



COMMITTEE ON  
THE CHALLENGES OF  
MODERN SOCIETY

EPA 542-R-98-001b  
June 1998  
[www.clu-in.com](http://www.clu-in.com)  
[www.nato.int/ccms](http://www.nato.int/ccms)

## **NATO/CCMS Pilot Study**

Evaluation of Demonstrated and  
Emerging Technologies for the  
Treatment and Clean Up of  
Contaminated Land and  
Groundwater

### **PHASE II OVERVIEW REPORT**

**Number 219**

**NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION**

---

**Overview Report  
NATO/CCMS Pilot Study**

**Evaluation of Demonstrated and Emerging  
Technologies for the Treatment and Clean Up  
of Contaminated Land and Groundwater  
(Phase II)**

**June 1998**

**NOTICE**

This report was prepared under the auspices of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society (NATO/CCMS) as a service to the technical community by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). The document was funded by U.S. EPA's Technology Innovation Office under the direction of Michael Kosakowski (Work Assignment Manager). Michael A. Smith of Berkhamsted, U.K., was the principal editor for the Pilot Study reports and the author of this Overview Report. The Overview Report was edited and produced by Environmental Management Support, Inc., of Silver Spring, Maryland, under U.S. EPA contract 68-W6-0014. Mention of trade names or specific applications does not imply endorsement or acceptance by U.S. EPA.

**CONTENTS**

1. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
2. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE . . . . .	2
3. RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER CCMS PROGRAMS . . . . .	2
3.1 The CCMS Fellowship Program . . . . .	2
3.2 CCMS Study Visit Program . . . . .	2
4. ACCOMPLISHMENTS . . . . .	2
5. TECHNICAL OVERVIEW . . . . .	5
5.1 Introduction . . . . .	5
5.2 Development Status . . . . .	5
5.3 <i>In Situ</i> vs. <i>Ex Situ</i> Technologies . . . . .	5
5.4 Technology Types . . . . .	5
5.5 Contaminants Treated . . . . .	6
6. THE PHASE III PILOT STUDY . . . . .	6
7. CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	7
8. RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	7
9. REFERENCES . . . . .	9
10. NATIONAL CONTACTS . . . . .	10

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This report provides an overview of the Phase II Pilot Study on the Evaluation of Demonstrated and Emerging Technologies for Treatment and Clean Up of Contaminated Land and Groundwater. It also contains the key conclusions of the Pilot Study and recommendations for further action. A detailed account of the Phase II Pilot Study is provided in the Final Report (1).

The Phase II Pilot Study was proposed to NATO by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) at the Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society's (CCMS) plenary session in April 1992. Member countries voted on and accepted the proposal at the same meeting.

The study was conducted under the joint leadership of the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, and the Netherlands. It was co-chaired by Mr. Stephen James and Dr. Walter Kovalick, Jr., of U.S. EPA. Dr. Deniz Beten, Director of CCMS Programs, provided liaison with the NATO/CCMS secretariat. Additional information on CCMS and the Pilot Studies may be obtained from the Country Representatives listed at the back of this document.

The Pilot Study Group held a total of seven meetings during the course of the study. During these meetings, countries submitted candidate projects that were discussed and voted on for inclusion in the study based on criteria agreed upon by the participating countries. In-depth interim and final report presentations on the implementation and results of these projects were made during the international meetings and summarized in meeting proceedings. Australia, Austria, Canada, the Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Hungary, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States provided projects to the study. In addition, Belgium, Hong Kong, Italy, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, and the Slovak Republic were represented at one or more meetings by a government representative, a CCMS Fellow, or an individual expert.

Each project was planned and executed by the responsible organization, with project funding from the various government and non-government organizations involved. The costs of participating in international meetings and preparing project reports were generally met by these organizations concerned, which in many cases were private companies.

Each international conference included host country presentations and a *tour de table*, during which member countries discussed developments in national legislation, regulations, and research and development programs. In addition, recognized experts in diverse technical fields gave invited papers related to the challenges of soil and groundwater remediation, and CCMS Fellows provided presentations and written reports on their work. These reports from Fellows were published as part of the proceedings of the international meetings and are contained in Appendix V of the Final Report.

