

#	Question	Response
1	Heptachlor epoxide was apparently detected in sample GRID-4R at a concentration of 0.1799 mg/kg. Can you clarify the potential source of this compound at Schedler? How would it have gotten there?	The source of the heptachlor epoxide is unknown.
2	Is Heptachlor epoxide dangerous to children? Pets?	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.
3	Has Ridgewood ever used heptachlor epoxide or similar pesticides at the Schedler property, either historically or in recent years?	Heptachlor epoxide is a breakdown product of the insecticide heptachlor. The Village of Ridgewood does not treat, nor has the Village historically treated, park properties with insecticides. This includes, but is not limited to, heptachlor.
4	Why did this sample exceed applicable soil standards? Was any follow-up testing conducted to understand the exceedance	The exceedance was identified because the compound was present in the sample at a concentration above an applicable NJDEP soil remediation standard. Additional sampling has been performed in the area of the exceedance for delineation purposes.
5	Ridgewood's March 2024 public FAQ states that "the entire matter remains under internal review" regarding the dumping of contaminated soil from Ridgewood Water at Schedler - twice. Who is currently overseeing this internal review?	The Village is awaiting the final remediation report from Matrix. At that time, all findings will be presented to the Bergen Joint Insurance Fund and the Environmental Joint Insurance Fund for review, further investigation, and coverage consideration.
6	When will the public be briefed on the results of the internal review?	The public will be briefed on the final remediation report from Matrix later this summer. Findings will be shared as to the review once the Joint Insurance Fund and Environmental Insurance Fund have completed their work relative to this matter.
7	On what dates (month, day, and year) were the Ridgewood Water spoil piles deposited at Schedler?	Material was moved when Village staff and equipment were available.
8	Appendix G of Matrix's August 2024 report includes Eurofins laboratory results (and on page 35 of the same August 2024 report Ridgewood Water noted it used them for soil testing), with certain samples flagged in purple highlighter seemingly indicating elevated concentrations. Who reviewed these results on behalf of Ridgewood Water, and what actions followed that review?	The Village does not have conclusive records to accurately answer this question.
9	Given Eurofins report, who authorized the transfer and deposition of spoil material from Ridgewood Water to the Schedler property?	The Village does not have conclusive records to accurately answer this question.
10	Was there a formal resolution, permit, or other documentation authorizing the deposition of spoil piles at Schedler for the two spoil piles? If so, where can it be accessed?	Formal permitting is not required.
11	Request for Clarification: A clear explanation of how the testing and investigation will be expanded to include off-site migration, specifically addressing adjacent properties, groundwater, well water, ecosystems, and the East Saddle River.	Please see the Question 50 and Question 91 responses from the January 2025 Q&A, previously posted on the Village website.
12	Request for Clarification: Evidence to substantiate the claim that contamination has not affected adjacent areas or ecosystems, including test results for adjacent areas and downstream ecosystems, with data demonstrating no evidence of contamination.	Based on analytical data for samples collected as part of investigation performed at the site to date, off-site migration of contaminants from the imported fill material has not been identified. Soil testing is ongoing, and investigation of potential off-site receptors will be performed if determined to be necessary based on data.
13	Request for Clarification: Immediate measures to reevaluate site conditions and independently assess potential migration impacts.	As part of the ongoing remedial investigation, potential contaminant migration will be evaluated.
14	Has soil contamination affected the pH, nutrient levels, or soil structure in ways that inhibit tree and plant growth, or that may have killed some of the trees?	To date, there has been no indication that soil contamination has affected pH, nutrient levels, or soil structure in a manner that inhibits tree or plant growth, or has caused tree mortality. As part of the ongoing remedial investigation, this potential pathway will be evaluated.
15	What is the impact of contamination on microorganisms and beneficial insects, worms, and other subterranean organisms in the soil?	Please see the Question 13 response from the January 2025 Q&A, previously posted on the Village website.
16	Are there different contamination levels at varying soil depths, and how might this affect root systems of the existing trees?	Contamination concentrations vary by location and depth. This potential pathway is currently being evaluated as part of the ongoing remedial investigation.
17	How does rainfall impact the spread of contaminants in this area (e.g., through increased runoff)?	Rainfall can influence contaminant movement through runoff and infiltration. This potential pathway is currently being evaluated as part of the ongoing remedial investigation.
18	Are contaminants accumulating in the food chain, posing risks to animals. birds, earthworms, etc. that feed in the area?	Please see the Questions 12 and 58 responses from the January 2025 Q&A, previously posted on the Village website.
