

#	Question	Response
1	Who specifically is conducting Ridgewood's internal review of the Ridgewood Water dumping incident at Schedler?	All findings, including the final remediation report from Matrix, have been shared with the Bergen Joint Insurance Fund and the Environmental Insurance Fund for review, further investigation and coverage consideration. The matter is currently under review.
2	Did Ridgewood Water's LSRP review the spoil pile samples before they were dumped at Schedler?	Please see responses to Questions 75, 77 and 81 from the November 2024 Q&A; Questions 59 and 109 from the January 2025 Q&A; and Questions 46, 47, 48 and 49 from the March 2025 Q&A, all previously posted on the Village website.
3	Who is Ridgewood Water's LSRP?	None of Ridgewood Water's current LSRPs were retained during the time period in question.
4	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?	Please see response to Question 1.
5	Regarding the "internal review" of Ridgewood Water in March 2024 FAQ, has the internal review been paused, transferred, or concluded as it relates to Ridgewood Water?	Please see response to Question 1.
6	Will the public be able to view the findings of Ridgewood's internal review of the Ridgewood Water spoil piles dumping separately from Matrix's remediation report? If so, when and in what format?	Findings will be shared once the Bergen Joint Insurance Fund and Environmental Insurance Fund have completed their work relative to this matter.
7	Please provide the specific dates (month, day, and year) when Ridgewood Water spoil piles were deposited at the Schedler property?	Please see response to Question 2.
8	If the Ridgewood Water soil exceeded NJDEP standards at the time they were dumped, why was it ever moved to a residential site without public notice, formal review, or permitting?	Please see response to Question 9 from the July 23, 2025 Q&A, previously posted on the Village website.
9	Who made that decision?	Please see response to Question 8.
10	Why are there "no conclusive records" about who reviewed the Eurofins data?	Please see response to Question 8.
11	Why was no formal permit or written approval required before Ridgewood Water deposited spoil piles at the Schedler site — a residential, historic, and NJDEP-involved property?	Please see response to Question 8.
12	Given Schedler's residential and historical sensitivity, and the fact that the material was later found to be contaminated, who made the decision to proceed without documentation, oversight, or public notification?	Please see response to Question 1.
13	Who had operational authority over the Ridgewood Water spoil piles material when it was moved to Schedler? Was it Village engineering, Ridgewood Water, or another department?	Please see response to Question 1.
14	Why has no testing been done on nearby stormwater or water main systems despite proximity to contaminated fill?	There is no evidence that the contaminated soil has migrated off site. Principles and regulations published by the American Water Works Association and NJDEP emphasize the importance of maintaining minimum pressure of 20 psi in all water mains to ensure safe water supply. The pressure last read at the hydrant on the Schedler property on August 7, 2025 was 94 psi.
15	What would trigger such testing, and who decides?	Please see response to Question 14.
16	Is there any third-party oversight verifying Ridgewood's claim that "pressure" in the water mains prevents leaching?	Principles and regulations published by the American Water Works Association and NJDEP emphasize the importance of maintaining minimum pressure of 20 psi in all water mains to ensure safe water supply. The pressure last read at the hydrant on the Schedler property on August 7, 2025 was 94 psi.
17	Has NJDEP or an independent engineer confirmed this?	Please see response to Question 16.

#	Question	Response
18	If the source of heptachlor epoxide is unknown, has any effort been made to identify potential sources or pathways of contamination at Schedler?	The Village has stated that the insecticide has never been used at the Schedler site. The detected heptachlor epoxide is assumed to be related to the imported fill material and applied at one or more of the donor sites prior to the material being transported to the Schedler parcel. Exceedances to the NJDEP's Residential Ingestion-Dermal/Inhalation soil remediation standards have been delineated, and the contamination will be removed as part of the remedial action.
19	What investigations, if any, were conducted to trace the origin of this banned pesticide?	Please see response to Question 18.
20	What specific observations, data, or monitoring were used to determine that no sediment migrated off the Schedler site during heavy rain events?	Soil sampling performed by Matrix adequately characterized the filled area of the site and successfully identified the extent of fill material exceeding the NJDEP's Residential Ingestion-Dermal/Inhalation soil remediation standards within the property limits. That data indicates that migration of contaminated soil beyond those limits was not likely. Evidence of off-site migration of contaminated soil was not observed throughout the remediation performed to date.
21	If no sediment traps, runoff monitoring, or stormwater inspections were conducted, on what basis is this claim being made?	Please see response to Question 20.
22	Could you clarify the date range of public questions addressed in the July 23, 2025 "Public Question Responses – Schedler Soil Testing" document?	March 25, 2025 through May 29, 2025.
23	Why was original/native soil never tested, despite DEP explicitly stating that soil testing does not require pre-approval	Please see response to Question 24.
24	Why was original/native soil never tested, despite long-standing concerns about Route 17-borne contaminants?	The ongoing remediation being performed by the Village is associated with NJDEP Case No. 24-05-28-1117-27, which is related to contaminated imported fill material. Site Investigation and Remedial Investigation sampling has been conducted as necessary to evaluate that area of concern.
