

Raskin, Morgan

From: Donna Mahon <Donna.Mahon@dep.nj.gov>
Sent: Thursday, August 07, 2014 4:21 PM
To: Raskin, Morgan; Kiser, Jonathan VL
Cc: Lauren Keltos; Shawn Bulger; William Lindner; Cindy Davis; Tonalee Key; Laura Henne; Feldman, Peter; Hartmann, Christine; Key, Chantel; Rock, Kenneth; Barry, Shawna; Lanza, Robert; Sliker, Laura; Shaw, Heather
Subject: RE: UPDATED NEP0226 QA findings

Dear All, see below communication between me and the engineer for NEP0226 project, Bill Stevens. He has confirmed that the PERC test has been performed and that mounding is not required. Therefore, the EPA requirement has been satisfied.

From: Bill Stevens <bstevens@pds-nj.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 07, 2014 3:30 PM
To: Donna Mahon
Subject: RE: Berkeley Township CDBG proposal

Yes, you are correct. The soils work has been done and mounded systems are not required.

Bill
William Stevens, P.E., P.P.

Professional Design Services, LLC

1245 Airport Road, Suite One

Lakewood N.J. 08701

732-363-0060 ext 103

From: Donna Mahon [mailto:Donna.Mahon@dep.nj.gov]
Sent: Thursday, August 07, 2014 11:20 AM
To: Bill Stevens
Subject: RE: Berkeley Township CDBG proposal

Hi Bill- another question for you. We received the official letter from EPA to allow the approval of the project without impacting the sole source aquifer. Their letter specifies that a PERC test is required to determine if a soil mound is required or not.

It is my assumption, but I don't want to make that assumption, that the PERC test is a requirement of any soil survey and design development for a septic field and that this has already been satisfied.

Thanks!

Donna

From: Raskin, Morgan [mailto:mraskin@louisberger.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2014 11:09 AM
To: Kiser, Jonathan VL; Donna Mahon
Cc: Lauren Keltos; Shawn Bulger; William Lindner; Cindy Davis; Tonalee Key; Laura Henne; Feldman, Peter; Hartmann, Christine; Key, Chantel; Rock, Kenneth; Barry, Shawna; Lanza, Robert; Sliker, Laura; Shaw, Heather
Subject: RE: UPDATED NEP0226 QA findings

Donna and Jonathan – we received the attached, official letter from EPA yesterday. We are reviewing it now to assess all that needs to be updated in the ERR based on its receipt and content.

Please advise if you have input about the updates we should make regarding their recommendations.

Thank you!

Morgan Raskin

Senior Environmental Scientist | Geo-Environmental/HazMat Services

Louis Berger | 973.407.1664 | louisberger.com

From: Raskin, Morgan
Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 2014 3:01 PM
To: 'Kiser, Jonathan VL'
Cc: Sliker, Laura
Subject: RE: UPDATED NEP0226 QA findings

Thanks, Jonathan. We'll make these updates and resubmit the ERR package.

Morgan Raskin

Senior Environmental Scientist | Geo-Environmental/HazMat Services

Louis Berger | 973.407.1664 | louisberger.com

From: Kiser, Jonathan VL [mailto:JonathanVL.Kiser@icfi.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 2014 1:42 PM
To: Raskin, Morgan; Sliker, Laura
Cc: Lauren Keltos; Shawn Bulger; William Lindner; Cindy Davis; Donna Mahon; tonalee.key@dep.state.nj.us; laura.henne@dep.state.nj.us; Feldman, Peter; Hartmann, Christine; Key, Chantel; Rock, Kenneth; Barry, Shawna; Lanza, Robert
Subject: UPDATED NEP0226 QA findings
Importance: High

Hi Morgan and Laura,

ICF and DEP have completed our QA re-review of NEP0226. Our determination is that, to move this file forward, the following outstanding updates need to be addressed:

1) Q10. Historic Preservation section. The Compliance Documentation now states: "It should be noted that the acreage and number of lots were incorrectly referenced as 5.78 acres and 36 lots instead of 2.04 acres and 34 lots, respectively."

To be accurate and more precise, please update this language to state: "It should be noted that the acreage and number of lots were incorrectly referenced as 5.78 acres and 34 lots (*See: NEP0226_SHPOResponse*), instead of the actual 2.04 acres and 36 lots, respectively."

2) Part II EA Checklist section - Soil Suitability subsection. The following type language should be added to the subsection narrative:

"It should be noted that the 2014 NRCS Custom Soil Report indicates the area of interest comprises 2.1 acres, which was a value determined from via mapping (See: *NEP0226_NRCSCustomSoilReport_NEP_TO2007.pdf*). The actual acreage of the affected project area is slightly less, at 2.04 acres."

NOTE THAT THE CURRENT FILE NAMING CONVENTION TO THE NRCS CUSTOM SOIL REPORT IN THIS SUBSECTION INACCURATELY INDICATES "TO2006."

3) Surface Water subsection under "Natural Features." Please indicate in this subsection that a Stormwater Discharge Permit for Small Construction from NJDEP must be obtained as a condition for project funding.

Please submit a new version of the complete set of files, including the requested updates, to the Document Library by 8/6/14.

Thanks and let me know if you have any questions.

