

#	Question	Response
1	What are the primary sources of contamination?	Contamination was identified in soil that was imported to the Schedler parcel from multiple sources. Details about the sources of that soil can be found in Section 1.2 of Matrix's April 2024 Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP). The SAP is included as Appendix B of Matrix's June 2024 Berm Sampling Report and as Appendix B of Matrix's August 2024 Grid Sampling Report, both of which are available on the Village's website.
2	When was contamination first identified at Schedler?	The initial laboratory analytical report for sampling of the berm at the Schedler parcel was issued by the laboratory on May 16, 2024.
3	Were there any warnings issued to the public regarding the contamination? If so, please provide copies of notification and methods of distribution.	All NJDEP-required notifications/public notices have been provided on the Village website and proper signage posted.
4	What testing methods were used to identify contaminants?	A description of the testing methods can be found in Section 2 of Matrix's April 2024 Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP). The SAP is included as Appendix B of Matrix's June 2024 Berm Sampling Report and as Appendix B of Matrix's August 2024 Grid Sampling Report, both of which are available on the Village's website.
5	Aside from testing, has there been regular monitoring of soil and water in the area since contamination was identified?	Soil investigation to identify the extent of soil impact above an applicable NJDEP soil remediation standard is ongoing. The investigations are iterative and not conducted at regular intervals, but notification of when soil sampling will occur is provided in advance of each event. Based on soil data collected to date, a groundwater investigation is not warranted at this time.
6	Has there been an assessment of air quality near the contaminated soil?	No. Exceedances of applicable NJDEP inhalation standards have not been detected at the site.
7	Have any corrective or containment actions been implemented to date?	No. A remedial action plan will be developed following delineation of the detected contamination.
8	Are children or elderly populations particularly at risk from these contaminants?	The Village cannot administer medical advice. You should consult with your primary care physician or County/State Health Department for more information on how these chemicals may affect you.
9	Is there any evidence of contaminants migrating to adjacent properties?	Investigation is ongoing. To date, evidence of contaminants migrating to adjacent properties has not been observed.
10	What is the contamination level compared to NJDEP and EPA safety standards?	The regulatory standards applicable to this investigation are the NJDEP's soil remediation standards. Benzo(a)pyrene concentrations detected at the site that exceed the most stringent applicable NJDEP soil remediation standard (0.51 mg/kg) range from 0.799 mg/kg to 3.35 mg/kg. Benzo(a)anthracene concentrations detected at the site that exceed the most stringent applicable NJDEP soil remediation standard (0.71) range from 2.37 mg/kg and 3.37 mg/kg. Mercury was detected above the most stringent applicable soil remediation standard (0.1 mg/kg) in one sample at a concentration of 1 mg/kg.
11	Have there been any reported health issues linked to this contamination?	The Village is not aware of any reported health issues.
12	What wildlife in the area might be affected by the soil contaminants?	Currently, an investigation and soil sampling are ongoing to assess the presence and concentration of soil contaminants at the site. As this process is still in progress, we do not yet have detailed information on how specific wildlife in the area may be affected. However, once the investigation is complete and we have more data, we will be able to provide further insight into any potential impacts on local wildlife.
13	Could plants or soil organisms be affected, potentially altering the ecosystem?	The ongoing investigation and soil sampling are aimed at determining the extent of contamination at the site, including any potential effects on plants and soil organisms. Once the investigation is complete and results are available, we will be able to offer a clearer understanding of any potential ecological impacts and how they may affect the broader environment.
14	Is the water table at risk of contamination from this site?	Soil investigation to identify the extent of soil impact above an applicable NJDEP soil remediation standard is ongoing. Based on soil data collected to date, a groundwater investigation is not warranted at this time.
15	Have any residents reported symptoms commonly associated with exposure to these contaminants?	The Village is not aware of any symptoms being reported.
16	What long-term health conditions could develop due to this contamination?	The Village cannot administer medical advice. You should consult with your primary care physician or County/State Health Department for more information on how these chemicals may affect you.
17	What is the likelihood of contaminants being carried offsite by rainwater or wind?	To date, there has been no indication that weather-related migration of contaminated soil has occurred, despite severe rainstorms in 2023 (September and December) and 2024 (January). Evidence of off-site migration of soils from the Schedler parcel has not been observed by Matrix.