The Final Report was prepared by a voluntary team drawn from a number of countries. The Pilot Study Directors acknowledge the efforts of the members of the team without whose contributions it would not have been possible to produce the report. The Final Report was published by U.S. EPA. Contributions towards the direct costs of preparing the Final Report have also been made by Denmark, Germany, Norway, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

The various Pilot Study activities resulted in extensive transfer of study findings to potential users of new remediation technologies and to a wider technical and administrative audience. They also increased the exchange of ideas on technology needs and fostered greater contact among experts and decision-makers within both member and non-member countries.

## 2. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

The problem of land and groundwater contamination from improper handling and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes is faced by all countries. Many countries have committed resources to developing advanced, innovative remediation technologies and to evaluating them under field conditions. The ongoing challenge is how to maximize the value of these technology demonstrations and effectively transfer the technologies both within and between countries. In addition, there has been an increasing recognition of the need for approaches not dependent on advanced technologies and for technologies that can be cost-effectively employed in the socioeconomic circumstances of Eastern and Central Europe and developing countries.

The purpose of this NATO/CCMS pilot study was to identify, discuss, and review innovative, emerging, and alternative technologies, and to transfer technical performance and economic information to potential users of these technologies. A specific objective of the study was to identify “lessons learned” from the technology demonstrations—both the successes and those that illustrated technology failures or limitations. The latter type of information is rarely presented in conferences or discussed in the technical literature, but is very important for making informed decisions involving critical time and monetary requirements. It is also useful for defining priorities in research and development programs.

## 3. RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER CCMS PROGRAMS

### 3.1 The CCMS Fellowship Program

The CCMS Fellowship Program made an important contribution to the success of the Phase II Pilot Study, as it did to the two earlier Pilot Studies on the remediation of contaminated soil and groundwater. It facilitated participation of several experts, including experts from countries such as Portugal, that would otherwise not have had a presence in the Pilot Study. The participation of these experts enabled a wider range of topics to be covered.

Ten NATO Fellowships were awarded under this Pilot Study. Nine Fellows conducted associated studies and submitted project reports to the Pilot Study under guidance of the Pilot Study Directors. One edited the Final Report and contributed to the content of the report; two other Fellows also contributed to the preparation of the report. All of the Fellows attended one or more meetings of the Pilot Study Group and played an active part in the discussions.

The Fellows came from private, university, and governmental organizations in the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Their activities covered a range of topics related to the Pilot Study, including an examination of the national approach to such problems as costs and economics, quality management, innovative approaches to large-scale remediation projects, and assessment of the performance of *in situ* treatment methods.

### 3.2 CCMS Study Visit Program

Participation by a number of individuals, including expert speakers, was made possible by the provision of travel funds through the CCMS Study Visit Program.

## 4. ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The Pilot Study Group examined 52 different remediation technology projects from 14 countries during the five-year program. The projects encompassed *in situ* and *ex situ* biological, physical-chemical, and

thermal treatment technologies. Many of the projects involved two or more technologies, either in integrated treatment systems or in parallel treatment. The reports on these projects revealed an ongoing evolution of innovative and advanced technologies. The Pilot Study is believed to have been instrumental in facilitating this development.

Non-member countries, including members of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) took increasing interest in and participated in the Phase II Pilot Study. For example:

- The first Pilot Study meeting was held in Budapest in 1992—the first CCMS meeting to be held in a NACC country. A number of the participants presented papers at an international environmental meeting held the previous week.
- The third meeting was held in Adelaide, Australia, in February 1995 and was co-hosted by the Commonwealth EPA.
- Projects were contributed by a number of non-member countries including, Australia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Sweden, and Switzerland.