25	Why was original/native soil never tested, despite DOH identifying proximity to Route 17 as a risk factor?	Please see response to Question 24.
26	How can Matrix conclude contamination came solely from imported fill when the undisturbed soil layer beneath it was never sampled?	Please see response to Question 24.
27	What scientific basis supports the claim that contamination "could be from anywhere," when DOH identified traffic emissions as a known source of PAHs?	PAHs can come from a variety of documented natural and anthropogenic sources. PAHs were identified in the imported material prior to its placement at the Schedler site.
28	What scientific basis supports the claim that contamination "could be from anywhere," when the site sits adjacent to a major highway?	Please see response to Question 27.
29	What scientific basis supports the claim that contamination "could be from anywhere," when contamination levels match traffic-derived PAH signatures?	Please see response to Question 27.
30	How will Matrix verify that contamination will not return if the deposition source—Route 17 — remains active?	The scope of remediation associated with NJDEP Case No. 24-05-28-1117-27 is limited to contamination associated with the imported fill.
31	Will Matrix commit to at least one post-removal baseline soil boring into native soil? If not, what is the scientific or regulatory justification?	The Village will comply with the NJDEP-approved Remedial Action Workplan.
32	Why did Matrix publicly downplay or minimize NJDEP's confirmed wetland, despite the Department's formal determination and EPA's independent confirmation that a freshwater wetland exists on the site?	The presence of the feature the NJDEP identified as a wetland was not downplayed or minimized. Matrix stated their disagreement with that determination based on their own investigation, which was also the conclusion of a second consulting engineering firm retained by the Village (Suburban).
33	If this area is "just a depression," why did NJDEP instruct Suburban to treat it as a jurisdictional wetland?	The NJDEP 's directive is based on their determination that a jurisdictional wetland is present at the site.

#	Question	Response
34	Did Matrix place test borings outside the wetland boundary instead of inside it?	Initial borings to assess the fill material for contamination were placed on a grid pattern throughout the site. None of the initial grid borings were located within the wetland feature. As part of the ecological evaluation of the site following confirmation of contamination in the fill, an exploratory boring was later placed within the wetland feature to assess whether it meets the criteria of a jurisdictional wetland. Evaluation of this boring was qualitative in nature and did not include chemical analysis.
35	Will Matrix commit to wetland-specific sampling and hydrology analysis inside the flagged area?	The area identified as wetlands by the NJDEP will be managed via a general permit, which has been filed by Suburban Consulting Engineers as part of the redevelopment project at the Schedler parcel. The Village and Suburban will be guided contingent upon the response from the NJDEP.
36	DOH recommended surface soil sampling on adjacent residential properties. Why was the DOH recommendation ignored?	The NJDOH recommendation that the NJDEP consider collection of surface samples was not ignored. The NJDOH concluded that exposures to PAHs at the Schedler parcel are unlikely to have harmed people's health and that there is no concern for an increased theoretical cancer risk from exposures to PAHs in the soil from the site. Additionally, soil investigations performed at the site did not identify off-site migration of contamination. Sampling beyond the property boundary was not conducted on those bases.
37	Why did Matrix proceed with a plan that does not satisfy DOH public-health guidance?	The NJDEP-approved Remedial Action Workplan is protective of human health and does not conflict with the NJDOH's determinations regarding the detected PAH contamination in the imported fill material at the Schedler site.
38	Will Matrix commit to limited off-site sampling to rule out exposure to families?	The investigation sampling conducted by Matrix did not identify off-site migration of contamination associated with the imported fill material.
39	Matrix openly stated it will not test after excavation. What is the justification for refusing post-removal confirmation sampling?	Applicable NJDEP guidance permits remedial investigation sampling to be used in place of post-removal confirmation sampling. Identifying the clean boundary of the removal area prior to the work enables the Village to better estimate resources needed to conduct the removal.
40	What NJDEP regulation prohibits post-removal confirmation testing?	There is no regulation that prohibits post-removal confirmation testing.
41	Without confirmation sampling, how will Matrix verify contamination was fully removed?	The lateral extent of the contaminated fill has been confirmed via pre-removal sampling.
42	If contamination source persists (Route 17), how will long-term safety be managed?	Management of potential future contamination is outside the scope of remediation associated with the contaminated imported fill material.
43	If residents pay for independent confirmation sampling, will Matrix provide access to exposed soils?	Only personnel retained by the Village to conduct remediation will be permitted on the work site during performance of the remedial action.
44	What chemicals will air monitors measure? PAHs? Metals? SVOCs? VOCs? Particulates?	Prior to the initiation of the remedial action, the Village will post a Perimeter Air Monitoring Plan (PAMP) on the Village website for residents to review. The PAMP will detail monitoring procedures, mitigation techniques, notification requirements, and an explanation of why each is appropriate for this project.
45	What triggers an alert? Define the action levels and who set them.	Please see response to Question 44.
46	Will these action levels be published publicly?	Please see response to Question 44.
47	What is the chemical composition of the foam Matrix proposes to use for dust suppression, and can you provide the full Material Safety Data Sheet (MSDS)? Has it been tested for inhalation safety?	Please see response to Question 44.