18	How close are residential areas to the most contaminated sections of the Schedler property? Please list specific addresses and distance for each.	The locations of soil samples where contamination above an applicable NJDEP soil remediation standard was detected are detailed in Matrix's June 2024 Berm Soil Sampling Report and August 2024 Grid Sampling Report. Both documents can be found on the Village's website.

#	Question	Response
19	Are contaminants expected to volatilize into the air?	To date, exceedances of applicable inhalation soil remediation standards have not been detected at the Schedler property for any compound. Benzo(a)pyrene has been detected at the site at concentrations above the residential and non-residential Ingestion-Dermal Soil Remediation Standard. Exposure via this pathway would occur when in direct contact with contaminated soil or if contaminated soil were ingested. Residents are not likely to be exposed to contaminated soil at the frequency and/or duration used by NJDEP to calculate these standards based on expected use of the property for recreational purposes.
20	Have nearby wells been tested for potential contamination spread?	No. Based on the depth of contamination relative to the depth drilled without encountering groundwater, a groundwater investigation is not warranted at this time. If the planned remedial action (excavation) or known site conditions change based on ongoing investigation, potential performance of a groundwater investigation will be re-evaluated at that time.
21	Are there pathways for children or pets to come into contact with contaminated soil?	The exceeded Ingestion-Dermal Soil Remediation Standards are calculated by NJDEP assuming potential direct contact with contaminated soil over prolonged periods of time in residential or commercial/industrial settings. These are different exposure scenarios than those anticipated to be encountered by nearby residents who may or may not use the Schedler property for recreational purposes.
22	Is groundwater testing part of the regular assessment plan?	Based on the depth of contamination relative to anticipated depth to groundwater, a groundwater investigation is not warranted at this time. If the planned remedial action (excavation) or known site conditions change based on ongoing investigation, potential performance of a groundwater investigation will be re-evaluated at that time.
23	Were nearby residents notified promptly about contamination findings?	Soil testing results were reported to the Village Council and the public on June 5, 2024 and August 7, 2024. Findings also were posted on the Village website. In addition, in accordance with the NJDEP-approved Public Outreach Plan, update letters have been and will continue to be sent to those on the Village's mailing list, which includes owners of properties within 200 feet of the Schedler property.
24	What advice or instructions were provided to residents to avoid exposure?	All NJDEP-required notifications/public notices have been provided on the Village website and proper signage posted.
25	Have all residents near the Schedler property been informed about potential well water risks?	In accordance with NJDEP guidance and based on current data, soil contamination has not been identified at a depth that would require investigation of groundwater at this time.
26	How often are updates provided to the public regarding the contamination status?	Updates regarding status of the investigation are posted on the Village's website as they are received. In addition, in accordance with the NJDEP-approved Public Outreach Plan, update letters have been and will continue to be sent to those on the Village's mailing list in advance of any major remedial milestones, such as completion of the remedial action and issuance of a Response Action Outcome.
27	Has an emergency response plan been communicated to residents?	No emergency response plan is required.
28	Has there been an established timeline for site cleanup?	In accordance with applicable NJDEP regulations, a Remedial Action must be implemented by May 14, 2030; pending results of the currently ongoing Remedial Investigation, the Village has targeted 2025 for implementation of a Remedial Action.
29	Is there funding allocated for the remediation process?	Funding will be discussed and allocated once the final report and assessment is submitted by Matrix.
30	Are there barriers restricting public access to contaminated areas?	No. A sign has been posted on the parcel identifying that remediation is taking place as required by NJDEP. Based on current data, property use and the nature of the contamination, restricting access is not warranted.
31	Will there be ongoing monitoring of soil and water after remediation?	The preliminary planned Remedial Action is excavation and off-site disposal of contaminated soils. Ongoing monitoring following implementation of this type of Remedial Action is not typically warranted; however, the potential need for post-remedial monitoring will be evaluated once a Remedial Action plan is finalized.
32	How will monitoring data be shared with the public?	Data will be shared in accordance with the Public Outreach Plan that was approved by the NJDEP on October 22, 2024 and has been posted on the Village website. The Village has developed a mailing list of owners of properties within 200 feet of the Schedler property. Periodic update letters that include a summary of the progress of remediation will be sent to those on the mailing list in advance of any major remedial milestones. The update letters will also be made available on the Village's website. Data reports will be posted to the Village's website as they become available.
