

#	Question	Response
1	As testing continued through the end of 2024, please provide the latest update, what are the current known contaminants and their levels at the site?	Matrix prepares a technical summary that includes sample locations and analytical results for each sampling event. The summaries are prepared after data is received and are posted on the Village's website upon receipt for viewing by the general public. The summary for the November 2024 sampling event was posted on March 3, 2025.
2	Are there ongoing reviews to reassess risks as new data becomes available?	Yes. Whenever new data is generated, Matrix assesses risks to potential receptors.
3	What is the current extent of contamination in soil, groundwater, and surface water?	The summary reports prepared by Matrix that are posted on the Village's website contain up-to-date information about the known extent of contamination.
4	Are there any ongoing monitoring or sampling programs at the site?	Please see the Question 53 response from the November 2024 Q&A previously posted on the Village website.
5	What is the proximity of the contaminated site to residential areas, schools and workplaces? Have these areas/people been individually notified of the contamination?	The initial receptor evaluation will be submitted to the NJDEP prior to May 15, 2025. Public notification has been performed in accordance with applicable NJDEP requirements.
6	Have there been any reported health issues or complaints from the nearby population?	Please see the Question 11 response from the January 2025 Q&A previously posted on the Village website.
7	Are there any outreach or communication efforts to inform the public about potential risks? If so, please detail methods of distribution and communication.	Please see the Question 61 response from the November 2024 Q&A previously posted on the Village website.
8	Will there be any health risk assessments or studies conducted for this site?	The New Jersey Department of Health is preparing a human health risk assessment of the site.
9	Are there recommendations for nearby residents to minimize potential exposure (e.g., drinking water usage, air filtration)?	Please see the Question 52 response from the November 2024 Q&A previously posted on the Village website.
10	Are there emergency plans or health advisories in place for the surrounding community?	Please see the Question 27 response from the January 2025 Q&A previously posted on the Village website.
11	What should residents do if they suspect exposure to site 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.
12	What government agencies at the New Jersey state level would be informed about and responsible for monitoring the site; ecological habitats, wetlands, specific species, ecosystems or surface water bodies at risk?	The NJDEP.
13	Are there specific species or ecosystems being monitored for contamination effects?	Please see the Question 93 response from the January 2025 Q&A previously posted on the Village website.
14	How will the cleanup efforts ensure protection of nearby surface water bodies - East Saddle River.	Please see the Question 18 response from the November 2024 Q&A and the Question 91 response from the January 2025 Q&A, both previously posted on the Village website.
15	Are there any water supply wells within the potential impact area of the site? Records show wells did exist at one point.	Please see the Question 21 response from the November 2024 Q&A previously posted on the Village website.
16	Have these wells been tested for contaminants? If so, what were the results?	Please see the Question 20 response from the January 2025 Q&A previously posted on the Village website.
17	Are there plans to provide alternative water supplies if contamination spreads to drinking water sources?	Please see the Question 71 response from the November 2024 Q&A previously posted on the Village website.
18	Has the contamination affected any underground utility lines or public infrastructure?	There is no indication that contamination associated with the imported fill has impacted utilities.
19	Are there risks of contamination spreading through these utilities (e.g., vapor intrusion)?	Based on collected data, vapor intrusion of contaminants of concern identified above an applicable soil remediation standard is not anticipated.
20	Migration Risks: How might contaminants migrate through soil, groundwater, or air (e.g., soil vapor, surface water runoff)?	Please see the Question 97 response from the January 2025 Q&A previously posted on the Village website.
21	What measures are being taken to control or prevent further migration?	Based on collected data, evidence of contamination migration has not been observed.

#	Question	Response
22	Are there identified exposure pathways for humans or the environment (e.g., inhalation, ingestion, dermal contact)? How are these pathways being monitored or mitigated?	Exposure to contaminants identified at the Schedler property could occur through direct contact and/or ingestion of the soil. Contaminants have not been identified at a concentration that exceeds an applicable NJDEP inhalation standard and, based on current data and anticipated depth to groundwater at the Schedler property, a groundwater investigation is not warranted at this time.
23	Was the Initial Receptor Evaluation (IRE) form submitted to the NJDEP? If not, when is the deadline?	The Initial Receptor Evaluation will be submitted to the NJDEP prior to the applicable May 15, 2025 timeframe.
24	Are the IRE findings available for public review? If so, where can they be accessed?	Upon submittal to the NJDEP, the Initial Receptor Evaluation will be posted on the Village website.
