

## **New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection**Site Remediation Program

## REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION REPORT FORM

Date Stamp (For Department use only)

SECTION A. SITE						
	(, <b>A</b> l.,					
	Program Interest (PI) Number(s):					
	ase Tracking Number(s) for this submission:					
	This form must be attached to the Cover/Certification Form					
SE	ECTION B. SCOPE OF THE REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION REPORT					
1.	Does the Remedial Investigation address:					
	Area(s) of Concern (AOCs) Only					
	☐ Entire Site (based on a completed and submitted Preliminary Assessment/Site Investigation)					
2.	Total number of contaminated AOCs associated with the case:					
3.	Total number of contaminated AOCs addressed in this submittal:					
4.	Is the Remedial Investigation complete for the contaminated AOCs addressed in this submittal?	☐ No				
5.	Is the Remedial Investigation complete for all AOCs associated with this case?	☐ No				
	If "Yes," provide date:					
W	hen answering the remaining questions on this form consider only the AOCs addressed in this submissi	on.				
SE	ECTION C. GENERAL					
1.	Are you proposing an alternative remediation standard pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:26D-7.4, alternate vapor intrusion screening level, or ecological site specific goal?	□No				
	If "Yes," attach the Alternative Remediation Standard and/or Screening Level Application Form as an addendum.					
2.	Was a site-specific screening level developed for the evaluation of the VI pathway? ☐ Yes	☐ No				
3.	Has/will the remediation vary from the Technical Rules?	☐ No				
	If "Yes." provide the citation(s) from which the remediation has/will vary and the page(s) in the attached document where the rationale for the variance is provided.					
	N.J.A.C. 7:26E Page					
	N.J.A.C. 7:26E Page					
	N.J.A.C. 7:26E Page					
4.	Were the laboratory reporting minimum detection limits below applicable remediation standards/ screening levels required for the site?	☐ No				
5.	Have past deficiencies/notice of deficiencies been addressed in this submittal?	□No				
SE	ECTION D. SITE CONDITIONS					
1.	Is any radiological contamination currently present at the AOCs addressed in this submission?	☐ No				
2.	At any time, did any of the AOCs addressed in this submission contain Ordnance and Explosives/ Unexploded Ordnance (OE/UXO)?	□No				
3.	Is free product present?	□No				