33	Will future construction projects require a soil contamination assessment?	The identified soil impact is being remediated under NJDEP Case #24-05-28-1114-27. Based on the anticipated Remedial Action, which is excavation and off-site disposal, Matrix's LSRP will issue an unrestricted use Response Action Outcome (RAO) for that case number once the Remedial Action has been performed. Additional sampling/assessment related to construction projects that initiate after the unrestricted use RAO has been issued will not be required relative to the soil contamination managed under case #24-05-28-1114-27.
34	What measures will be put in place to prevent recontamination?	Any soil placed on any Village property will meet all applicable NJDEP standards.
35	What recourse do residents have if they experience health impacts linked to the contamination?	The Village is not aware of any reported health issues.
36	Will there be health screenings or support for residents potentially exposed?	The Village is not aware of any reported health issues.

#	Question	Response
37	Are health agencies providing oversight on this case?	The New Jersey Department of Health is performing their own investigation of the site, but do not have an oversight role for the work being performed by Matrix on behalf of the Village.
38	What steps are being taken to track long-term health outcomes?	The Village is not aware of any reported health issues.
39	Will residents be notified of any changes in contamination levels over time?	Data will be shared in accordance with the Public Outreach Plan that was approved by the NJDEP on October 22, 2024 and has been posted on the Village website. The Village has developed a mailing list of owners of properties within 200 feet of the Schedler property. Periodic update letters that include a summary of the progress of remediation will be sent to those on the mailing list in advance of any major remedial milestones. The update letters will also be made available on the Village's website. Data reports will be posted to the Village's website as they become available.
40	In most cases, the 200-foot notification requirement is measured as a radius extending from the perimeter or boundary of the entire affected property, rather than from a specific point within it. Can you confirm if this measurement standard applies to this specific site?	The 200-foot radius used for notification purposes was measured from the perimeter of the Schedler property.
41	Since this is a public park, open to and used by the community beyond the 200-foot notification radius, how is the broader community being informed about this matter?	A sign has been posted on the parcel identifying that remediation is taking place. In addition, investigation/remediation-related documents are uploaded to the Village's website as they become available. Updates regarding remediation of the Schedler parcel are also periodically provided at Village Council meetings, which are open to the public.
42	Additionally, given the park's proximity to an interstate highway, how are residents across Bergen County and the state of New Jersey being kept informed?	Any resident that is not on the Village's mailing list can access investigation/remediation-related documents via the Village's website.
43	In June, the Superintendent for Ridgewood Water stated publicly at a Village Council meeting that "Two out of the three projects that generated bulk soil were public bids. The contractor, OnQue Construction, conducted independent sampling and submitted it to the Village for disposal." That was pulled directly from the transcript. Residents have not seen any independent samples from OnQue. Can you provide them?	The samples referenced are for the DeBoer Avenue water main project and the Jefferson/Salem contract, both performed by OnQue/Conquest. The sample results were provided to NJDEP and Matrix, and referenced in the December 11, 2023 NJDEP letter. The sample results are posted on the Village website within the June 21, 2024 Matrix Berm Letter Report in Appendix B (Sampling Analysis Plan) and the August 8, 2024 Matrix Grid Sampling Letter Report in Appendix B (Sampling and Analysis Plan).
44	And is OnQue a NJDEP-certified lab? And did OnQue submit these "independent samples" to NJDEP?	OnQue/Conquest is a public works contractor and not a certified lab.
45	Also, why was OnQue, who was hired to construct the berm, responsible for "independent sampling and submitting it to the Village for disposal"?	The contractor excavating the material was responsible for sampling.
46	Finally, what needed to be disposed of?	The soil excavated below grade to construct new water mains.
47	And why?	The local jurisdictions require that any native soil be removed and replaced with dense graded aggregate backfill for proper compaction to avoid settlement of the new water main trenches.
48	What were the results?	Copies are appended to the NJDEP December 11, 2023 letter as well as in the June 21, 2024 Matrix Berm Letter Report in Appendix B (Sampling Analysis Plan) and the August 8, 2024 Matrix Grid Sampling Letter Report in Appendix B (Sampling and Analysis Plan).