48	What happens during winter when water freezes and dust suppression fails?	Please see response to Question 44.
49	Will residents receive real-time access to monitoring data?	Please see response to Question 44.
50	If residents see something that looks like protocols are not being followed, do we call 1-800-WARN-DEP?	Residents should notify the Village and Matrix if they have concerns regarding compliance with the protocols established by Matrix.
51	Why January?	At the community meeting on November 13, 2025, an estimated time frame for the project to begin was shared with the public in attendance, based upon bids being collected in early January. The estimated time frame was speculative, and the final schedule will not be able to be shared until a contractor is selected.

#	Question	Response
52	The public who lives within 200' has made clear we're not in support of contaminated soil removal at this scale. Why not cap it?	Soil removal provides the greatest likelihood of success that impacted soils exceeding the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection's Residential Ingestion-Dermal Soil Remediation Standard and the Residential Inhalation Soil Remediation Standard do not pose an ongoing exposure risk to residents of the Village.
53	What's the price comparison of removal versus capping for tax payers?	A price comparison was not prepared as the Village opted, based on Matrix's recommendation, to pursue full removal instead of a remedial action that resulted in leaving contaminated soils in place. Soil removal provides the greatest likelihood of success that impacted soils do not pose an ongoing exposure risk to residents of the Village.
54	What is the exact truck route, and when will the public see it?	The Ridgewood Police Department will work in conjunction with the selected contractor to develop the least impactful truck route for the safest access on/off the site. The route will be shared with neighborhood residents 10 days prior to the start of the project.
55	If the bus stop needed to be moved for safety, what is the explanation for why the same stretch of road is considered safe for residents walking, biking, or using their driveways?	The Ridgewood Police Department will supervise and oversee all safety aspects of truck access to the site in order to ensure neighborhood safety.
56	What is the child-exposure mitigation plan for kids who live directly across from the truck entrance?	Please see response to Question 44.
57	What health-risk analysis was performed to determine how far children must be kept from truck routes and excavation?	Please see response to Question 44.
58	Will parents be notified in writing that the bus stop relocation is happening because the Village is proactively choosing to remove this in January when kids are in school versus summer months?	Yes, by the Ridgewood Public Schools, after consultation with the Ridgewood Police Department.
59	What is the written child-safety protocol for days with heavy truck traffic or visible dust?	Please see responses to Questions 44 and 54.
60	What happens if tarps fail en route?	This question cannot be addressed until a remediation contractor, disposal facility and transportation company have been selected.
61	What is the maximum number of trucks per hour?	This question cannot be addressed until a remediation contractor, disposal facility and transportation company have been selected, and a project schedule has been established.
62	Will an independent third-party oversee truck safety?	The contractor coordinating transportation of removed fill is required to be licensed (A-901) with the NJDEP. The licensing process is extensive and ensures that transportation of contaminated soil and solid waste is being performed by qualified individuals. Third-party oversight is unnecessary.
63	Matrix admitted that trees will be removed or relocated. Has contamination been detected on the tree root systems?	The work effort to transplant trees from the berm to the northern border of the property was abandoned upon the recommendation of Matrix and Downes Tree Service on December 17, 2025.
64	What is the survival rate of transplanted trees?	Please see response to Question 63.
65	What arborist is certifying trees for relocation?	Please see response to Question 63.
66	Will root-ball soil be treated as contaminated?	Please see response to Question 63.
67	The two remaining spots that need to be tested, why are they not done yet?	The two remaining spots will be sampled during the soil removal activities.
68	Matrix mentioned a "pocket of Mercury" - where is that location on the property?	The area where mercury is a contaminant of concern is west of the residential structure.
69	Why only 28 initial samples for a 7-acre site?	Per the NJDEP's conditional approval issued on April 3, 2024, one sample was to be collected at 10,000 square feet spacing in a grid pattern, less the lawn around the residential structure. Based on the measured square footage of the property, 28 samples were required to adhere to the NJDEP's condition.
70	Why were random samples not collected outside known fill zones?	Please see response to Question 24.
71	Why were no samples taken in native-soil areas as a baseline?	Please see response to Question 24.
72	What is the cumulative risk model for airborne exposure during excavation?	Please see response to Question 44.
73	Which contaminants pose inhalation vs ingestion risks?	Please see response to Question 44.

#	Question	Response
74	Has Matrix modeled combined exposure to PAHs, particulates, metals, and diesel pollutants?	Please see response to Question 44.
75	Will you provide a redline between the version sent to DEP and any publicly posted version?	The NJDEP did not have revisions to the plan Matrix submitted.
76	How will the public know what changed?	Please see response to Question 75.
77	Will all DEP comments (including Farrell's) be published verbatim?	Please see response to Question 75.
78	Will you disclose all email correspondence between Matrix, DEP, Suburban, and the Village relating to edits?	Please see response to Question 75.