19	Are there plants or animals showing signs of bioaccumulation (increasing contaminant levels in tissues)?	Please see the Questions 12 and 13 responses from the January 2025 Q&A, previously posted on the Village website.
20	Has contamination affected nearby East Saddle River that connects to the area?	Please see the Question 91 response from the January 2025 Q&A, previously posted on the Village website.
21	Could construction or maintenance activities on the property worsen soil contamination in this area?	Unless these activities introduce new contamination, construction/maintenance on the Schedler parcel will not increase existing contaminant concentrations at the site.
22	Have there been observable changes in plant species diversity or distribution due to contamination?	Please see the Question 13 response from the January 2025 Q&A, previously posted on the Village website.
23	Is the soil contamination presenting a hazard to those engaging in recreational activities on the property, such as walking ?	Please see the Question 26 response from the November 2024 Q&A and the Question 21 response from the January 2025 Q&A, both previously posted on the Village website.
24	Could wildlife that moves through the area transport contaminants to other locations?	It is possible that soil particles at the site adhere to wildlife moving through the property.

#	Question	Response
25	Are there areas within the ecosystem where soil contamination is minimal and could serve as control zones for comparative study?	Although investigation is ongoing, areas of the site where concentrations have not been identified above an applicable standard have been documented. The Village is conducting the investigation and cleanup in accordance with NJDEP requirements. A comparative study has not been required by the NJDEP.
26	What is the estimated cost of implementing effective remediation solutions, and who would (or should) be responsible for funding it?	The final cost of redmediation will be estimated in the final Matrix report. The initial estimate by Matrix was not to exceed \$1.5 million, which was included in the 2025 Village Capital Budget. The Village also intends to pursue NJDEP grants and file an insurance claim to recover costs.
27	What are the long-term goals for restoring the ecosystem, and how will progress be measured over time?	Following remediation, the remedial excavation will be backfilled with clean fill to match existing grade. No new vegetation will be introduced as part of the restoration.
28	Has there been communication, compensation sought or collaboration between local government and responsible parties	The Village is awaiting the final remediation report from Matrix. At that time, all findings will be presented to the Bergen Joint Insurance Fund and the Environmental Joint Insurance Fund for review, further investigation, and coverage consideration.
29	Are there any grant programs, environmental funds, or financial resources available to support cleanup efforts, and have responsible parties applied for them?	The Village is looking into NJDEP grant options to support cleanup efforts. Findings from the final remediation report from Matrix will be presented to the Bergen Joint Insurance Fund and the Environmental Joint Insurance Fund for review, further investigation, and coverage consideration.
30	Is there a requirement for responsible parties to conduct ongoing monitoring to ensure that contamination does not increase over time?	Please see the Question 54 response from the November 2024 Q&A, previously posted on the Village website.
31	What role do local stakeholders, such as residents, environmental advocacy groups, and public health agencies, play in holding the responsible party accountable?	Non-governmental stakeholders typically do not have an active role in enforcing regulations or assessing penalties. Stakeholders wishing to discuss enforcement actions related to applicable regulations may contact the agency responsible for administering those regulations.
32	Are there penalties or enforcement mechanisms in place if responsible parties fail to address contamination adequately?	Remediation of the Schedler parcel is being conducted in accordance with applicable NJDEP regulations. Per those regulations, failure to adequately address contamination within timeframes established by the NJDEP can trigger enforcement action including, but not limited to, fines and penalties.
33	Was the option to cap the berm (rather than remove it) considered, and if so, what were the technical or regulatory reasons for selecting removal over capping? Children will not be in direct contact with the berm and a fence could have been added between the field and the berm to ensure no one walks over it, even after capping it with 18-20 inches of soil? Afterall a berm next to the highway is safer than a chain link fence for vehicular traffic.	The imported material contains a variety of debris that the Bureau of Solid Waste Compliance and Enforcement (BSWCE) deems solid waste. BSWCE has required that visually confirmed solid waste be removed from the property. In order to remove this material, excavation of much of the imported fill is necessary. As excavation is already required at the site, chemically contaminated soil will also be removed as part of this process to facilitate an unrestricted use property designation.
34	During the Council meeting, the Licensed Site Remediation Professional (LSRP) referenced an estimated \$1.5 million cost for remediation (the village manager mentioned that this amount was part of the budget for remediation and the LSRP confirmed that it would be sufficient). Could you please clarify how this cost estimate was determined, have you completed the testing and is this complete scope of the project?	The estimate was based on typical current industry rates for disposing of contaminated, non-hazardous waste at an off-site facility, as well as standard labor costs for soil excavation. A more precise cost will be determined once the investigation is complete and the exact volume of soil to be excavated is known.