49	Grid 26 and 16 are closest to homes with private water wells and open swimming pools where small kids play. How concerned should residents be that both hit for benzo(a)pyrene?	The Village cannot administer medical advice. You should consult with your primary care physician or County/State Health Department for more information on how these chemicals may affect you.
50	What is the Village's plan to test the residential properties for contamination considering grid samples have hit right by their homes?	Delineation of soils exhibiting contaminant concentrations in excess of an applicable NJDEP soil remediation standard will continue until a clean boundary has been established, independent of the property boundary for the Schedler parcel. If it is determined that access to nearby residential properties is needed to complete delineation, requests for access to those properties will be submitted to respective property owners at that time.
51	In the August 7, 2024, Village Council meeting, the Village Manager stated, "I've asked Matrix to start soliciting quotes from state-licensed contractors to remove the identified soil from the berm and dispose of it at an appropriate location." This seemed odd since all sample testing has not been completed and residents don't have ground truth yet on the extent of this contamination. Nor have we been briefed on this specific remediation plan. Please provide the solicited quotes, estimates, contracts, trucking companies, and designated disposal locations.	Matrix has engaged with a licensed soil broker to determine high-level costs related to disposal of material at the Schedler site based on volume. That information was used to evaluate the relative cost difference between disposing of imported fill across the entire parcel versus the cost to conduct soil sampling and disposal of a reduced amount of material based on where solid waste is visually observed and/or exceedances are detected. Contracts can't be established and transporters/disposal locations can't be chosen until the RI is complete and the final volume of soil to be disposed of has been determined.
52	How much soil, beyond the berm, might need to be removed?	Investigation is ongoing. Final estimates of the volume of soil to be excavated will be calculated once delineation has been achieved.
53	How many pounds and at what depth across the property?	Investigation is ongoing. Final estimates of the volume of soil to be excavated will be calculated once delineation has been achieved.
54	What impact will all this future remediation have to the quiet enjoyment that residents living next to Schedler deserve?	Significant amounts of soil will need to be trucked off site to a licensed disposal facility.

#	Question	Response
55	How will future remediation impact the health of residents within 200 feet, considering potential dust and soil dispersion?	The Village cannot administer medical advice. You should consult with your primary care physician or County/State Health Department for more information on how these chemicals may affect you. The current planned Remedial Action for the Schedler site is excavation. Advance notification of the schedule for the Remedial Action will be provided to residents. In addition, during performance of the Remedial Action, appropriate health and safety protocols and best practices for monitoring/suppressing dust generation will be implemented.
56	Is it healthy for residents to be in the area?	The Village cannot administer medical advice. You should consult with your primary care physician or County/State Health Department for more information on how these chemicals may affect you.
57	And how does the timeline for remediation impact their exposure risks?	The NJDEP Remedial Action Regulatory Timeframe that applies to the Schedler site is May 14, 2030. The Village has prioritized implementation of a Remedial Action, taking an expedited approach and targeting 2025 for completion of remediation. Based on current data, benzo(a)pyrene, a semi-volatile organic compound, is present in soil above the NJDEP's Ingestion-Dermal Soil Remediation Standards. The exceeded standards are calculated by NJDEP assuming potential direct contact with contaminated soil over prolonged periods in residential or commercial/industrial settings. These are different exposure scenarios than those anticipated to be encountered by nearby residents who may or may not use the Schedler property for recreational purposes.
58	How has the contaminated soil impacted the wildlife in the area? How do you know?	At this stage, the investigation and soil sampling are still ongoing, and a full assessment of how the contaminated soil may have impacted wildlife in the area has not been performed. Once the investigation is concluded, we will be better equipped to understand any impacts on wildlife and how they may be affected by the contaminants present.
59	In Matrix's June report, SGS issued a report to Ridgewood Water indicating "Benzo(a)pyrene concentrations are recorded at 213-744 µg/kg." Despite this, the soil was transported to Schedler, a residential neighborhood with kids, although both Matrix's June report and a WSP memo to Ridgewood Water all highlight, multiple times, that the soil was unsuitable for clean fill. Given the high contamination levels, why was this soil placed at Schedler? Who gave the authority to dump it from Ridgewood Water and the town?	The Village's internal review of this matter is ongoing. You are referring to two distinct and different spoil piles. The 2020 WSP memo refers to one spoil pile that was never placed at Schedler. The NJDEP 2023 letter and Matrix's 2024 report refer to a separate spoil pile.
