U.S. EPA, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20460, e-mail: [popino.rick@epa.gov](mailto:popino.rick@epa.gov). For mailing list inquiries, contact Debra Kemp, SciComm Inc., 7735 Old Georgetown Rd, 5th Floor, Bethesda, MD 20814, fax: 301-652-7001, e-mail: [dkemp@scicomm.com](mailto:dkemp@scicomm.com).

FIRST CLASS  
POSTAGE & FEES PAID  
EPA  
PERMIT NO. G-35

United States Environmental  
Protection Agency  
(2271A)  
Washington, DC 20460  
Official Business  
Penalty for Private Use  
\$300