

Environmental Advisory Board Respecting Votee Park (EABRVP)

Recommendation of an LSRP to Teaneck's
Council

August 14, 2012

Kenneth R. Hoffman, MD, MPH, Chairperson

What We Did

- First meeting was May 17, 2012.
- Met weekly on May 17,24,31,June 14, 20, 2012.
- Reviewed all data collected by GZA, report from NJDHSS, information from the Delaware Health and Social Service Division of Public Health and Federal Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry.
- These reports all confirmed that there is no health risks to the users of Votee Park.

What We Did (Continued)

- Identified ten (10) potential firms to act as Teaneck's LRSP for Votee Park. No member of the Advisory Board had a conflict of interest with any potential firm.
- Prepared a proposal letter with attachments that was electronically sent to all ten firms.
- All ten firms responded: three (3) with proposals and seven (7) with "thanks but no thanks." Primary reason for refusal was those firms were too busy to take on a new project.

Selection of LSRP finalists

- Two firms sent us detailed proposals:
 - Langan Engineering and Environmental Services
 - JM Sorge, Inc
- Additional information was requested and provided by both firms.
- Both firms were invited to have interviews with our Advisory Board via telecommunications.

Individual Interview Process

- At our July 18 EABRVP meeting we developed questions to be asked of both firms. These were refined and agreed upon by all before our meeting.
- The two separate interviews were held on Friday afternoon, July 27.
- All board members participating in the process.

Similarities Between the Two Firms

- Langan: represented by Mr. Brian Blum and Dr. Jorge Berkowitz, both permanent LSRPs.
- Sorge: represented by Mr. Joseph Sorge and two staff members. Mr. Sorge and one of the staff members are permanent LSRPs.
- Both firms are fully compliant with Teaneck's "Pay for Play" rules.
- Both firms felt that the hot spot of lead should be removed. There would need to be a better delineation of the spot before its "resection."

Similarities Between the Two Firms (Continued)

- Both felt that a “Deed Restriction Notice” was mandatory.
- Both felt that the Park’s elevated levels of Poly Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH) should simply be evaluated as Historic Fill. This makes the evaluation and remediation plan easier to understand and, therefore, get faster regulatory approval.
- Both felt that the soccer field construction should be addressed first allowing for construction to begin in November.
- Both felt that this would still allow site-wide averaging and use the benefits of the soccer fields cover and turf.
- The major issue of concern is the northern half of Votee where the baseball fields are located.

Similarities Between the Two Firms (Continued)

- Both firms felt that the NJDHSS letter explicitly stating that there was no health risks to the population using Votee Park was “golden” and was a keystone to their proposals on how to get Votee Park remediated and approved by NJDEP.
- Both felt that a statement that the groundwater from Votee would not be used as well water would be required.
- Sorge was confident that this certification note would satisfy the DEP regulations on this point.

Similarities Between the Two Firms

- Both firms believed that the entire process would take between 16 and 20 weeks.
- Both firms projected that the entire cost of remediation would be much less than \$100,000.
- To reemphasize, both firms felt that NJDEP Green Acres office would not be a roadblock to the remediation of Votee Park and that the synthetic turf field construction could begin in November.
- Both thought that that the soil in this location could be safely reused without any regulatory or health issue.

Similarities Between the Two Firms

- Based on their preliminary review of the data, both firms felt that the information analyzed by the two labs used by GZA would be acceptable. These two laboratories are also used by Langan and Sorge.
- Preliminarily, except for outlining the area of contamination of lead, both firms felt that no further data points were needed.

Differences Between the Two Firms: Langan

- Langan proposed that Turf Management be used to bring the [PAH] concentrations in the northern half of Votee Park under NJ DEP's maximum levels.
- This approach would require a yearly inspection by a LSRP to approve the Park's fields and would mandate seasonal upkeep of top soil, grass and clay. The most important part of turf management is a grass cover.
- The cost of maintaining this cover is unknown but it is a lifetime requirement and was viewed by the EABRVP members as a significant DPW and financial burden for the Township.

Differences Between The Two Firms: Sorge

- Sorge proposes a remediation plan that would be accomplished by statistical averaging using a standard hexagonal approach.
- If any hot spot was unable to be averaged out then that area would be selectively removed. Very few areas, if any at all, are expected to need this procedure.
- Once remediation is successfully accomplished in this way there would be no further cost to the Township.
- Sorge plans on using multiple lines of regulatory compliance to better assure NJDEP approval.

Follow-Up After Our Discussions

- Both Langan and Sorge were very impressed by how thorough we were in our knowledge and questioning of techniques to fix Votee Park
- Both Langan and Sorge were asked to provide additional information to support some of their answers and did so.
- On top of this, Sorge sent multiple e-mails detailing the key NJDEP regulations and statistical outlines that they would be using to evaluate our collected data and make the remediation plan for NJDEP

Decision by EABRVP

- On August 2, the EABRVP met to discuss our thoughts and to make its recommendation to Council.
- Besides the points previously mentioned, the EABRVP board members felt that Sorge were better public communicators and would work more closely in partnership with the Advisory Board and Township professional staff.
- Therefore, the EABRVP members unanimously recommend that JM Sorge Inc be selected as Teaneck's LSRP for Votee Park.

Decision by EABRVP

- Letters were electronically sent out to Langan, and, the applicant firm not interviewed, Environmental Waste Management Associates (EWMA), letting them know that we would be recommending another firm.
- Letter was also electronically sent to GZA letting the firm know that another firm was recommended to be Teaneck's LSRP for Votee Park
- Letter was sent to JM Sorge letting the firm know that the EABRVP would be recommending their firm to Council

EABRVP

- The nine members of the board worked diligently to get this correctly done ASAP. Members remotely participated when on vacation, business trips and caught in traffic.
- All communications from the board were approved by all members before being sent out under the signature of the Chairperson.
- The members of the EABRVP have my gratitude of a job well done but we are not done yet!
- Once contracted, the members of the EABRVP are all looking forward to working closely with the selected LSRP.