25	Other than emailing questions, will there be public forums or opportunities for community members to dialogue and ask questions to the LSRP and agencies involved?	Please see the Question 62 response from the November 2024 Q&A previously posted on the Village website.
26	What is the timeline for remediation efforts at the site?	Please see the Question 28 response from the January 2025 Q&A previously posted on the Village website.
27	Are there ongoing reviews to reassess risks as new data becomes available?	Yes.
28	Are there plans to conduct health monitoring of nearby populations over time?	Please see the Question 35 response from the November 2024 Q&A previously posted on the Village website.
29	How will the Department of Health track long-term effects of contamination on community health?	Please see the Question 36 response from the November 2024 Q&A previously posted on the Village website.
30	Given the contamination, will the Authorization to Discharge 5G3 - Construction Activity Stormwater (GP), issued by the Bureau of NJPDES Stormwater Permitting and Water Quality Management under the Division of Watershed Protection and Restoration, New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, be revoked or suspended?	No. A soil erosion and sediment control plan was approved in conjunction with the permit.
31	How has the work already conducted under this permit (valid from 3/1/22 to 2/28/27) affected the contamination and its potential spread?	No evidence of migration of contaminated soils at the site has been observed.
32	In November 2024, The NJ Dept of Health emailed you and Ms. Feury directly and asked the following:  "[...] If possible, we would like surface soil samples collected at 0-6 inch depths to help us characterize community exposures. We defer to DEP for sampling protocols, but we think the surface soil samples and analytes can be the same as the locations where you are planning to collect depth samples per your November 2024 Grid Remedial Investigation Sampling Workplan."  You cited cost and timeline concerns and asked NJ Dept of Health to consider funding it, which they declined. In fairness to our town (who was not on the original cc), was this request from the NJ Dept of Health presented to Ridgewood officials to consider since it directly involves the health of their constituents?	The NJ Department of Health (DOH) request was forwarded to Village administration upon receipt by Matrix.
33	Did Ridgewood decline it?	The Village made a determination that any data generated as part of sampling being conducted to satisfy NJDEP requirements would be made available to DOH for their use.
34	Or did Matrix make this decision in isolation?	Matrix was not involved in the decision-making process regarding the DOH request made to the Village.
35	In Ridgewood's NJDEP wetlands LOI application (August 2024), Suburban Engineering marked "no" for known hazards on-site at Schedler, which confuses residents (see attached). Isn't NJDEP's Bureau of Solid Waste Compliance and Enforcement overseeing the Schedler site for contamination due to hazards found in the soil?	The NJDEP BSWCE is overseeing remediation of solid waste and related contamination identified at the Schedler property.
36	Isn't there a physical sign stating this at the Schedler site?	A sign has been posted at the Schedler site that identifies investigation/cleanup is taking place at the site and provides contact info for obtaining additional information.

#	Question	Response
37	Didn't Matrix publicly confirm in June and August 2024 that mercury, lead, and benzo(a)pyrene are present thanks to soil from Bergen Community College and Ridgewood Water? Are those not considered hazards.	Matrix has identified benzo(a)pyrene, benzo(a)anthracene, mercury, and heptachlor epoxide at the site above an applicable NJDEP soil remediation standard. To date, lead has not been detected in Matrix's samples above an applicable soil remediation standard.
38	It looks like remediation is being planned for 2025 - is that correct?	Please see the Question 28 response from the January 2025 Q&A previously posted on the Village website.
39	Can you provide any details on the remediation plan?	Please see the Question 7 response from the January 2025 Q&A previously posted on the Village website.
40	Also, did you conclude that the contamination was not spread to properties adjacent to Schedler?	Please see the Question 9 response from the January 2025 Q&A previously posted on the Village website.
41	If so, how did you arrive at that, since testing was not done there?	Please see the Question 9 response from the January 2025 Q&A previously posted on the Village website.
42	If not, do you have any plan to test adjacent properties?	Please see the Question 50 response from the January 2025 Q&A previously posted on the Village website.
43	How come the public was never informed that the NJ Dept of Health requested specific depth of soil samples?	The Village communicates with various state agencies on a weekly, sometimes daily, basis. To notify the public of all communications, requests and information sharing is not reasonable or possible.