60	Please explain why pesticides were not targeted analytes at the Schedler property given the problem with the matrix spike showing low recoveries for Alpha-BHC, Delta-BHC, Lindane, 4,4-DDD, 4,4-DDT, and Endrin Aldehyde during the grid sampling event through November 21, 2025.	Pesticides were targeted analytes at the Schedler property.
61	Provide further details on why the matrix spike showed low recoveries for Alpha-BHC, Delta-BHC, Lindane, 4,4-DDD, 4,4-DDT, and Endrin Aldehyde.	With regard to the referenced matrix spike/matrix spike duplicate analysis, the laboratory that performed the analysis indicated that the matrix spike was compromised during TBA cleanup to remove sulfur. They determined that the reason for the lower recovery in the matrix spike was due to interference of sulfur on the internal standard. The analyzing laboratory has since revised the data to report the matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate from the original analysis without the interference. The lab has indicated that analytes in the matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate are within control limits.
62	Is there any regulatory or scientific reasoning that led to the exclusion of these pesticides from being targeted analytes in the sampling protocol?	Pesticides were not excluded from Remedial Investigation sampling.
63	Were there any changes to the sampling or analysis protocol that could have affected the detection or recovery of pesticides during the grid sampling event?	There was nothing inherent to the sampling or analytical methodologies that affected recovery of pesticides.
64	Are there recommendations for improving the accuracy of pesticide recovery in future sampling events? If so, what is the plan and timeframe to correct this specific contamination?	The recovery in the matrix spike was the result of an attempt to clean up sulfur interference by the lab. The lab subsequently revised the data using the original analysis without the interference. The result was that analytes in the matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate samples were within control limits.
65	Impact of Low Recoveries: How do the low recoveries for these pesticides affect the overall assessment of contamination at the Schedler property?	The initial low recoveries in the matrix spike sample did not affect the overall assessment. The laboratory revised the report without the TBA cleanup and analytes in the matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate were within control limits.
66	What steps are being taken to address or rectify the low recovery issue for these pesticides in future testing?	Potential low bias identified in the matrix spike sample associated with job JD91204 prior to the laboratory reissue of the report was an isolated occurrence unrelated to sampling methodology. It was identified through routine data validation and would be identified via similar validation in the unlikely event it occurred again.
67	Quality Assurance and Quality Control (QA/QC): What QA/QC measures are in place to ensure reliable pesticide analysis at the Schedler property, and were any of these measures compromised?	Sampling is performed in accordance with the NJDEP Field Sampling Procedures Manual, and the laboratory analysis is performed by a certified laboratory in accordance with EPA methodologies.
68	Can you provide insight into how matrix interferences or sample contamination might have influenced the low recoveries for these pesticides?	The laboratory identified sulfur interference on the lab's internal standard. The low recovery in the matrix spike was due to the lab's attempt to clean up the interference. The lab has revised the data reporting the matrix spike from the original analysis from the signal/channel without the interference, and recoveries were within control limits.

#	Question	Response
69	Have similar low recovery issues been observed for these pesticides in previous sampling events at the Schedler property, or was this an isolated occurrence?	The low recovery that was identified in the matrix spike sample associated with job JD91204 prior to the laboratory issuing a revised report was not identified in other samples.
70	How do the results from the most recent grid sampling event compare to historical data regarding pesticide contamination levels?	As with the referenced grid sampling data, exceedances to applicable soil remediation standards for pesticides were not identified in historical data.
71	How might the low recoveries for pesticides such as Alpha-BHC, Delta-BHC, Lindane, 4,4-DDD, 4,4-DDT, and Endrin Aldehyde affect public health if these contaminants are present?	The laboratory has revised the report and recoveries for the cited compounds were within limits.
72	How will this information be distributed to the public, including those within 200 feet, the extended community, and widespread park users?	Investigation/remediation-related documents are uploaded to the Village's website as they become available. In addition, in accordance with the NJDEP-approved Public Outreach Plan, update letters have been and will continue to be sent to those on the Village's mailing list, which includes owners of properties within 200 feet of the Schedler property. Updates regarding remediation of the Schedler parcel are also periodically provided at Village Council meetings, which are open to the public.