4.	Has dioxin been detected at levels above NJDE of 50 ppt dioxin TEQ (TCDD Toxicity Equivalen this submission?	ce Quotient) in a	ny AOCs address	sed in	Yes	□No
5.	5. Have any of the following contaminants <i>ever</i> be ecological screening levels at the AOCs address				Yes	☐ No
	If "Yes," check all that apply:					
	☐ Arsenic ☐ Dioxin ☐ Mercury	☐ PCBs	☐ Pesticide	es		
6.		<del></del>	— discharge to surfa	ace water?	Yes	□No
7.	7. Did contaminants from the AOCs addressed in Sensitive Natural Resource (ESNR)?	this submission o	discharge to an E	nvironmentally	Yes	□No
8.	8. Are any of the following conditions currently pre-	sent? <i>(check all</i> :	that apply)			
	Ground water:		Soil:			
	<ul> <li>☐ Contaminated ground water in the overburde</li> <li>☐ Contaminated ground water in a confined aquite</li> <li>☐ Contaminated ground water in the bedrock at</li> <li>☐ Contaminated ground water in multiple aquife</li> <li>☐ Multiple distinct ground water plumes</li> <li>☐ Contaminated ground water migrating off-site</li> <li>☐ Natural background ground water contaminate</li> <li>☐ Contaminated ground water discharging to sue the Environmentally Sensitive Natural Resource</li> <li>☐ Residual or free product</li> <li>☐ Radionuclides</li> </ul>	uifer quifer er units tion urface water or	Chromate C Munitions a Contaminat Historic pes Residual or Radionuclic Historic Fill Natural bac Water Clea	Chemical Product and explosives are soil in the sticide impacts free product des ekground only a nup Criteria ekground above	aturated zone	OPR  Ground
	SECTION E. APPLICABLE REMEDIATION STAN  1. Were Default Remediation Standards used for a (If "Yes," check all that apply)  Direct Contact Impact to Ground Water Soil Screening L	II contaminants?	☐ Soil contarr	n Standards nination in an E		□No
1.	SECTION E. APPLICABLE REMEDIATION STAN  1. Were Default Remediation Standards used for a (If "Yes," check all that apply)  Direct Contact  Impact to Ground Water Soil Screening L  Ecological Screening Levels	Il contaminants? .evels	☐ Soil contam	nination in an E		□No
1.	SECTION E. APPLICABLE REMEDIATION STAN  1. Were Default Remediation Standards used for a (If "Yes," check all that apply)  Direct Contact  Impact to Ground Water Soil Screening L  Ecological Screening Levels  2. Has compliance averaging been utilized to deter Remediation Standards?	Il contaminants? .evels .mine compliance	Soil contam	nination in an E	Yes	□ No
1.	SECTION E. APPLICABLE REMEDIATION STAN  1. Were Default Remediation Standards used for a (If "Yes," check all that apply)  Direct Contact  Impact to Ground Water Soil Screening Lecological Screening Levels  2. Has compliance averaging been utilized to determine the second standard standard standards are second standards.	Il contaminants? evels mine compliance	Soil contam	nination in an E	Yes	
1.	SECTION E. APPLICABLE REMEDIATION STAN  1. Were Default Remediation Standards used for a (If "Yes," check all that apply)  Direct Contact  Impact to Ground Water Soil Screening Lecological Screening Levels  2. Has compliance averaging been utilized to deter Remediation Standards?	Il contaminants? evels mine compliance Comp	Soil contame	g Method Utili	Yes	
1.	SECTION E. APPLICABLE REMEDIATION STAN  1. Were Default Remediation Standards used for a (If "Yes," check all that apply)  Direct Contact  Impact to Ground Water Soil Screening Lecological Screening Levels  2. Has compliance averaging been utilized to deter Remediation Standards?	Il contaminants? evels mine compliance Comp	Soil contam	nination in an E	Yes	□No
1.	SECTION E. APPLICABLE REMEDIATION STAN  1. Were Default Remediation Standards used for a (If "Yes," check all that apply)  Direct Contact  Impact to Ground Water Soil Screening Lecological Screening Levels  2. Has compliance averaging been utilized to deter Remediation Standards?	Il contaminants?  evels  mine compliance  Comp	Soil contame	g <b>Method Utili</b> Spatially Weighted	Yes Yes zed 75 Percent/	□No
1.	SECTION E. APPLICABLE REMEDIATION STAN  1. Were Default Remediation Standards used for a (If "Yes," check all that apply)  Direct Contact  Impact to Ground Water Soil Screening Lecological Screening Levels  2. Has compliance averaging been utilized to deter Remediation Standards?	Il contaminants?  evels  mine compliance  Comp	Soil contame	g <b>Method Utili</b> Spatially Weighted	Yes Yes zed 75 Percent/	□No
1.	SECTION E. APPLICABLE REMEDIATION STAN  1. Were Default Remediation Standards used for a (If "Yes," check all that apply)  Direct Contact  Impact to Ground Water Soil Screening Lecological Screening Levels  2. Has compliance averaging been utilized to deter Remediation Standards?	Il contaminants?  evels  mine compliance  Comp	Soil contame	g <b>Method Utili</b> Spatially Weighted	Yes Yes zed 75 Percent/	□No
1.	SECTION E. APPLICABLE REMEDIATION STAN  1. Were Default Remediation Standards used for a (If "Yes," check all that apply)  Direct Contact  Impact to Ground Water Soil Screening Lecological Screening Levels  2. Has compliance averaging been utilized to deter Remediation Standards?	evels  Comp  Arithmetic Mean  In the compliance of the compliance	Soil contame	g Method Utili Spatially Weighted Average	Yes  Yes  zed  75 Percent/ 10X Procedure	□No
1. 2. 3.	SECTION E. APPLICABLE REMEDIATION STAN  1. Were Default Remediation Standards used for a (If "Yes," check all that apply)  Direct Contact  Impact to Ground Water Soil Screening Lecological Screening Levels  2. Has compliance averaging been utilized to deter Remediation Standards?	Levels  Comp  Arithmetic Mean  In the compliance of the compliance	e with the Soil  Soil contame  e with the Soil  Soliance Averaging  95 Percent  UCL  D  D  with the Impact to	g Method Utili Spatially Weighted Average	Yes  zed  75 Percent/ 10X Procedure	□ No
<ol> <li>3.</li> <li>4.</li> </ol>	SECTION E. APPLICABLE REMEDIATION STAN  1. Were Default Remediation Standards used for a (If "Yes," check all that apply)  Direct Contact  Impact to Ground Water Soil Screening Lecological Screening Levels  2. Has compliance averaging been utilized to deter Remediation Standards?	Levels  Comp  Arithmetic Mean  Indicate tiles red from dischard where a standa	e with the Soil  cliance Averaging  95 Percent  UCL  with the Impact to	g Method Utili Spatially Weighted Average	Yes  Yes  Zed  75 Percent/ 10X Procedure	□ No