The Pilot Study was designed to provide participants with a broader view of the research strategies of other countries to help them focus their own research strategy. Technology transfer from the Pilot Study was promoted by circulating meeting reports, involving members in conferences and symposia, and publishing papers in professional journals. Some examples of this activity are listed below:

- The proceedings of the Pilot Study meetings were provided to country representatives (nominated by their respective countries for participation in the meetings) to duplicate and distribute within their countries, as needed.
- In 1995, U.S. EPA published an Interim Status Report (2) that was distributed to all participating countries and others worldwide.
- The German Federal Ministry of Environment, Nature Protection, and Reactor Safety (Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Naturschutz und Reaktorsicherheit) commissioned one CCMS Fellow to prepare a report of the meeting held in Berlin in 1996 and a review of research needs (3). This report was circulated to country representatives.
- During the Pilot Study meetings, participants visited soil treatment facilities, ongoing site cleanup, and research institutions. These activities stimulated the participation of private companies in the Pilot Study and enlarged the network of international experts and increased their interactions.
- The Pilot Study Director and Co-Directors provided annual reports to NATO/CCMS.
- The Co-Directors and other members of the Pilot Study served on numerous science advisory committees and presented invited papers at national and international technology conferences and symposia at national conferences in Australia, the Netherlands, Canada, Luxembourg, the United Kingdom, and the United States. A special session based on the Pilot Study formed part of the Netherlands Research Organization (TNO) international conference on contaminated soil, held in Maastricht in 1995.
- A paper describing the current Pilot Study and the achievements of earlier studies on contaminated land and groundwater (4) was presented at an International Symposium on the Rehabilitation of

Military Sites and Demilitarization of Explosive Ordnance, held in Luxembourg 1994 and co-sponsored by NATO, the World Health Organization, and the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg.

- In the United Kingdom, a number of related reports were prepared for the U.K. Department of the Environment. One of these formed the basis for a wider publication.

In addition to the technical issues that were the focus of this Pilot Study, each meeting started with a *tour de table*, during which each country discussed developments in national legislation, regulations, technical criteria, and guidelines (5). Understanding differences in policy and management strategies in other countries has been helpful to study members for discussions when they returned to their countries.

Close liaison was maintained throughout the study with other international groups dealing with the problems of contaminated land including:

- the CCMS Pilot Study on the Environmental Aspects of Reusing Military Lands;
- the “*Ad hoc* International Working Group” on Contaminated Land, which grew out of discussions among country representatives attending the NATO/CCMS meetings. The Working Group exists to provide a forum—open to any country—in which the issues and problems of contaminated land and groundwater can be discussed at a national level and information can be freely exchanged to the benefit of all participants;
- the Common Forum on Contaminated Land in the European Union, which also began through the NATO/CCMS meetings;
- CARACAS\* (the European Union’s [EU] Concerted Action on Risk Assessment for Contaminated Sites);
- NICOLE\* (the EU’s Concerted Action Network for Industrially Contaminated Land in Europe);
- the International Organization for Standardization’s (ISO) Technical Committee TC190: Soil Quality, which is preparing international standards for soil and site assessment, including chemical, biological, and physical testing methods; and
- the German-United States Bilateral Agreement, the goals of which are to:
  - facilitate an understanding of each country’s approach to the remediation of contaminated sites;
  - demonstrate innovative remedial technologies;
  - compare quality assurance programs; and
  - facilitate technology transfer.

---

\* CARACAS (coordinated by the German Umweltbundesamt) and NICOLE are both funded by the European Commission’s Directorate General XII under the Environment and Climate Research and Development Program.

## 5. TECHNICAL OVERVIEW

### 5.1 Introduction

There were 52 active projects in the Pilot Study. Summary information on each project is provided in Appendix IV (Volume 2 of the Final Report). The project summaries provide a technical abstract, which summarizes the project's progress and results, but is not a critical review of the project. The summaries also provide the name of a technical contact for further information.

While the objective of the Pilot Study was to evaluate applications of particular technologies, a large proportion of the projects involved more than one technology. Some involved the use of integrated treatment systems combining more than one technology, and others involved the application of more than one technology to deal with separate aspects of site contamination. Other projects concerned theoretical studies, strategic scientific studies, or large-scale remediation projects for which the remediation strategy had yet to be developed.

Because the projects are classified below in a variety of ways, they may be counted two or three times, and not all projects may be included in each analysis. Furthermore, the categorization of projects is a matter of judgment, and alternative categorizations may be possible. The projects are classified in the following sections as follows:

- by the development status of the technology (Section 5.2);
- whether they are *in situ* or *ex situ* technologies, or a combination of both (Section 5.3);
- by the type of technology used (Section 5.4);
- by the contaminants treated (Section 5.5); and
- whether they involve a single technology, mixed technologies, or integrated treatment systems.