73	If low recoveries indicate an underestimation of pesticide contamination, how might this impact the assessment of public health risk in the area?	The assessment of public health was not impacted by low recovery in the matrix spike sample associated with job JD91204. The laboratory subsequently revised the analytical report to address the low recovery from the matrix spike sample.
74	Are there specific vulnerable populations (e.g., children, pregnant women, elderly) who may be at greater risk from exposure to these pesticides if they are present in the environment, despite low recoveries during sampling?	The Village cannot administer medical advice. You should consult with your primary care physician or County/State Health Department for more information on how these chemicals may affect you.
75	How does the potential for pesticide contamination at the Schedler property impact communities who rely on local water sources?	To date, pesticides have not been detected above an applicable NJDEP soil remediation standard at the Schedler site.
76	With known contamination, does the Village of Ridgewood still have plans to acquire the residential parcels abutting/adjacent to the contaminated site at 460 West Saddle River Road?	There is no plan to acquire additional adjoining lots at this time.
77	Have these adjacent properties been tested for contamination and pesticides using proper guidelines?	Remedial investigation is ongoing and thus far has been limited to the Schedler parcel.
78	Once the site is ready for a Corrective Action Workplan, fill materials that visually contain solid waste must be removed, regardless of the results of laboratory analyses. Will the scope of this cleanup be presented in a report (identified and marked) and communicated to NJDEP for approval prior to work beginning?	Yes.
79	Are there studies that show a link between exposure to these specific chemicals (found at Schedler) and pesticides (Alpha-BHC, Delta-BHC, Lindane, etc.) and chronic health issues in humans, such as cancer, neurological disorders, or reproductive problems?	The Village cannot administer medical advice. You should consult with your primary care physician or County/State Health Department for more information on how these chemicals may affect you.
80	False Statements: In an email to Ridgewood Village Manager Keith Kazmark on September 2, 2024, the NJDEP flagged false statements regarding public outreach, specifically that the DEP did not agree it was premature to hold a public Q&A. What protocols are in place to hold individuals or agencies accountable for making false or misleading statements in relation to the remediation project?	There was no false or misleading statement made. The comment pertained to it being premature to hold a Q&A with residents prior to testing results being received and a full report being prepared by Matrix. Since that time, the Village has encouraged questions to be submitted to Matrix for response.
81	What steps will be taken to correct the public record and ensure that the community receives accurate and transparent information?	There was no inaccurate or nontransparent statement made. A public outreach plan was approved by the NJDEP on October 22, 2024 and has been posted on the Village website. Meeting notices are posted on the Village website in advance of the meeting dates. The Village has developed a mailing list of owners of properties within 200 feet of the Schedler property. Periodic update letters that include a summary of the progress of remediation will be sent to those on the mailing list in advance of any major remedial milestones. The update letters will also be made available on the Village's website.
82	What types of contaminants are present in the soil? (e.g., heavy metals, hydrocarbons, pesticides, salts)	The contaminants that were detected above an applicable NJDEP soil remediation standard include mercury (a heavy metal) and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), specifically benzo[a]pyrene and benzo[a]anthracene.
83	What is the extent and concentration of each contaminant?	Remedial Investigation to determine the extent of contamination is currently in progress.
84	Are there hotspot areas with higher levels of contamination? If so, please provide a map with details.	There are specific areas of the Schedler site where contamination has been detected above an applicable NJDEP Soil Remediation Standard. Details regarding sample locations and contaminant concentrations can be found in Matrix's soil sampling reports that were uploaded to the Village's website.
85	How close is the contamination source (highway) to sensitive areas within the nature reserve, such as bodies of water, plant communities, or animal habitats?	The source of contamination at the Schedler site is imported fill material. Investigation of potential contamination originating at the highway is not part of Matrix's scope.
86	Has contamination increased over time?	There is no evidence that contaminant levels associated with the imported fill material are increasing over time.

#	Question	Response
87	Are there trends showing seasonal increases (e.g., winter salt runoff)?	No.
88	How does the contamination affect local plant and animal species?	We do not yet have detailed information on how specific wildlife and plants in the area may be affected. However, once the investigation is complete and we have more data, we will be able to provide further insight into any potential impacts on local wildlife and plants.