7.	. Were Site Specific Standards used for the Impact to Ground Water Pathway?	No
	☐ Soil-Water Partitioning Equation ☐ SPLP ☐ Sesoil ☐ Sesoil/AT123D ☐ DAF Modification	
8.	. Were Site Specific Ecological Remediation Goals used?	No
9.	. What is the ground water classification for this site as per N.J.A.C. 7:9C? (check all that apply)	
	☐ Class I-A	
	☐ Class II-A ☐ Class III-A	
	☐ Class I-PL Pinelands Preservation Area ☐ Class III-B	
SE	ECTION F. BACKGROUND CONDITIONS	
Di	old the RI demonstrate via a background investigation, outside the influence of on-site AOCs <b>and</b> operational areas, the	at:
	. All or any part of the ground water contamination is migrating onto this site per	N I A
	N.J.A.C. 7:26E-3.9?	
	. Soil contamination is naturally occurring per N.J.A.C. 7:26E-3.8 Yes No	INA
SE	SECTION G. HISTORIC FILL	
1.	. Is Historic Fill present at the site?	No
	If "Yes":	
	a). What is the evidence that Historic Fill is present?	
	b). Are any other AOCs co-located within the Historic Fill? Yes	No
	If "Yes," have the same contaminant types (e.g. lead arsenic, etc.) characterized as	INO
	being present in the Historic Fill been sampled for as contaminants of concern at these	
	co-located AOCs?	No
2.	. Was the historic fill characterized pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:26E-4.7 and the NJDEP Historic Fill  Material Technical Guidance Document?	No
<u> </u>	ECCTION II. COOLIND WATER TRICCER	
	SECTION H. GROUND WATER TRIGGER	
1.	. Was a ground water investigation conducted at all AOCs where a ground water investigation was triggered pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:26E-3.5 and 4.3?	NA
2.		No
-	ECCTION I. CROUND WATER REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION INFORMATION	
	SECTION I. GROUND WATER REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION INFORMATION	NI.
1.	. Are contaminants present with a specific gravity less than that of water?	No
	a. If "Yes," were any monitor wells installed in unconfined aquifers in which the water table is higher than the top of the well screen?	No
	If "Yes" to 1a, identify the affected wells.	
2.	. Are contaminants present with a specific gravity greater than that of water?	No
	a. If "Yes," were multiple depth discrete ground water samples collected in a vertical profile	
	at each ground water sampling location where dense contaminants were suspected? Yes	No
3.	. Is ground water in the bedrock aquifer contaminated?	No
	If "Yes," answer questions 3a and 3b.	
	a. Were bedrock cores collected?	No
	b. Were geophysical logging methods conducted to characterize the bedrock aquifer	
	· , , — —	No
4	Is contamination in ground water fully delineated?	No

SE	CTION J. ECOLOGICAL RECEPTORS
1.	Have soil, sediment, and/or surface water data been collected from Environmentally Sensitive Natural Resources (ESNR)?
	a. If "Yes," do contaminant concentrations at the ESNR exceed ecological screening criteria or the aquatic chronic NJSWQS [N.J.A.C.7:9B]?
	b. If "Yes," have soil and sediment data been collected from both surface and subsurface intervals in the ESNR?
	c. If "No" for 1b, provide explanation
2.	Have contaminant migration pathways from the site/AOC to the ESNR been identified?
3.	Do the results of the Ecological Evaluation require a remedial investigation of ecological receptors?
	If "No," provide explanation
4.	Has an Ecological Risk Assessment been conducted [N.J.A.C.7:26E-4.8]? Yes No
5.	Is remediation required in an ESNR? Yes No
SE	CTION K. MISCELLANEOUS
1.	Were any regulated USTs identified during the course of the RI that were not previously known? Yes
	If "Yes," list tank size, contents and registration number(s):
	a. If "Yes," and if these USTs were Federally Regulated, was the source/cause of release identified on a Confirmed Discharge Notification form?
	If "No," to 1.a., complete and submit a revised Confirmed Discharge Notification form.
2.	Were additional Areas of Concern identified during the RI?
	If "Yes," identify AOC(s):
3.	Identify Remedial Measures (RMs) conducted during the RI (check all that apply):
0.	☐ Soil excavation ☐ UST closure
	☐ Potable water supply treatment or replacement ☐ Free product recovery
	☐ Hydraulic containment of source area ☐ Vapor intrusion mitigation
	☐ Soil vapor extraction ☐ No RMs were conducted during the RI
	☐ Enhanced fluid recovery (EFR) ☐ Other(s), specify:
4.	Has new information (material facts, data or other information) been generated during the RI that corrects or contradicts information, or changes conclusions from, previously submitted reports or information? — Yes No
	If "Yes," explain:

SECTION L. LABORATORY DATA					
1.	Were all data submitted in the appropriate full and/or reduced formats according to the deliverables defined in N.J.A.C. 7:26E-2?	. 🗌 Yes	□No		
2.	Do all data submitted meet the quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) requirements incorporated by reference in N.J.A.C. 7:26E-2 for:				
	sampling	. 🗌 Yes	☐ No		
	analysis	.∐ Yes	☐ No		
3.	How was it determined that the data complied with the QA/QC requirements?  Laboratory non-conformance summary/narrative  Laboratory correspondence  LSRP review  Independent contractor review  Other:	-			
4.	Has any data been qualified and used?	.∐ Yes	☐ No		
5.	Has any data been rejected and used?	. 🗌 Yes	☐ No		
6.	Provide the page number for the "Reliability of Data" section of the report:				