79	What are the projected noise levels at nearby homes?	Noise levels will be consistent with that typical of construction activities. If complaints are made, the Village will investigate and determine whether changes need to be made to the process. The Ridgewood Police Department will be supervising any disruptions to the neighborhood.
80	What is the threshold for stopping work?	If complaints are made, the Village will investigate and determine whether changes need to be made to the process.
81	If noise cannot be mitigated, why schedule months of weekday work?	The work will generate noise regardless of when it occurs. It is expected that working on weeknights or weekends would result in greater impact to the community.
82	What is the compensation policy for impacted residents?	There is no compensation policy.
83	What contaminant levels trigger alerts?	Please see response to Question 44.
84	Will you provide lower-threshold alerts for medically vulnerable residents?	Please see response to Question 44.
85	Will residents be notified every time dust suppression is activated?	Please see response to Question 44.
86	Will immediate alerts be sent via text or email?	Please see response to Question 44.
87	What is the total number of trucks (chemical, solid waste, berm removal)?	Please see response to Question 61.
88	What is the maximum wind speed for automatic work stoppage?	Please see response to Question 44.
89	How will dust be prevented during loading and excavation?	Please see response to Question 44.
90	Why was bioremediation dismissed without any feasibility analysis?	Soil removal provides the greatest likelihood of success that impacted soils do not pose an ongoing exposure risk to residents of the Village.
91	Where is the alternatives matrix comparing excavation vs capping vs bioremediation?	Discussions about remedial action alternatives happened on a conceptual level. A comparison document was not prepared.
92	Who decided that "speed" outweighed "least harmful"?	Such a decision was not made. Please see response to Question 53.
93	If contamination is ongoing from the highway, why not implement ongoing bioremediation?	The remedial action is being implemented to address contaminated fill that was imported onto the site.
94	Why was groundwater not encountered when residents have near-surface water?	Groundwater has not been documented at the site shallower than 10 feet below grade.
95	Why wasn't winter-season hydrology assessed?	Hydrology at the site was sufficiently assessed.
96	Why were wetland areas omitted from geotechnical analyses?	A geotechnical investigation was completed for use in the stormwater management design, in accordance with the NJDEP Stormwater Management Regulations. Stormwater management facilities are not anticipated to be located where the wetland was noted by the NJDEP. As such, this type of geotechnical analysis was not necessary to be performed in the wetland area.
97	Why is January work scheduled before NJDEP approval?	Please see response to Question 51.
98	Will all plan changes be publicly posted before bidding or construction?	Please see response to Question 75.
99	What legal authority permits pre-approval scheduling?	There is no regulation that prohibits developing a preliminary schedule prior to approval of the remedial action.
100	Will an independent third-party environmental monitor be hired?	No.
101	Will daily reports, dust logs, wind-speed data be published online?	Please see response to Question 44.
102	Who bears responsibility for off-site contamination or dust release?	The person responsible for conducting the remediation.

#	Question	Response
103	If residents see dust, should they: close all windows? shelter in place? evacuate temporarily? notify a hotline?	Residents should take whatever steps necessary relative to their own comfort level. The exceeded standards are based on a lifetime exposure scenario, not short-term exposure such as that which may be encountered in the unlikely event that residents encounter dust during the remedial action.
104	Who receives dust complaints—Matrix, DEP, Village, or an independent monitor?	Residents should notify the Village and Matrix with complaints of dust during the remedial action.
105	What is the immediate stop-work protocol if visible dust is reported?	Please see response to Question 44.
106	Will work automatically stop upon any documented dust plume?	Please see response to Question 44.
107	Will residents receive guidance for: immunocompromised family members, infants, outdoor pets, air purifier needs?	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.
108	We expect your work to reflect that responsibility by presenting all remediation options, as the public requested, including a side by side comparison of: - Full excavation plan presented to NJDEP, mentioned during the community meeting but NOT presented to the public - Hybrid approaches (limited excavation + bioremediation) - Full bioremediation Including environmental + health impacts, long-term maintenance needs, public-safety considerations, and full lifecycle costs.	The Remedial Action Workplan prepared by Matrix was approved by the NJDEP on November 24, 2025. Full removal was the option chosen by the Village to provide for the greatest likelihood of success that the impacted soils do not pose an ongoing exposure risk to the residents of the Village.
109	When will you return to complete the community meeting and ensure that all remaining questions and public feedback are fully addressed prior to any irreversible decisions being made?	The community meeting, which took place on November 13, 2025 and ran for just under three hours, was complete. The Remedial Action Workplan was not altered, and there were no recommended changes by the NJDEP Bureau of Solid Waste Compliance and Enforcement from the initial submission of the plan on October 22, 2025. Subsequent questions that have been submitted are being responded to in this round of Q&A.
110	Please provide a schedule or anticipated timeline for when the next set of Public Question Responses for the Schedler Soil Testing will be released.	This document includes responses to questions/comments received as of December 31, 2025.
111	I'm unsure of the order of events here, but has the Village committed to working with Matrix without a specific remediation plan selected?	The Remedial Action Workplan prepared by Matrix was submitted to the NJDEP Bureau of Solid Waste Compliance and Enforcement on October 22, 2025, and it was approved on November 24, 2025.