### 5.2 Development Status

Forty-nine of the 52 active projects were technology-based. The Pilot Study accepted technical projects in two areas of development: "emerging" and "demonstration." For the purposes of the Pilot Study, an emerging technology is defined as being at bench- or pilot-scale, while a demonstrated technology is one implemented at field- or full-scale. Demonstrated technologies are usually at or near to commercial application. There was almost an even split of projects within the Pilot Study examining emerging and demonstrated technologies.

### 5.3 *In Situ* vs. *Ex Situ* Technologies

There were 18 projects using *in situ* technologies: 26 projects using *ex situ* technologies, six projects using both *in situ* and *ex situ* technologies, and two projects (Projects 22 and 56) for which the remediation strategy had yet to be decided.

### 5.4 Technology Types

For the purposes of the Final Report the technologies described in each technical project were broadly classified as one of five types: biological, chemical, physical-chemical, stabilization/solidification, or

thermal. The additional categories of “integrated” and “mixed” are used to describe combinations of technologies used as part of an overall remediation strategy. “Integrated” refers to approaches where two or more technologies are used simultaneously or in series to treat a specific site problem. “Mixed” projects involve two or more technologies used to treat different contaminated areas or media as part of an overall remedial strategy.

The classification of projects was as follows (Note that some projects were counted twice.):

Technology Type	Number of Projects	Examples of Technologies
Biological	24	bioventing, biopiles, slurry reactors, white rot fungi
Physical-Chemical	29	soil vapor extraction, soil washing, solvent extraction, ultraviolet treatment
Chemical	4	photochemical oxidation, ozone treatment, sorption, leaching
Thermal	5	thermal desorption, incineration, thermal vitrification
Stabilization/Solidification	2	chemical fixation, grouting
Other	4	site characterizations, free-product recovery

There were 23 projects that relied upon a single technology, 19 that used integrated technologies, seven mixed technologies, and three that did not involve treatment. Typical combinations were soil vapor extraction with *in situ* biotreatment, soil washing followed by biotreatment, and soil washing followed by thermal treatment.

## 5.5 Contaminants Treated

Forty of the 52 projects were concerned only with the treatment of organic contaminants, including polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, polychlorinated biphenyls, and BTEX compounds (benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes). Six projects dealt exclusively with metals, and six dealt with both inorganic and organic contaminants. One project focused on remediation of inorganic sulfates and cyanides.

## 6. THE PHASE III PILOT STUDY

The country representatives and other participants in the Pilot Study agreed on the merit of a Phase III Pilot Study—both for those countries having established programs to address contaminated land and for those who have more recently begun to address contamination problems, such as countries in Central and Eastern Europe. In addition, developing countries might benefit by avoiding the environmental degradation that accompanied the industrialization of Europe and North America. Particular needs identified included more extensive, cheaper, and sustainable treatment technologies, and studies of containment methods.

The United States formally proposed a follow-up Pilot Study at the CCMS Plenary Meeting held in April 1997. The proposal was accepted, and Germany and The Netherlands agreed to participate as co-pilot

countries. The new Pilot Study was welcomed by Cooperation Partners at the subsequent “Continuation of the Plenary Meeting.” The first meeting of the new Pilot Study was held in Vienna, Austria, in February 1998. Seven projects initiated during this Phase II study will be continued during the Phase III study.

## 7. CONCLUSIONS

This Phase II Pilot Study again demonstrated the benefits of exchanging technical and economic information on contaminated land and groundwater remediation technologies. The full conclusions of the Pilot Study are presented in the Final Report, together with supporting statements. The conclusions are based on the deliberations of the Pilot Study Group, case studies, expert speaker presentations, special studies carried out by Fellows of the Pilot Study, and the experience and expertise of the individual chapter authors. The conclusions are of four types:

- general conclusions arising from the Pilot Study;
- general conclusions about remediation and technology transfer;
- conclusions relating to individual chapters in the report; and
- research needs.

