

**Lawler,  
Matusky  
& Skelly  
Engineers**

Environmental Science & Engineering Consultants

40054  
RECEIVED BY  
E. G. KAUP

MAR 11 '86

ONE BLUE HILL PLAZA, PEARL RIVER, NEW YORK 10965  
(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.

3 March 1986  
File Nos. 455-102/103

Mr. Edgar Kaup  
NJ Department of Environmental Protection  
Division of Waste Management  
Hazardous Site Mitigation Administration  
428 East State Street  
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Re: 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 from 1 January to 28 February 1986.

A. TASK WORK AND DELIVERABLES

1. Task 2 - Site Investigations and RI Report

In fulfillment of the scope-of-work, LMS submitted the preliminary Remedial Investigation Report (summarizing the work conducted in Task 2) to the NJDEP and EPA on 24 February 1986. The report was submitted approximately three weeks later than originally scheduled, primarily because of delays in receipt of the analytical data (resulting, in turn, in delays in reviewing the data) and late receipt of several portions of the report (dealing with the hydrogeology of the site) from a major subcontractor.

This preliminary RI report will be finalized and included in the final RI/FS report submitted after the completion of Task 6, Conceptual Design.

As requested by the NJDEP, LMS has in this preliminary report labelled as NS (no sample) those fractions of several potable well samples where analytical data was deemed unacceptable by the NJDEP based on their QA/QC review of the data and associated laboratory procedures. However, it must be clarified that these NS fractions were actually sampled by LMS and analyzed by the subcontracting laboratory.

303116

2. Task 3 - Objectives and alternatives Development

In order to complete the preliminary RI report described above, the originally planned work on alternatives screening scheduled for January and February 1986 was postponed. Because no further comments have been received on the memorandum prepared by LMS describing the screening of remedial technologies, LMS will now proceed with a memorandum on the preliminary screening of alternatives based on the technologies deemed appropriate for the site. Subsequent to a meeting with the NJDEP, a final list of candidate alternatives will be selected from those screened for detailed evaluation in Task 5. The memoranda prepared as part of this Task will become chapters within the final RI/FS Report.

3. Task 4 - Laboratory Analysis and Treatability Study

By mid-January 1986, all analytical data had been received from the subcontracting laboratories and LMS had completed its QA/QC review of the data. No further laboratory work is outstanding.

On 26 February 1986, LMS met with several representatives of the NJDEP to discuss the requirements and possibilities for conducting a treatability study. After a number of technical issues regarding effluent discharge limitations are resolved with the NJDEP, LMS will prepare a proposed scope of work for such a treatability study. Should this scope-of-work be acceptable to the NJDEP, a treatability study may run concurrently with the remainder of the feasibility study's task assignments.

4. Task 5 and Task 6 - Evaluation of Alternatives and Conceptual Design

No work was conducted on these two tasks in January or February 1986. Work is expected to resume in March 1986.

B. PROJECT SCHEDULE

Two schedule scenarios for the remaining FS work have been discussed with the NJDEP. Both scenarios allow for a public hearing to be held in May 1986 and the subsequent selection of a final remedy to be made by early June 1986. In the first scenario, the analysis of alternatives (Task 5) is completed prior to the public hearing and a conceptual design (Task 6) is

303117

subsequently provided only for the selected remedial action. In the second schedule scenario, the conceptual design work of Task 6 is apportioned among the alternatives being analyzed in Task 5 so that additional detail is available in each alternative prior to selection of a final remedy. However, in the second scenario, no additional detail is provided for the finally selected alternative; this detail is assumed to be provided in a future predesign report not within the scope of the present RI/FS.

A selection of a study schedule scenario must be made by the NJDEP by the week of 10 March 1986 in order for LMS to assign appropriate in-house staff to particular work assignments.

C. PERCENT COMPLETION

The percent completion of the project's tasks, based on their revised budget allocations, are as follows:

Task 1	-	100%
Task 2	-	100%
Task 3	-	60%
Task 4	-	30%
Task 5	-	0%
Task 6	-	0%
Task 7	-	70%
<hr/>		
Project Total	-	89%

If you have any questions, please call.

Very truly yours,



Ruth M. Maikish  
Senior Project Manager

RMM:gmk

cc: E. Kaup, NJDEP (4)  
C. Boyer, REWAI  
K. Stoddard, EPA Region II

303118