112	As such, who decided what remediation plan the Village is going with and when?	Please see response to Questions 108 and 111.
113	Are there minutes available so residents can understand how this decision came to be and what questions were asked/answered.	Matrix appeared before the Village Council on June 5, 2024; August 7, 2024; March 5, 2025; August 6, 2025; and December 3, 2025. In addition, a community meeting was held on November 13, 2025. All meetings can be viewed on the Village's YouTube channel.
114	Given the sensitivity of the Schedler site and the long history of environmental controversy around this project, it is essential that the community see the full analysis behind Matrix's recommendation. That means the modeling, the sampling comparisons, the environmental risk assessment, the cost breakdown, and the long term outcome projections.	The SIR/RIR/RAW prepared by Matrix and posted on the Village's website provides the justification for the recommended remedial action. The NJDEP has reviewed and approved the Remedial Action Workplan, and the Village is moving forward with that approval.
115	Given that no visually observed solid waste is present, please explain who determined—and on what basis—the proposal to remove the entire berm, a structure that currently serves as a buffer providing safety, environmental protection, and separation from the adjacent highway.	A remedial action is required to address exceedances to applicable soil remediation standards in the soil within the berm. Exceedances to the Residential Ingestion-Dermal/Inhalation soil remediation standards were detected in more than half of the initial characterization samples collected from soil within the berm. Based on the contamination distribution, significant portions of the berm require a remedial action. Matrix recommended removal as it provides the greatest likelihood of success that impacted soils do not pose an ongoing exposure risk to residents, which is the Village's goal. The recommendation is also consistent with the NJDEP BSWCE's December 2023 directive that fill exceeding applicable Residential Ingestion-Dermal/Inhalation soil remediation standards be removed.

#	Question	Response
116	Please clearly state: Is the Bureau of Solid Waste or Matrix requiring that the berm be removed in its entirety? If so, on what grounds?	Please see response to Question 115.
117	The removal of the berm would leave only a guardrail as the sole barrier to the adjacent highway. We request justification for why full excavation is being pursued rather than evaluating or implementing less invasive alternatives, which would maintain the much needed berm and public safety.	Please see response to Question 115. The remedial action does not preclude installation of an alternative safety barrier upon completion.
118	As the LSRP of record, state regulations require you to act independently and prioritize public health and environmental protection in every decision and recommendation. In fulfillment of that obligation, please provide the complete remediation plan for review and answer the questions submitted.	The SIR/RIR/RAW prepared by Matrix was posted on the Village's website following receipt of NJDEP approval. As of this posting, responses to resident questions received by December 31, 2025 have been provided.
119	"Matrix has looked at the bioremediation option and is not recommending it, especially in light of the future park development at the Schedler property." Would you be able to send me the full report, including the rationale behind disregarding the bioremediation option?	Please see responses to Questions 90, 115 and 118.
120	I am somewhat confused, however, because Mr Kazmark wrote to one of our citizens: "Matrix has looked at the bioremediation option and is not recommending it, especially in light of the future park development at the Schedler property." His response tends to indicate that Matrix has already opined on bioremediation, whereas your tends to indicate that you are working on responses. Hoping you can clarify.	Please see response to Question 119.
121	At tonight's council meeting, your team mentioned that removal is needed for continuation in your professional opinion. For an earlier written response, you had mentioned that "since DEP is requiring removal of solid waste, you would just remove everything while there to remove the solid waste". So my question is..are you recommending removal of the entire berm due to the presence of visually observed solid waste or are you proposing the removal of entire berm because of chemical contamination.	Please see response to Question 115.
122	At tonight's council meeting it was mentioned that capping was ruled out. Can you explain why capping was ruled out for the BERM portion of the project? If there is a fence between the field and berm, and children cannot access it, why did you rule out capping?	Please see response to Question 115.
123	It was mentioned at tonight's council meeting again that your team is recommending to remove the entire berm to get to residential cleanup standards. At an earlier meeting it was mentioned that the first 15-30 feet area next to the highway can again get contaminated with highway fumes. Can you please explain that if this area is again likely to get contaminated, why are you recommending to clean it to the residential standards? This is recreational area, and not just recreational area, it's the BERM that separates the recreational area from highway. Why are you recommending to remove the berm and clean this area to residential standards and not recreational standards?	Please see responses to Questions 42 and 115.
124	I have found a video of 20240807 meeting where the Village Manager mentioned that DEP and Matrix are going to agree with us to remove the BERM. So was this all agreed to before 20240807?	Matrix made the recommendation to remove the berm at the August 7, 2024 Village Council Meeting. The recommendation was based on site investigation data collected from the berm and is consistent with the NJDEP BSWCE's December 2023 correspondence.

#	Question	Response
125	Can you please explain that why is it not possible to recommend different solutions for the BERM and for the field, where the contamination is "removed" for the field but "capped" for the BERM?	Please see response to Question 115.