35	If the cap option was not considered for the berm and all the soil is required to be removed, will you be recommending the same solution for the entire property where any similar contamination is found, or the playground / field area where children will be playing is allowed to be capped but the berm must be removed? If different solutions are proposed for different parts of the property, what's the rationale?	The recommended remedial action (excavation) applies to other areas of the site where exceedances have been documented in addition to the berm. The rationale for this recommendation is the same as that previously identified for the berm.
36	Contaminant Infiltration Into Drainage Systems - What measures are in place to monitor and prevent contaminated soil or runoff from entering the drainage network?	There is no catch basin infrastructure on the site.
37	Contaminant Infiltration Into Drainage Systems - Have stormwater systems in and around the area been tested for evidence of contamination? If so, please provide the results.	There has been no testing of the stormwater systems.
38	Contaminant Infiltration Into Drainage Systems - How are runoff events being managed to prevent further spread of contaminants through the ground and drainage system?	There is no evidence of migration of sediment off the site during heavy rain events.
39	Leaching into Water Mains - Have water mains in and near the site been inspected and tested for potential leaching of contaminants?	No plans are in place, nor have studies been completed, as the water mains are under pressure, thereby prohibiting any leaching.
40	Leaching into Water Mains - What contingency plans are in place to protect the drinking water supply near water mains?	No plans are in place, nor have studies been completed, as the water mains are under pressure, thereby prohibiting any leaching.
41	Leaching into Water Mains - Are there any reports or studies assessing the condition and vulnerability of water mains in the affected area?	No plans are in place, nor have studies been completed, as the water mains are under pressure, thereby prohibiting any leaching.
42	Impact on Sewer Lines - Has there been testing of sewer lines in or around the site to determine if contaminants are entering the system?	All sanitary flow that comes into the Village's Wastewater Treatment Plan is subject to the required testing by the USEPA/NJDEP.
43	Impact on Sewer Lines - Are there protocols in place to identify and manage hazardous materials within the sewer network?	All sanitary flow that comes into the Village's Wastewater Treatment Plan is subject to the required testing by the USEPA/NJDEP.

#	Question	Response
44	Impact on Sewer Lines - What steps are being taken to ensure that wastewater treatment facilities can handle potential contamination from the site?	The Village tests in accordance with permit requirements. The Wastewater Treatment Plant is staffed and monitored 24/7.
45	Corrosion and Infrastructure Degradation - Have inspections been conducted to assess whether contaminants are causing or could cause corrosion or damage to the underground infrastructure?	The Village has no concerns.
46	Corrosion and Infrastructure Degradation - What plans are in place to address maintenance and repairs of infrastructure damage identified? Please provide a list of repairs and maintenance that have already occurred.	The Village has no concerns.
47	Corrosion and Infrastructure Degradation - Are protective measures being considered to prevent contaminants from accelerating infrastructure degradation?	The Village has no concerns.
48	Groundwater Contamination Pathways - What assessments have been conducted to determine whether the water infrastructure installed after the contamination has facilitated the migration of pollutants into groundwater or surrounding ecosystems?	All groundwater wells are tested in accordance with NJDEP safe drinking water requirements.
49	Groundwater Contamination Pathways - Were any protective measures, such as contaminant barriers or monitoring systems, implemented during the installation of the water infrastructure to mitigate the risk of spreading existing contamination?	All groundwater wells are tested in accordance with NJDEP safe drinking water requirements.
50	Groundwater Contamination Pathways - How will ongoing maintenance or monitoring of the water infrastructure address potential contamination risks caused by its interaction with pre-existing pollutants?	All groundwater wells are tested in accordance with NJDEP safe drinking water requirements.
51	Ridgewood Public Water Facility and Eastside Tank Concerns - Have studies been conducted to determine whether underground infrastructure (e.g., drainage pipes, water mains, sewer lines) is facilitating the spread of contaminants into groundwater or aquifers?	The Village has no evidence of contaminant migration onto the Eastside Tank property, so there is no reason to conduct a study.
52	Ridgewood Public Water Facility and Eastside Tank Concerns - Is the water supply at the Zabriskie Schedler house safe for use and drinking?	All water meets the NJDEP safe drinking water requirements with the exception of PFAS.
53	Ridgewood Public Water Facility and Eastside Tank Concerns - How is groundwater in and near the site being monitored, and what are the results of recent testing?	There are no active wells on the Eastside property.