Seven of the conclusions listed in the Final Report are regarded as particularly important and are listed below:

1. Remediation strategies in a number of countries are moving from technology-intensive treatment processes to increasing use of land use management and extensive approaches such as natural attenuation.
2. The intended future use of a site is increasingly a determining factor when setting clean-up objectives and selecting a remediation strategy.
3. Integrated treatment systems are frequently needed for site remediation.
4. Energy efficiency practices influence plant design resulting in varying processing costs between countries. This may make cost comparisons between countries difficult and lead to the choice of different technologies to address similar problems.
5. All remediation activities require proper operation and management.
6. Independent evaluation and verification of technologies and uniform data collection are needed for effective technology transfer.
7. Scientific understanding of processes is essential to avoid forming harmful end-products and byproducts, ensure process optimization, avoid unwanted transfer of contaminants to other media, and understand the limits of technical performance.

## 8. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) *The CCMS is invited by the Pilot Study Directors to commend this Phase II Pilot Study Final Report to the NATO Council for approval.*

All the participants in this phase of the study are commended for their professionalism, technical expertise, and cooperation. The Pilot Study Directors particularly thank the two co-pilot countries, Germany and The Netherlands, for their assistance. The CCMS Fellows are complimented on their technical quality and personal input to the Pilot Study. The Expert Speaker activities were a major success in stimulating discussion among participants. Over and above the technical successes of the Pilot Study, a camaraderie was established between participants leading to extensive exchanges of information outside of the Pilot Study. The progress of the Study was reported via formal interim reports and numerous papers published in technical journals, and conference proceedings published in North America, Europe, and Australia. Consequently, the CCMS is invited to commend the Final Report to member governments and to the governments of the NACC countries drawing their attention to the technical information, conclusions, and recommendations it contains.

- 2) *The CCMS is requested to encourage participation of NATO and non-NATO countries in the continuation study (Phase III Pilot Study).*

The participation of NACC and other non-NATO countries has been a feature of the Phase II Pilot Study with mutual benefit to all involved. The Pilot Study co-pilots will continue to elicit formal participation by additional countries known to have contaminated land and groundwater programs.

CCMS is requested to draw the attention of member countries to the way in which formal participation can open doors for researchers, regulators, and others from within and outside government to high quality technology and information exchange activities and to an extensive network of professional contacts. The CCMS is asked to encourage member countries to adopt formal observer status, even if the countries wish to have only minimal active participation at an official level.

- 3) *The Phase III Pilot Study should maintain liaison with related international activities on contaminated land.*

The benefits to all participants has been enhanced by the parallel activities in policy-orientated areas (e.g., the International Working Group on Contaminated Land and the Common Forum on Contaminated Land) and technical areas such as risk assessment through CARACAS and soil quality through the ISO Technical Committee 190. Liaison should be extended in the Phase III study to include NICOLE, the European Environment Agency's Soil Topic Centre, the World Health Organization's European Centre for Environment and Health and others involved in this technical area. Close liaison should be continued with NATO/CCMS Pilot Studies dealing with contamination of military installations.

- 4) *The Phase III Pilot Study should publish an annual progress report and, as appropriate, periodic technical reports on selected topics.*

Preparing a technical report summarizing work over several years requires a considerable effort on the part of all concerned. It involves not only critical review of submitted information, but also the gathering of additional technical information and liaison with country representatives and project authors. Furthermore, there is a considerable editorial effort required to combine the individual contributions into a coherent and substantive final report. Preparation of the Final Report for this and preceding Pilot Studies (1,2) has been possible because of the volunteer efforts of the writing teams.

The remediation of contaminated soil and groundwater is a rapidly evolving field so that there is a risk that much of the information provided in the Pilot Study report will already be out of date by the time of publication. It is therefore recommended that this issue be addressed by:

- preparation of an annual report that could be widely distributed and serve as a working tool for participants to monitor the progress of the Pilot Study, including the introduction and completion of individual projects;
- the publication from time to time of technical and non-technical reports on specific topics as seems appropriate; and
- the use of other channels of publication, such as technical journals and conference publications, to ensure rapid dissemination of the results of individual projects and of the Pilot Study as a whole.