126	How much difference would it be for the tax payers you cap the berm or partially remediate the berm and fully remediate the field, compared to your current proposal? What is the cost difference?	Matrix recommended removal as it provides the greatest likelihood of success that impacted soils do not pose an ongoing exposure risk to residents, which is the Village's goal. The recommendation is also consistent with the NJDEP BSWCE's December 2023 directive that fill exceeding applicable Residential Ingestion-Dermal/Inhalation soil remediation standards be removed.
127	Earlier this year when the village council was setting the budget, the village manager asked your team that are you confident that remediation will take a little more than a million dollars and they would like to budget that. Your partner responded with confidence that "yes". What changed since then for this project to become a multi-million dollar project? (This was after the 20240807 meeting)	Matrix provided a preliminary budget estimate of \$1.5 million for the project. The Village is working through the bid process to determine the final cost, which will be based on the scope of work outlined in the Remedial Action Workplan approved by the NJDEP and responsive bid amounts.
128	Can you provide your rationale that why can we not just remove visually observed solid waste from the berm and cap the chemical contamination and save the berm?	Please see response to Question 115.
129	Can you provide your rationale that why can we not just remove the visually observed solid waste from the berm and if needed remove the chemical contamination from the berm, which I understand is a small area, and save the berm?	Please see response to Question 115.
130	Was today's Q&A session with the village council pre rehearsed? Pre planned?	No.
131	The Mayor mentioned at today's meeting that LSRP is a professional and once we pay them, they work with the DEP and they don't do what "we want them to do".. they do what they think is right professionally and what "DEP wants them to do". At the meeting two weeks ago, you had mentioned that you had proposed capping but you are going with berm removal because that's what the village wanted to do. Can you please clarify if you are proposing to remove the BERM because that's what you and DEP want to do, or is it because what the village wants to do. Both of these statements are on the video and they are contradicting. Please provide a response to this question as part of your responses.	As the person responsible for conducting the remediation at the Schedler parcel, the Village of Ridgewood is responsible for site cleanup and is required to conduct remediation in accordance with applicable NJDEP rules and regulations. The LSRP's role at the Schedler site is to help the Village navigate those requirements, facilitate the remediation, and ensure that the Village remains in compliance. The Village can choose which remedial action to implement based on project-specific needs, as long as the chosen remedy and timing comply with applicable NJDEP requirements. Multiple remedial action options were conceptually discussed, but the Village ultimately decided to proceed with removal (see Questions 90 and 115), which will result in compliance with applicable NJDEP requirements while meeting the Village's goal of achieving residential soil remediation standards, which is most protective of residents.
132	Another question. What is the rush to start in January and possibly use foam (another chemical). Why can this not wait until spring when foam or other chemicals will not be needed? It's a property by highway and no one is accessing it	The schedule for work is contingent upon the awarded contractor's availability.
133	Are you aware of the fact that once contamination is cleaned then the village plans to put a turf field at this location? Was this discussed during the discussions on what type of remediation may be needed to put down a turf? (If you were not aware of it, you are aware of it now).	Matrix is aware of the Village's future plans for the site. There is nothing inherent to the planned redevelopment that would bar removal of contaminated fill as a viable remedial action.

#	Question	Response
134	As part of your contamination cleanup, have you advised the village and the NJDEP contacts that you are working with that an artificial turf will contaminate the soil again with PFAS, based on the studies done in 2023-2024 on PFAS contamination from artificial turf? It may not be in the scope of current remediation, but if you are aware of this "plan", does it fall in your professional responsibility to make your clients and NJDEP aware of the planned contamination?	The NJDEP is aware of the Village's redevelopment plan and approved it on August 27, 2025.
135	Who determines what level of clean up is required (eg, residential, recreational)?	The Village's goal is to achieve residential site remediation standards, which is most protective of residents.
136	And specifically which person(s) is responsible for this decision?	Please see response to Question 135.
137	What metrics are considered in determining the best remediation for each?	Please see response to Question 135.
138	Are there minutes available from meetings where these choices were made?	Please see response to Question 113.
139	Is there any policy barring the Village or Matrix (or any other entity) from follow up testing of the soil after remediation? It seems that would provide the certainty that residents are looking for. The Village manager kept repeating that it's not required, but didn't address that it is still possible.	Please see response to Question 39.
140	Has an alternate truck route for removal been considered? (Specifically entrance/egress from the route 17 side)? Large dump trucks regularly access the grandfathered nursery properties just north of Schedler.	The Ridgewood Police Department will determine all truck routes and truck safety procedures in consultation with the contractor awarded the bid. It is unlikely, however, that direct access to/from Route 17 from the site would be approved based upon safety and the location of acceleration lanes.
141	It doesn't make sense to do this project, no matter the remediation method, in the dead of winter. Work hours are shorter secondary to daylight and the ground is frozen. I don't know the impacts of frozen ground on the plan, or the impacts of spraying the chemicals suggested may be used in freezing temperatures. Can you advise if these issues were considered and what the alternatives were? And again, are there minutes available so residents can understand the risks and tradeoffs?	Please see response to Question 132.
142	What contaminants were found in the BERM area (not the other parts of the property).	Benzo(a)pyrene, benzo(a)anthracene, mercury, and lead were found above a default NJDEP soil remediation standard in the berm.