44	Matrix mentioned cost concerns to the NJ Dept of Health. How much would that have cost to follow their recommendation?	The NJDOH is performing their own assessment of the parcel. The communication received from the DOH was not a recommendation, but rather a request that the Village conduct additional sampling on their behalf. Per DOH correspondence, they requested additional sampling from each of the 89 boring locations that were planned. The cost related to the additional time, equipment and materials to conduct that sampling, as well as laboratory costs for analyses that would have been necessary to assess those samples in the same manner that at-depth samples at the site had been characterized, was estimated to be approximately \$40,000.
45	In the February 5, 2025 Village Council meeting, it was confirmed that Matrix's last report (August) was fully shared with Suburban Consulting Engineering, meaning they had full disclosure when completing the wetlands application. Can you confirm why the LOI application states there were no hazards at Schedler? Can you confirm whether there are consequences for a vendor appearing to provide inaccurate information on a State wetlands LOI application for Schedler?	The contamination along the berm was not seen as a hazard for the LOI presence/absence verification as wetlands are typically not present in such areas, and therefore was not included in the application. To address concerns, SCE will submit a revised application, including the email correspondence by the LSRP stating that the site is safe to visit. It must be noted that this question is asked on the LOI application to ensure the safety of DEP staff visiting the site for inspection. There is no safety hazard for DEP staff to visit the site.
46	In January 2025, Question #59 states, "The Village's internal review of this matter is ongoing." If the review is ongoing, how can you definitively say that the Spoil Pile referenced in the WSP memo didn't go to Schedler?	While this entire matter remains under internal review, Ridgewood Water staff confirmed that the referenced spoils pile was not taken to the Schedler property.
47	Can you provide documentation or evidence that clearly distinguishes the two spoil piles referred to in your response? This should include dates, locations, and any chain of custody records for both spoil piles. Without such evidence, how can this assertion be substantiated to residents?	The Village maintains a purchase order and invoices, which substantiates the disposal of the soil.
48	How did Ridgewood Water not realize dumping their spoil piles in a residential neighborhood was unacceptable?	Please see the responses to Questions 75-80 from the November 2024 Q&A previously posted on the Village website.
49	How did Ridgewood Water, which has its own LSRP, not know that the soil they were given to Schedler was contaminated? WSP, their own LSRP, writes memos to them about their findings and recommendations.	Please see the responses to Questions 75-80 from the November 2024 Q&A previously posted on the Village website.

#	Question	Response
50	On February 10, 2025, the Village Council awarded Ridgewood Water a contract for \$100,000 to dispose of another spoil pile. How much money did we save Ridgewood Water for allowing them to dump their spoil piles in a residential neighborhood (500 cubic yards total according to public testimony by Matrix in June and August 2024)?	The Village was seeking soil to develop the berm during this period. No accounting exists as to cost savings.
51	Has Ridgewood explored potential legal action or restitution from Bergen Community College and Ridgewood Water to help offset costs, rather than relying primarily on taxpayer funds and insurance claims?	No.
52	Removing dirt is expensive. How much money did we save the six sites by dumping it at Schedler (in a residential neighborhood)?	The Village was seeking soil to develop the berm during this period. No accounting exists as to cost savings.
53	Did the residential property in the December 2023 NJDEP letter that provided soil to Schedler pay for its removal? If so, how much?	The property owner's excavation contractor trucked the soil to the Schedler property. Amount is unknown.
54	In the February 2018 newsletter, sent on February 6, 2018 by then-Councilman Ramon Hache, it stated, "The estimated soil quantity is approximately 5,200 cubic yards. Based on the model of trucks we are expecting to be used for the project, we are estimating 400 truck loads." Over June and August 2024, Matrix said it was 8,000 cubic yards. Why the discrepancy?	The Village speculates that the councilmember was working off estimated quantities at the time. Matrix, in their analysis, has the benefit of knowing the actual quantities.
55	On February 6, 2019, according to public Village minutes, then Mayor Hache asked if the soil would be used for grading the property, and Mr. Rutishauser agreed. The above public record seems to contradict your FAQ statement from November 2024, which states, "Soil was only brought to the Schedler property to establish the berm." Was the public made aware that the berm project seemingly evolved into grading the entire Schedler property consisting of over 7 acres of land?	The entire site was not graded. Areas were graded following the soil being stored while developing the berm and in the area of the haul road.
56	Was SHPO made aware of the grading across the seven acres of land?	Applications were sent to SHPO outlining the scope of the berm project on July 12, 2021 and December 16, 2022. Both applications addressed the surface areas traversed by the equipment being restored and regraded upon completion of the berm work.