54	Ridgewood Public Water Facility and Eastside Tank Concerns - What strategies are being implemented to prevent underground infrastructure from becoming a pathway for further contamination?	There are no active wells on the Eastside property.
55	Schedler Park Development and Contamination - Given NJDEP's observation that the fill materials at the site may not be suitable for artificial turf, what specific geotechnical or environmental studies have been conducted to confirm the safety and stability of these materials as a base for artificial turf?	The Schedler park development project is designed to be constructed after all soil remediation is complete and approved by the NJDEP.
56	Schedler Park Development and Contamination - Why is the Village moving forward with plans to install artificial turf despite NJDEP's explicit warnings about its unsuitability for this site, and before the completion of soil investigation, testing, and remediation? What justification has been provided to NJDEP or SHPO for proceeding with this plan?	The purpose of this document is to address concerns regarding the contamination and remediation of the Schedler property. Questions regarding the redevelopment of the site, including the installation of artificial turf, are not related to the remediation of the site.
57	Schedler Park Development and Contamination - A sign with the text "Environmental Investigation/Cleanup in Progress at this Site" is required to be posted at a site undergoing environmental remediation. Given the extent of contamination: How many years is the sign expected to remain in place? Once the field is completed and open to park users, will this signage still be present as notice to the public?	In accordance with applicable NJDEP requirements, the sign will be maintained until remediation is completed. Once the Response Action Outcome is filed with the NJDEP, the sign will be removed.
58	Schedler Park Development and Contamination - How will the installation of artificial turf on potentially unsuitable fill materials affect the site's environmental integrity, particularly concerning soil stability, groundwater contamination, and runoff?	As contaminated soil associated with the imported fill material will be excavated and removed from the site prior to installation of artificial turf, the redevelopment will not have an effect on those efforts.
59	Schedler Park Development and Contamination - Were alternative materials or designs considered that align with NJDEP recommendations? If not, why was artificial turf prioritized over potentially less harmful options?	The purpose of this document is to address concerns regarding the contamination and remediation of the Schedler property. Questions regarding the redevelopment of the site, including the installation of artificial turf, are not related to the remediation of the site.
60	Schedler Park Development and Contamination - Who will bear full accountability if the installation of artificial turf results in more environmental harm, structural instability, or violations of regulatory standards? What specific contingency plans have been established to address these potential outcomes, and how will they be implemented?	The purpose of this document is to address concerns regarding the contamination and remediation of the Schedler property. Questions regarding the redevelopment of the site, including the installation of artificial turf, are not related to the remediation of the site.
61	Schedler Park Development and Contamination - What baseline data is being collected now to distinguish between pre-existing contamination and any future contamination caused by the artificial turf infill?	The purpose of this document is to address concerns regarding the contamination and remediation of the Schedler property. Questions regarding the redevelopment of the site, including the installation of artificial turf, are not related to the remediation of the site.

#	Question	Response
62	Schedler Park Development and Contamination - If new contamination is linked to the artificial turf, what financial safeguards or insurance policies are in place to ensure timely remediation without burdening taxpayers?	The purpose of this document is to address concerns regarding the contamination and remediation of the Schedler property. Questions regarding the redevelopment of the site, including the installation of artificial turf, are not related to the remediation of the site.
63	Did Matrix accurately represent Bergen Community College's test results in its June 2024 public presentation?	<p>Yes, Matrix's explanation of the analytical results associated with the 2019 sampling was accurate.</p> <p>To clarify, the applicable standards have changed since the 2019 data was generated. When evaluating the 2019 results against the standards in effect at that time, exceedances of the NJDEP's Residential and Non-Residential Soil Remediation Standards were not identified, but aluminum, manganese, and mercury were detected above the NJDEP's default Impact to Ground Water Soil Screening Levels (IGWSSLs). Since then, the NJDEP eliminated the IGWSSLs and promulgated Migration to Ground Water Soil Remediation Standards (MGWSRSs). When evaluating the 2019 data against the current soil remediation standards, only mercury was identified at a concentration that exceeds the applicable MGWSRS.</p>
64	Is Bergen County's position, based on the same test date, consistent with the documentation in your records?	Any questions regarding a third party's assessment of the data should be directed to the party providing that assessment.
65	How does your office explain the conflicting interpretations of the same test results?	Any questions regarding a third party's assessment of the data should be directed to the party providing that assessment.
66	Was the soil brought over by Ridgewood Water considered contaminated under the standards in place at the time or only under today's updated NJDEP standards?	Exceedances of current and previous standards were identified in the samples collected from Ridgewood Water soil.