143	From those contaminants, which ones can be attributed to highway traffic and are likely to be added again, especially now that area will become actual playing field.	The identified contaminants can come from a variety of sources. Matrix cannot speculate on the likelihood of future contamination from unspecified sources.
144	Any contaminants that will likely get deposited from the highway traffic, are we better off if they get deposited to the berm, or the actual field. As per the current plan, the berm will be replaced by the playing area. Please don't claim that is not your responsibility	Please see response to Question 42.
145	Is the bid process and contract award a public process?	The bid will be awarded under the New Jersey Open Public Contracts Law.
146	If so, would the residents know about those processes in advance and can monitor/anticipate a start date?	The bid was legally advertised and due on January 6, 2026. Bids are currently under review. The schedule will be based upon the availability of the contractor awarded the bid. Start dates will be shared and announced at Village Council meetings and through other typical Village information outlets.
147	Or is the contractor also pre planned like the outcome of the remediation application to DEP and the outcome of the testing (berm removal)? Just asking as this is a few million dollars project and the manager writing the checks (using tax payer dollars), and the agency head overseeing the process, co hosted a political fund raising event for the incoming governor of our great state.	The bid will be awarded under the New Jersey Open Public Contracts Law, which requires an open bid process and an award to the lowest responsible bidder.

#	Question	Response
148	<p>The manager had declared the outcome of the application a year ago and the other application pending before the same agency for the grand plan of the stadium and field was approved by this agency over the objections of SHPO. So like every other outcome so far, are the contractors and their payouts pre planned or will this go through a proper bidding process (hopefully not for 10 days during Christmas break)?</p>	<p>Please see response to Question 147.</p>
149	<p>And given that the original January start date was repeated several times at the 11.13.25 Matrix community meeting, can you also clarify what changed in the past three weeks to shift that timeline, and when were residents going to be updated if we didn't proactively ask?</p>	<p>Please see response to Question 132.</p>
150	<p>The information from NJDEP specifically said any trees removed were to be at ground height, no stumps ground. The language of the agreement between the Village of Ridgewood and Downes specifies not only to grind stumps but extra wide and extra deep. This is concerning because in the emails forwarded to me Matrix noted neither of the vendors they contacted were able/willing to perform this work.</p> <p>Also, the Downes equipment had to roll through the whole site - over dirt and trash debris that litters the site still. Nothing appears demarcated, so it's unclear how Downes tree, untrained in remediation, would be aware of the contamination, or wetlands identified. Furthermore, the head of operation for Downes whom I contacted offered no assurances that they were aware of any such areas and said they were moving the arbor vitae. Keith Kazmark, Village Manager, indicated the same as he stressed the need to relocate them quickly in whatever remaining window he thinks they have to successfully transplant trees.</p> <p>Since that will disturb the known to be contaminated berm, the same precautions for remediation should be in place, no? Someone with the 40 hour training outlined at the November meeting?</p>	<p>The NJDEP requirements regarding tree/stump handling were specific to identified archaeological areas of the property. The attempted relocation of the arborvitae and the stump grinding by Downes Tree Service that was performed in December 2025 took place outside of the archaeological areas. Additionally, the plan to relocate arborvitae from the berm to the northern border of the property was abandoned on December 17, 2025 upon the recommendation of Matrix Engineering and Downes Tree Service.</p>
151	<p>It does seem strange to me that they would remove healthy trees from an area where the soil is not contaminated in order to make room for Arborvitae that are coming from an area where the soil is contaminated. Why couldn't they just put the arborvitae in among existing trees in the uncontaminated area?</p>	<p>The plan to relocate arborvitae from the berm to the northern border of the property was abandoned on December 17, 2025 upon the recommendation of Matrix Engineering and Downes Tree Service.</p>
152	<p>It's a foregone conclusion that many of the arborvitae will not survive the transfer, as their entire root system has to be bathed and cleansed somehow. This is not compatible with allowing a tree to be transplanted and survive. Maybe some will, hopefully many will, but for sure some won't. Therefore, I don't understand why healthy trees would be taken out of an area where the soil did not get contaminated. Maybe you can clarify this?</p>	<p>Please see response to Question 151.</p>
153	<p>How much soil/dirt will need to be removed (estimated depth and volume) in order to install the stormwater management systems required by this ordinance?</p>	<p>This question pertains to park development and not remediation of the property.</p>
154	<p>How was this amount determined?</p>	<p>Please see response to Question 153.</p>
155	<p>How will this excavation affect the known wetlands?</p>	<p>Please see response to Question 153.</p>

#	Question	Response
156	Additionally, we ask for a timeline indicating when the remaining wetland areas—particularly those that have been filled with solid/contaminated waste and subsequently drained—will be evaluated and tested to determine the extent of environmental impact and any necessary remediation.	The NJDEP has identified one area of jurisdictional wetlands on the Schedler parcel. Additional wetlands have not been identified by the NJDEP, Matrix or Suburban. See response to Question 35.
