

Responses to RFP for Environmental Investigation of 3 sites (HDSRF funding)

ADDENDUM 2

Apple Tree Village

The Remedial Investigation Report/Remedial Action Work Plan contains three volumes. Volume 1 ends at Table 6. Volume 2 begins with Attachment 3. There should be two more Tables, twelve Figures and two more Attachments between the Table 6 and Attachment 3 according to the Volume 1 Table of Contents. Are these items available?

Response: The missing items referenced in this question are not available at this time.

We understand that the scope of work is to be implemented on the sidewalks at the perimeter of the private properties however; the NJDEP May 16, 2005 RIR/RAWP review letter identified certain deficiencies in the previous environmental investigations. Specifically, failure to complete vertical delineation of groundwater contamination at AOC-B (and possibly AOC-E). Our opinion is that correcting this deficiency might not be feasible without access to the location of the AOC(s). Furthermore, the NJDEP letter directs that a groundwater sampling point be located at the former dry well (AOC-E). Again, this will not be feasible without access to the location.

Response: The City of Elizabeth maintains that ground water monitoring locations in the sidewalk, placed as close to AOC-B and AOC-E as possible, will served as vertical delineation locations. This approach was included in the City application for a Hazardous Discharge Site Remediation Fund grant to complete this work. That application was reviewed and approved by the NJDEP.

The NJDEP letter references an investigative finding of “some free product observed” in the AOC-B excavation. Please note that a Remedial Investigation cannot be completed until all source contaminated media has been removed. Please advise if this has been accomplished.

Response: AOC-B soils received a NJDEP No Further Action approval in 2006. Free product was not reported in the ground water monitoring results from within AOC-B. The City of Elizabeth anticipates that the free product was removed and disposed off-site with the contaminated soil. The ground water investigation included in the RFP scope of work will determine if free product remains.

Exact Anodizing Property

The RFP lists the Property as 74-82 Livingston Street, Block 2/Lot 655, but the supporting documentation contains four reports associated with the property at 59-81 Livingston Street, Block 2/Lot 604 (aka 70 Broadway Supermarket Commercial Center). The NJDEP March 31,

2010 Supplemental Site Investigation Scope of Work Approval Letter “lumps” these two sites together. Please confirm that the RFP is solely for the 74-82 Livingston Street Property.

Response: The RFP is solely for the 74-82 Livingston Street Property.

The supporting documentation contains an Amended Scope of Work for Environmental Site Investigation Operations dated March 31, 2009 however; the NJDEP March 31, 2010 Supplemental Site Investigation Scope of Work Approval Letter referenced an August 28, 2007 Site Investigation Proposal and makes no mention of the March 31, 2009 Amended Scope of Work. Please clarify which document represents the accurate Site Investigation scope of work.

Response: It is the City of Elizabeth understanding that the March 31, 2009 Amended Scope of Work for Environmental Site Investigation Operations represents an investigation of site conditions after the buildings were demolished and removed, and is the accurate scope of work.

Kull Property

The undated NJDEP letter in the supporting documentation referenced a June 11, 2003 Remedial Investigation Scope of Work however; the supporting documentation did not include this. There is a May 30, 2003 letter from PMK to the NJDEP titled “RE: Remedial Investigation Scope of Work”. Is the June 11, 2003 Remedial Investigation Scope of Work available?

Response: The 2003 Remedial Investigation Scope of Work was not required by NJDEP at that time. The City of Elizabeth intends to install appropriate institutional and engineering controls without further environmental sampling.

The NJDEP Dataminer database contains no indication that a Remedial Investigation Report was submitted to the NJDEP and the RFP does not require one. Should the proposal include one?

Response: The proposal should not include the development of a Remedial Investigation Report.

Was a Remedial Action Work Plan prepared and, if not, should the proposal include one?

Response: The proposal should not include the development of a Remedial Action Work Plan.

Due to the Questions and Answers being posted, the deadline to submit for the RFP for Environmental Services for the three sites has been extended to January 5, 2018.

Please be sure to include a signed Acknowledgment of Receipt of Addenda

SUBMISSION DEADLINE

4:00 PM JANUARY 5, 2018

ADDRESS ALL PROPOSALS IN THE FORM REQUIRED IN THE SPECIFICATIONS AND ONE (1) ORIGINAL AND (4) COPIES MUST BE DELIVERED TO:

EDUARDO J. RODRIGUEZ

Director, Planning & Community Development

50 Winfield Scott Plaza, Room 114

Elizabeth, NJ 07201