89	Are there signs of reduced biodiversity, stressed plants, or unusual animal behavior?	No signs of reduced biodiversity, stressed plants, or unusual animal behavior associated with the soil contamination related to the imported fill has been observed.
90	Are there endangered or sensitive species in the area that might be particularly affected by soil contaminants?	There have been no habitats for threatened or endangered species identified on the Schedler parcel.
91	How does soil contamination impact water quality in the area (e.g., runoff into streams, groundwater contamination)?	No surface or groundwater contamination associated with soil at the Schedler parcel has been identified, as current soil data does not trigger the requirement to conduct a groundwater investigation, in accordance with NJDEP guidance.
92	Are there known health risks to visitors from soil contaminants, such as through inhalation, ingestion, or skin contact?	The Village cannot administer medical advice. You should consult with your primary care physician or County/State Health Department for more information on how these chemicals may affect you.
93	What studies or environmental assessments have been conducted to evaluate the long-term ecological impact of the contaminants?	Remedial Investigation of the site is ongoing. Depending on the results of that investigation, an ecological receptor evaluation may be performed, as applicable.
94	How are contaminants being transported in the soil and water within the natural area?	Remedial Investigation of the site to determine extent of contamination is ongoing. Based on data collected to date, contamination is limited to the imported fill material.
95	Are there specific pathways (like rainwater runoff, erosion, or wind dispersal) that increase contaminant spread?	To date, there has been no indication that weather-related migration of contaminated soil has occurred, despite severe rainstorms in 2023 (September and December) and 2024 (January). Evidence of off-site migration of soils from the Schedler parcel has not been observed by Matrix.
96	Is there potential for contaminants to move into adjacent areas or affect ecosystems downstream?	There is potential for migration of soils that exhibit concentrations above an applicable standard; however, no evidence that this has occurred has been observed.
97	How do soil type, moisture content, and topography influence contaminant mobility?	Contaminant mobility is influenced by a variety of factors. Fate and transport mechanisms are complex and cannot be adequately explained in an FAQ. Information on fate and transport of contaminants in environmental media can be found online from the US EPA (www.epa.gov), articles/training by the Interstate Technology & Regulatory Council (www.itrcweb.org), and publications from scientific journals like the Environmental Science & Technology Journal (https://pubs.acs.org/journal/esthag).
98	What remediation strategies are available to reduce soil contamination in this environment, and what is their feasibility?	The current planned Remedial Action for the Schedler site is excavation. Based on direction from the NJDEP's Bureau of Solid Waste, alternative strategies will not be permitted.
99	Can phytoremediation (using plants to absorb contaminants) or bioremediation (using microbes) be effectively employed in this natural area?	Remediation of the Schedler site is subject to oversight of the NJDEP's Bureau of Solid Waste. Based on direction from the Bureau, remedial alternatives to excavation will not be permitted.
100	Are there soil amendments or stabilization techniques that could help limit contaminant mobility without damaging the ecosystem?	Stabilization is typically used as a remedial alternative for contaminated soil that will remain in place. The current planned Remedial Action for contaminated soils at the Schedler site is removal via excavation.
101	How will remediation efforts be conducted to avoid or minimize disruptions to the public and local wildlife?	Based on current data, remediation will be limited to the Schedler parcel and disruptions to the public are not anticipated. The Village will work with Matrix to evaluate time-of-year restrictions related to identified wildlife and obtain approval from the NJDEP when necessary as part of remediation activities.
102	What ongoing monitoring is in place to track soil contamination levels over time?	Investigation to delineate the extent of contamination is ongoing. Based on the nature of the contamination, concentrations are not expected to increase over time.
103	Are there baseline thresholds for contaminants in this area, and if so, how often is soil testing conducted to ensure levels remain within safe limits?	A background investigation has not been performed to identify background concentrations of the contaminants of concern, as removal of contaminated soils will be required regardless of background concentrations. Ongoing soil investigation is being performed to document the extent of contamination.
104	How will changes in highway usage or expansion projects impact contamination, and are there mitigation measures required by regulatory agencies?	The current planned Remedial Action for the Schedler site is excavation. Once the contaminated imported fill is removed, a Response Action Outcome will be issued for the property documenting that remediation is complete and future projects or changes in use of nearby roadways will be unaffected.
