

39968

**Lawler,
Matusky
& Skelly
Engineers**

Environmental Science & Engineering Consultants

ONE BLUE HILL PLAZA, PEARL RIVER, NEW YORK 10985
(914) 735-8300
TWX: LMSE PERL 710-577-2782

JOHN P. LAWLER, P. E.
FELIX E. MATUSKY, P. E.
MICHAEL J. SKELLY, P. E.
KARIM A. ABOOD, P. E.
PATRICK J. LAWLER, P. E.
FRANCIS M. MCGOWAN, P. E.
THOMAS L. ENGLERT, P. E.

9 April 1985
File No. 455-102

Mr. Edgar Kaup
New Jersey Department of
Environmental Protection
Division of Waste Management
Hazardous Site Mitigation Administration
428 East State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08608

Subject: Combe Fill South Landfill
RI/FS Progress Report

Dear Mr. Kaup:

This letter summarizes work conducted by Lawler, Matusky & Skelly Engineers (LMS) and its subcontractors on the above referenced project from 1 March 1985 to 31 March 1985.

A. TASK WORK AND DELIVERABLES

1. Task 1 - Preinvestigation Activities

LMS submitted all Task 1 deliverables at the end of August 1984.

a. QAPMP and FSP

Confirmation of additional costs required by the use of stainless steel cable was sent to NJDEP in correspondence dated 1 March 1985.

LMS received on 22 March 1985, through E. Kaup, a copy of a memo from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) concerning their comments to recent FSP and QAPMP changes. LMS discussed these comments with E. Stone (NJDEP) who will be issuing a joint response memo noting those comments agreed to and any exceptions taken.

303018

2. Task 2 - Site Investigations

No work was conducted in the field during the month of March because the issues of laboratory capacity, turnaround time, and price, as they concerned the continued use of S-R Analytical as the subcontracting laboratory, were being re-evaluated by the NJDEP. LMS mobilized on 28 March and 29 March 1985 for possible field sampling, however, this effort was cancelled by the NJDEP.

3. Task 3 - Selection of Remedial Response Objectives and Identification of Alternatives

LMS has begun a literature review of feasible remedial technologies. This review includes an initial screening of technologies based on impacts, costs and applicability to the Combe Fill South Landfill.

4. Tasks 4, 5 and 6

No additional work has been conducted on these Tasks since the last progress report.

5. Task 7 - Coordination and Community Relations

LMS has continued to coordinate project efforts with the NJDEP and has attempted to keep the project schedule within reasonable time frames acceptable to the NJDEP, despite numerous setbacks as documented in previous progress letters.

B. PROJECT SCHEDULE, PROJECTED ACTIVITIES AND ANTICIPATED PROBLEMS

During March, resolutions on overbudget items were reached among NJDEP, LMS and R. E. Wright Associates Inc. (REWAI), LMS's hydrogeological subcontractor. Correspondence of 1 March 1985 from R. Maikish to E. Kaup clarified (at the request of S. Corwin, NJDEP) LMS's overbudget items as submitted in previous correspondence. Correspondence of 15 March 1985 from R. Maikish to L. Romino, confirmed the acceptance by REWAI of a settlement of \$60,000 on their overbudget claims as outlined in previous correspondence.

303019

As requested by the NJDEP, LMS pursued the alternative of finding and pricing another laboratory (ies) to replace or assist S-R Analytical as the project laboratory consultant. The NJDEP understood that such substitution would result in increased project costs and agreed to pay these costs. General inquiries were made and rough quotations obtained from approximately seven other laboratory subcontractors.

LMS presented, in a telephone call to the NJDEP, a summary of probable project costs using a combination of S-R Analytical and Environmental Testing and Certification (ETC). The NJDEP then requested a cost estimate and project schedule be developed that did not include S-R Analytical. LMS provided such a cost summary, including possible project schedule, and proposed revised Task 2 billing schedule, to the NJDEP in correspondence dated 21 March 1985 to L. Romino (NJDEP). (At this time, LMS was informed by the NJDEP that S-R Analytical, in addition to several other laboratories, had recently failed to pass recertification tests for GC/MS work). This was followed by a detailed summary of costs, provided to the NJDEP in correspondence dated 28 March 1985, using ETC and U.S. Testing to substitute entirely for S-R Analytical.

During these discussions, the use of a USEPA contract laboratory was explored by the NJDEP. Although such a possibility exists, the NJDEP decided against using such a laboratory because the time for data turnaround, i.e., up to 120 days (or more), would excessively delay the project schedule.

Currently, LMS is awaiting oral, to be followed by written, authorization to proceed with the project work using the proposed substitute laboratories. In addition, LMS is awaiting a decision on the method of payment for such laboratory work and approval of a revised Task 2 billing schedule.

C. PERCENT COMPLETE

The percent completion of the projects tasks based on their approximate (assuming about \$250,000 additional budget for Task 2) new task budgets, are as follows:

Task 1	-	100%
Task 2	-	38%
Task 3	-	10%

303926

Mr. E. Kaup

Page 4

Task 4 - 5%

Task 5 - 0%

Task 6 - 0%

Task 7B - 50%

Project Total - 35%

If you have any questions, please call.

Very truly yours,



Ruth M. Maikish

RMM:eap

cc: C. Boyer, REWAI

E. Kaup, NJDEP (4)

V. Manov, VEP

R. Schwartz, EPA Region II

303^21

Lawler, Matusky & Skelly Engineers