157	What is the proposed plan for meeting the ordinance’s standards for: Stormwater quantity control	Please see response to Question 153.
158	What is the proposed plan for meeting the ordinance’s standards for: Groundwater recharge	Please see response to Question 153.
159	What is the proposed plan for meeting the ordinance’s standards for: Water quality treatment	Please see response to Question 153.
160	Will underground infiltration or water-seepage tanks(chambers, galleries, trenches, or basins) be required for compliance?	Please see response to Question 153.
161	To what depth (in feet) will the infiltration tanks or subsurface recharge systems need to be installed?	Please see response to Question 153.
162	Where on the site are these systems proposed to be placed relative to the turf field, driveway, and parking lot?	Please see response to Question 153.
163	Has soil permeability/infiltration testing been conducted in the exact locations where infiltration systems are proposed?	Please see response to Question 153.
164	If yes, please share:	Please see response to Question 153.
165	Soil permeability results	Please see response to Question 153.
166	Depth to groundwater	Please see response to Question 153.
167	Any constraints (e.g., low permeability, shallow groundwater, contamination concerns)	Please see response to Question 153.
168	Based on the planned design, what is the total estimated volume of soil that will be displaced or exported off-site to install the stormwater and recharge systems?	Please see response to Question 153.
169	If there is no contamination within the berm, what is the environmental basis for its removal?	Contamination has been documented within the berm.
170	If the removal is not mandated by the NJDEP for remediation purposes, is it being removed solely at the request of the Village?	Please see response to Question 115.
171	Please identify exactly who made the determination to remove this critical safety barrier.	Please see responses to Questions 115 and 131.
172	<p>On pages 49–50, Matrix’s October 2025 report states that vegetation and tree clearing will include removal of most trees, with stumps and associated soil removed and transported off-site. Residents understand that NJDEP’s SHPO indicated in August 2025 that stump grinding or removal should not occur, given the potential impact to archaeological resources.</p> <p>In addition, the September 2025 Grubb archaeological report documents over 8,000 artifacts recovered from approximately 4% of Site Core 1 at Schedler, indicating substantial remaining resources. Could you clarify how the proposed remediation approach aligns with SHPO guidance, and whether your office is actively coordinating with SHPO to ensure remediation activities do not conflict with archaeological preservation requirements?</p>	Matrix is preparing an Application for Project Authorization for submittal to the NJDEP’s Historic Preservation Office that details the planned remedial action.

#	Question	Response
173	On page 52, the Matrix report states: "Trees will be mechanically removed using standard equipment, with stumps cleared as needed to allow for full removal." Residents are trying to understand how this language and any future action align with SHPO guidance regarding protection of archaeological resources.	Please see response to Question 172.
174	Under the ecological evaluation section, it is residents' understanding that the report states that further consultation and/or coordination with the New Jersey Ecological Services Field Office is necessary to address potential impacts to designated species habitat. What is the current plan for coordination with the New Jersey Ecological Services Field Office, and where can the public review any related correspondence or determinations? We couldn't find this info in Appendix M.	Matrix has engaged verbally with the USFWS NJ Field Office, and the Village will follow their recommendations. Formal correspondence has not been provided to date.
175	Given that the report confirms removal of forested habitat comprising "more than 50 percent of the site," how can impacts be avoided or minimized, and what specific avoidance or minimization measures (if any) have been reviewed and approved by USFWS prior to authorizing tree removal?	Please see response to Question 174.
176	In December 2025, tree removal and stump grinding occurred on portions of the Schedler site, which has been documented by multiple residents. Matrix was reportedly aware of planned tree removal and was observed onsite by residents. Could you clarify whether the New Jersey Ecological Services Field Office had been consulted prior to this work, and if so, where that coordination is documented?	The tree removal/stump grinding was not done as part of Matrix's scope. Matrix was an on-site observer to ensure that contaminated soil was not transplanted to other areas of the site.
177	To help avoid further confusion with the information provided to residents by NJDEP regarding wetland presence (your report cites it a few times), could you clarify the respective roles of Matrix and NJDEP in wetlands identification and jurisdictional determination, and confirm which entity has final regulatory authority?	Final regulatory authority rests with the NJDEP.
178	At the November 13, 2025 Matrix Q&A meeting, dust and particulate exposure was noted as a concern. What is the current plan to address dust and particulates during remediation and construction activities? Is that in a forthcoming report?	Please see response to Question 44.
179	Residents have reviewed Village documents showing that the berm was recommended by the Ridgewood Police Department for safety, based on the property's location next to Route 17. Given that the berm is fenced off and not subject to public contact, could you clarify the basis for recommending full removal of it, and how the public's safety considerations were weighed alongside remediation objectives?	Please see response to Question 115.
180	Given the recent recommendation by Richard Grubb & Associates that the Town pursue listing a portion of the site under Criterion D due to its archaeological significance, can you clarify how the remediation approach, particularly within or adjacent to Site Core 1, is being evaluated to ensure consistency with Criterion D considerations, including avoidance, minimization, and coordination with SHPO for any ground-disturbing activities?	Please see response to Question 172.