## 9. REFERENCES

1. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Technology Innovation Office, *NATO/CCMS Pilot Study: Evaluation of Demonstrated and Emerging Technologies for Treatment and Clean Up of Contaminated Land and Groundwater, Phase II Final Report*, EPA/542/R-98/001a, 1998.
2. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *NATO/CCMS Pilot Study: Evaluation of Demonstrated and Emerging Technologies for Treatment and Clean-up of Contaminated Land and Groundwater (Phase II): Interim Status Report*, 1995, EPA/542/R-95/006.
3. Smith, M.A., *NATO/CCMS Pilot Study: Evaluation of Demonstrated and Emerging Technologies for the Treatment and Clean-up of Contaminated Land and Groundwater: Interim Status Report and Report on Meeting Held in Berlin in September 1996*, Report for Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Naturschutz und Reaktorsicherheit, 1996, Bonn, Germany.
4. Smith, M.A., "NATO/CCMS Pilot Study on remediation technologies for contaminated land and groundwater," In, *Proc. 1994 Luxembourg International Conference on the Rehabilitation of Military Sites and Demilitarization of Explosives Ordnance*, 1994, pp 325-332.

## 10. NATIONAL CONTACTS

### Directors

Stephen C. James (Co-Director)  
National Risk Management Research Laboratory  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
26 Martin Luther King Drive  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45268  
**United States**  
tel: 513-569-7877  
fax: 513-569-7680  
E-mail: james.steve@epa.gov

Walter W. Kovalick, Jr. (Co-Director)  
Technology Innovation Office  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
401 M Street, SW (5102G)  
Washington, DC 20460  
**United States**  
tel: 703-603-9910  
fax: 703-603-9135  
E-mail: kovalick.walter@epa.gov

### Co-Pilot Directors

Volker Franzius  
Umweltbundesamt  
Bismarckplatz 1  
D-14193 Berlin  
**Germany**  
tel: 49/30-8903-2496  
fax: 49/30-8903-2285 or -2103

H. Johan van Veen  
The Netherlands Integrated Soil Research  
Programme  
P.O. Box 37  
NL-6700 AA Wageningen  
**The Netherlands**  
tel: 31/317-484-170  
fax: 31/317-485-051  
E-mail: anneke.v.d.heuvel@spbo.beng.wau.nl

### Country Representatives

Gillian King Rodda  
Manager, Contaminated Sites  
Environment Protection Group  
Environment Australia  
PO Box E305  
Kingston ACT 2604  
**Australia**  
tel: 61-2-6274-1114  
fax: 61-2-6274-1164  
E-mail: gillian.king.rodde@ea.gov.au

Jacqueline Miller  
Brussels University  
Avenue Jeanne 44  
1050 Brussels  
**Belgium**  
tel: 32/2-650-3183  
fax: 32/2-650-3189  
E-mail: jmiller@resulb.ulb.ac.be

Nora Auer  
Federal Ministry of Environment, Youth and  
Family Affairs  
Dept. III/3  
Stubenbastei 5  
A-1010 Vienna  
**Austria**  
tel: 43/1-515-22-3449  
fax: 43/1-513-1679-1008  
E-mail: Nora.Auer@bmu.gv.at

Harry Whittaker  
Emergencies Engineering Division  
Environment Canada  
3439 River Road  
Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0H3  
**Canada**  
tel: 613/991-1841  
fax: 613/991-1673  
E-mail: harry.whittaker@etc.ec.gc.ca

Jan Švoma  
Aquatest a.s.  
Geologicka 4  
152 00 Prague 5  
**Czech Republic**  
tel: 420/2-581-83-80  
fax: 420/2-581-77-58  
E-mail: aquatest@aquatest.cz

Inge-Marie Skovgård  
Contaminated Land Division  
Danish Environmental Protection Agency  
29 Strandgade  
DK-1401 Copenhagen K  
**Denmark**  
tel: 45/3-266-0100 - direct 45/32660397  
fax: 45/3-296-1656  
E-mail: ims@mst.dk

Ari Seppänen  
Ministry of Environment  
P.O. Box 399  
00121 Helsinki  
**Finland**  
tel: +358/9-199-197-15  
fax: +358/9-199-196-30

