Matusky Environmental Science & Engineering Consultants

& Skelly Engineers

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.

Lawler

6 June 1986 File Nos. 455-102 to 106

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 May to 2 June 1986

A. TASK WORK AND DELIVERABLES

1. Task 2 - Site Investigations and RI Report

On 9 May 1986 LMS submitted to the NJDEP and EPA Region II the "Final Remedial Investigation Report: Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study, Combe Fill South Landfill", in fulfillment of our Task 2 work scope.

This report included the out-of-scope work requested by the NJDEP for changes to the potable well identification system. We would like to invoice the State for this work and request that contract change orders or amendments be sent to us as soon as possible. Our correspondence of 26 March 1986 details the manhours and costs associated with this additional work.

Task 4 - Laboratory Analysis and Treatability Study

On 19 May 1986, LMS received a memorandum from the NJDEP on its review of LMS' correspondence of 14 March 1986 regarding effluent limitations and treatability study guidance. Basically, this memorandum requested additional information on in-stream water quality prior to making any final decisions on effluent quality. In response, LMS submitted the requested data in correspondence dated 30 May 1986.

303157

Memo to Mr. Edgar Kaup NJ Department of Environmental Protection -27 March 1986 Page 2

LMS is now awaiting conclusions from the NJDEP on our original correspondence prior to the development of a treatability study work scope.

3. Task 5 - Evaluations of Alternatives

LMS received oral authorization from E. Kaup on 22 May 1986 to proceed with the alternate water supply study detailed in our correspondence of 9 April 1986. On 2 June a meeting was held, at the Washington Township MUA to discuss this study with local officials. In attendance were Mr. Paul Costic (Consulting Engineer to WTMUA), Ms. Cathy Burns (Wash. Twp Administrator), Ms. Judy Hancock (Wash. Twp. Sanitarian), Mr. Edgar Kaup (NJDEP), Mr. John Larkin (LMS). We are awaiting the appropriate contract amendment (or change order) documents from the NJDEP to cover the costs of this additional work item. Manhours and the project cost estimate are detailed in our correspondence of 9 April 1986.

On 2 June 1986, LMS transmitted to the NJDEP and EPA Region II the draft Task 5 report entitled: "Draft Feasibility Study Report: Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study, Combe Fill South Landfill". This submittal is in fulfillment of our Task 5 work scope requirements.

4. Task 6 - Conceptual Design

LMS has begun evaluation of several conceptual design elements, i.e. the site grading and capping, that are expected to be carried forward into a recommended alternative. Additionally, we are evaluating at the request of the NJDEP and EPA off-site treatment of contaminated groundwater, a technology not evaluated in Task 5.

B. PROJECT SCHEDULE

It is our understanding that a public meeting will be held in early July 1986 to present the findings of the draft feasibility study. Subsequent to this meeting the NJDEP and EPA will select a final alternative set of remedial components for detailed evaluation as part of Task 6 - Conceptual Design. The final feasibility study report, including conceptual design of the selected alternative will be finalized within six weeks of receipt of correspondence from the NJDEP/EPA on the selected alternative.

Feit & June

= f:

303158

Memo to Mr. Edgar Kaup NJ Department of Environmental Protection 27 March 1986 Page 3

C. PERCENT COMPLETION

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

Task 1	-	100%
Task 2	-	100% (Including 100% of Contract
		Modification)
Task 3	-	100%
Task 4	-	60%
Task 5	-	100% - Know to the second
Task 6	-	10%
Task 7	-	70%
Project Total	-	93%
Alt. Water		
Suppley	-	10%

We are still awaiting payment of our Task 2 invoices as resubmitted. Also, we expect to shortly enumerate and request payment for additional costs we have incurred in performing services in the completed tasks that were beyond our original scope of work.

If you have any questions, please call.

Very truly yours,

auth M. Maitish

Ruth M. Maikish Senior Project Manager

cc: E. Kaup, NJDEP (4)

C. Boyer, REWAI

K. Stoddard, EPA Region IC-

RMM:jms

303159