105	What are the legal or regulatory requirements for addressing soil contamination in this public area? Are there specific benchmarks set by environmental protection agencies?	The contamination is being remediated in accordance with Contaminated Site Remediation & Redevelopment (CSRR) rules. Some examples of these rules include N.J.A.C. 7:26C (Administrative Requirements for the Remediation of Contaminated Sites), N.J.A.C. 7:26D (Remediation Standards), and N.J.A.C. 7:26E (Technical Requirements for Site Remediation).

#	Question	Response
106	How is information on contamination levels and health risks communicated to the public, and are there warnings or advisories posted in high-risk areas?	Technical reports detailing investigation results and contaminant concentrations are posted on the Village's website as they become available. A sign has been posted on the parcel identifying that remediation is taking place. The Village cannot administer medical advice. You should consult with your primary care physician or County/State Health Department for more information on how these chemicals may affect you.
107	Is there a plan in place to inform the public about remediation efforts and timelines, as well as any potential short-term impacts on public access?	A Public Outreach Plan that details how the Village will update the public about remediation of the Schedler site was approved by the NJDEP. That plan can be found on the Village's website.
108	NJDEP's October 2022 interim guidance required soil remediation testing for PFAS/PFOAS at sites under N.J.A.C. 7:26D-6.3 and related rules. Did NJDEP confirm that testing for PFAS was not required? And why was Matrix exempt from these interim standards?	The referenced guidance established interim soil remediation standards for several PFAS, including perfluorononanoic acid (PFNA), perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA), perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS), and hexafluoropropylene oxide dimer acid and its ammonium salt. It did not require that analysis for PFAS be performed at all sites. Analysis for PFAS in soil at a site undergoing remediation is typically performed when there is evidence that PFAS may be contaminants of concern at that site. There is no existing NJDEP regulation that requires PFAS analysis at all sites. The NJDEP reviewed and approved the sampling plan provided by Matrix.
109	Matrix's August 2024 report and NJDEP's December 2023 letter confirm that Ridgewood's spoil pile was sent to Schedler in 2021, despite exceeding soil standards. The report states: "According to the Village engineer, the Ridgewood Water Company spoils were placed in the northwestern portion of the Site, near Block 4704, lot 12." This occurred a year after a 2020 WSP memo advised Ridgewood Water against using the spoil pile due to contamination. Is this incorrect? The FAQ stated the 2020 WSP memo only links to a 2023 Ridgewood Water spoil pile, causing confusion for residents over timelines and decisions since we know the spoil pile went to Schedler in 2021.	Yes, that is incorrect. The question refers to two distinct and different spoil piles. The 2020 WSP memo refers to one spoil pile that was never placed at Schedler. The NJDEP 2023 letter and Matrix's 2024 report refer to a separate spoil pile.
110	The FAQ stated the Streets Division built the berm at Schedler in 2019. But OnQue Construction got a contract in 2021 for "Schedler property berm construction" (res 21-339). Why were they needed if the berm was already built in 2019?	OnQue was retained to finish grading the berm and to plant trees on it.
111	FAQ states, "Legal truck weights are the responsibility of the Police Department." Were the police overseeing the Schedler soil transportation for all six sites that were listed in the December 2023 NJDEP letter to the town?	The Police Department is responsible for enforcing legal truck weights, not for the oversight of the project.
112	Who was in charge of coordinating soil truck movements and their weights with the police department for the Schedler project?	The entities providing the soil were responsible for coordinating the delivery of the soil. The driver of the delivery truck is ultimately responsible for truck weight. The Police Department is responsible for the enforcement of legal truck weights.
113	Is it typical to not inform residents living within 200 feet of a years-long soil dumping project involving dust and soil? The FAQ stated, "Individual notice was not provided." Why?	There is no legal requirement to notify the public within 200 feet of a community project on public property.
114	FAQ stated: "Based on the site history and current data, there is no evidence that contamination has migrated off-site." You haven't tested the private properties next to Schedler, where nearby soil samples showed contamination, correct?	Sampling to date has been limited to soil located on the Schedler parcel. Delineation of soils exhibiting contaminant concentrations in excess of an applicable NJDEP soil remediation standard will continue until a clean boundary has been established, independent of the property boundary for the Schedler parcel. If it is determined that access to nearby residential properties is needed to complete delineation, requests for access to those properties will be submitted to respective property owners at that time.