René Goubier  
Polluted Sites Team  
ADEME  
B.P. 406  
49004 Angers Cedex 01  
**France**  
tel: 33/241-204-120  
fax: 33/241-872-350

Antonios Kontopoulos\*  
National Technical University of Athens  
GR-157 80 Zografos  
Athens  
**Greece**

Pál Varga  
National Authority for the Environment  
Fö u.44  
H-1011 Budapest  
**Hungary**  
tel: 36/1-457-3530  
fax: 36/1-201-4282  
E-mail: vargap@kik.ktm.hu

Matthew Crowe  
Environmental Management and Planning  
Division  
Environmental Protection Agency  
P.O. Box 3000  
Johnstown Castle Estate  
County Wexford  
**Ireland**  
tel: +353 53 60600  
fax: +353 53 60699  
E-mail: m.crowe@epa.ie

Takeshi Nishio  
Soil and Agricultural Chemicals Division  
Environment Agency, Water Quality Bureau  
Japan Environment Agency  
1-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-Ku  
Tokyo 100  
**Japan**  
tel: +81-3-3580-3173  
fax: +81/3-3593-1438  
E-mail: takeshi\_nishio@eanet.go.jp

Raymond Salter  
Ministry for the Environment  
84 Boulcott Street  
P.O. Box 10362  
Wellington  
**New Zealand**  
tel: 64/4-917-4000  
fax: 64/4-917-7523  
e-mail: rs@mfe.govt.nz

---

\*Due to the death of Prof. Kontopoulos, communications with the Greek delegation to the Pilot Study may be directed to: Manolis Papadopoulos, tel: +30-1-772 2219; fax: +30-1-772 2218, E-mail: papadop@metal.ntua.gr

Bjørn Bjørnstad  
Norwegian Pollution Control Authority  
P.O. Box 8100 Dep  
N-0032 Oslo  
**Norway**  
tel: 47/22-257-3664  
fax: 47/22-267-6706  
E-mail: bjorn.bjornstad@sftospost.md.dep.  
telemax.no

Ewa Marchwinska  
Institute for Ecology of Industrial Areas  
6 Kossutha Street  
40-833 Katowice  
**Poland**  
tel: 48/32 -1546-031  
fax.: 48/32 -1541-717  
e-mail: ietu@ietu.katowice.pl

Marco Estrela  
Instituto de Soldadura e Qualidade  
Centro de Tecnologias Ambientais  
Estrada Nacional 249–Km 3–Leiao (Tagus Park)  
Apartado 119 - 2781 Oeiras Codex  
**Portugal**  
tel: +351/1-422-8100  
fax: +351/1-422-8129  
E-mail: maestrela@isq.pt

Branko Druzina  
Institute of Public Health  
Trubarjeva 2-Post Box 260  
6100 Ljubljana  
**Slovenia**  
tel: 386/61-313-276  
fax: 386/61-323-955  
E-mail: branko.druzina@ivz.sigov.mail.si

Ingrid Hasselsten  
Swedish Environmental Protection Agency  
Blekhölmsterrassen 36  
S-106 48 Stockholm  
**Sweden**  
tel: 46/8-698-1179  
fax: 46/8-698-1222  
E-mail: inh@environ.se

Bernhard Hammer  
BUWAL  
Federal Department of the Interior  
3003 Bern  
**Switzerland**  
tel: 41/31-322-9307  
fax: 41/31-382-1546

Resat Apak  
Istanbul University  
Avcilar Campus, Avcilar 34850  
Istanbul  
**Turkey**  
tel: 90/212-5911-998  
fax: 90/212-5911-997  
E-mail: rapak@istanbul.edu.tr

Kahraman Ünlü  
Department of Environmental Engineering  
Middle East Technical University  
Inönü Bulvarı  
06531 Ankara  
**Turkey**  
tel: 90-312-210-1000  
fax: 90-312-210-1260  
E-mail: kunlu@rorqual.cc.metu.edu.tr

Ian D. Martin  
Environment Agency  
Olton Court  
10 Warwick Road  
Olton, West Midlands  
**United Kingdom**  
tel: 44/121-711-2324  
fax: 44/121-711-5830  
E-mail: ianmartin@environment-agency.gov.uk