Best regards,

Jonathan

From: Raskin, Morgan [<mailto:mraskin@louisberger.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 2014 9:54 AM

To: Kiser, Jonathan VL; Sliker, Laura

Cc: Lauren Keltos; Shawn Bulger; William Lindner; Cindy Davis; Donna Mahon; tonalee.key@dep.state.nj.us; laura.henne@dep.state.nj.us; Feldman, Peter; Hartmann, Christine; Key, Chantel; Rock, Kenneth; Barry, Shawna

Subject: RE: UPDATED NEP0226 QA findings

Hi Jonathan,

A revised ERR package for NEP0226 has been uploaded to the document library. A few notes on the changes made:

- The 36 lots are not leftover from a previous project description, but rather a product of the project including former lots that are being combined into six. We have updated the EA form accordingly and added explanatory where helpful to explain discrepancies between the acreages cited in consultation documents and the actual project site area.
- We have added the UWDZ and the Hackensack Meadowlands areas to the Coastal Zone Mgmt map; however, since the site is in the CAFRA zone, it has generally been redundant to include those layers also.

This map has also been zoomed out to show the boundary of the CAFRA zone. The MHWL buffer does not show at this scale, but we changed the settings so that it is displayed.

- References and the back-up documentation regarding the July 2014 custom soil report have been added where applicable
- The two sections with mitigation measures and conditions have been updated to include the archaeological standard treatment and to more closely correspond with each other.

Please let me know if you have any questions and if there are further revisions to be made.

Thank you!

Morgan Raskin

Senior Environmental Scientist | Geo-Environmental/HazMat Services

Louis Berger | 973.407.1664 | louisberger.com

From: Kiser, Jonathan VL [<mailto:JonathanVL.Kiser@icfi.com>]

Sent: Thursday, July 31, 2014 4:47 PM

To: Raskin, Morgan; Sliker, Laura

Cc: Lauren Keltos; Shawn Bulger; William Lindner; Cindy Davis; Donna Mahon; tonalee.key@dep.state.nj.us; laura.henne@dep.state.nj.us; Feldman, Peter; Hartmann, Christine; Key, Chantel; Rock, Kenneth; Barry, Shawna

Subject: UPDATED NEP0226 QA findings

Morgan and Laura,

Here is a comment just received from Donna:

“All, I am confused on why this indicates 36 parcels in the description – that was the previous project. This project includes construction of six three-bedroom single family, one story structures of 1,200 to 1,500 sq. feet on vacant lots with parking adjacent to each home at Pierce’s Woods in Berkeley Township, Ocean County. So, definitely, they have listed the previous project in the description versus the actual project.”

From Donna’s observation, with confirmation from Cindy, it is clear that the Project Location described in the EA (and shown immediately below), was left over from a previous project and does not apply to NEP0226. Please remove all inaccurate language relating to this issue throughout the EA, including from the SHPO document, and update the file to reflect the six vacant lots.

Thanks and let me know if you have any questions.

Jonathan

Project Location: “Pierce’s Woods” end of Nolan Ave (Street Address)

Berkeley Township (Municipality) Ocean (County) NJ (State)

573 (Block) 34-44 (Lot)

573 (Block) 24-29 (Lot)

573 (Block) 9 (Lot)

569 (Block) 1-12 (Lot)

569 (Block) 15-19 (Lot)

569 (Block) 32 (Lot)

From: Kiser, Jonathan VL
Sent: Thursday, July 31, 2014 4:22 PM
To: Raskin, Morgan; Sliker, Laura
Cc: Lauren Keltos; Shawn Bulger; William Lindner; Cindy Davis; Donna Mahon; tonalee.key@dep.state.nj.us;
laura.henne@dep.state.nj.us; Feldman, Peter; Hartmann, Christine; Key, Chantel; Rock, Kenneth; Barry, Shawna
Subject: NEP0226 QA findings

Hi Morgan and Laura,

ICF and DEP have completed our QA review of NEP0226. Our determination is that, to move this file forward, the following updates are needed:

1) EA Description of Proposed Project section. Statement is made that project involves new construction on 6 lots totaling 2.75 acres. This acreage amount is contradicted in a number of places in the file support documentation (e.g., The U.S. Department of Agriculture Farmland Conversion Impact Rating Form – See: NEP0226_AD1006_NEP_TO2007 – indicates 2.1 acres; The Custom Soil Resource Report – See: NEP0226_Soil_Report – indicates 2.1 acres; and The SHPO Response – See: NEP0226_SHPO Response - indicates 5.78 acres. Please confirm which is the accurate acreage number, make the appropriate adjustment(s) throughout the EA, and make the appropriate clarifying statement(s) in all appropriate EA Compliance Documentation section(s) regarding any misstated acreage amounts. The exact acreage needs to be consistent throughout the document.

2) Q3. Coastal Zone Management section. The map provided (NEP0226_CoastalZoneManagementActMapCAFRA) does not reflect all three layers of interest (CAFRA, Upland Waterfront Development, and Hackensack Meadowlands), in addition to the MHWL layer provided. It would also be helpful to zoom out so the boundaries can be seen. Please provide a new map.

3) Q4. Contamination & Toxic Substances section. Even though the project involves new construction on wooded lots, it would be helpful to indicate that Lead-Based Paint and Asbestos were therefore not a concern in the Compliance Documentation section. In addition, please remove the language “The parcel may be within a hazardous waste facility” since this is not the case.

4) Q5. Endangered Species section. The consultation final determination email - See: NEP0226_FWSFinalDetermination_NEP_TO2007 – refers to the clearing of 2 acres, compared to the EA Project Description. See Comment #1 above. In addition, depending on the new details added to the Project Description, it may be necessary to get a new determination if the acreage amount increases. Please address this appropriately in the Compliance Documentation section.

5) Q10. Historic Preservation section. The number of parcels adds up to 36 and the description listed on the SHPO response states 34 parcels as well as the 5.78 acres. The number of parcels we counted adds up to 36. Please clarify this discrepancy and address in the Compliance Documentation section. In addition, please make reference to the supporting documentation like is done in other sections (e.g., See data in Supporting Documentation Folder titled XXX). Finally, moving forward, make sure that SHPO support documentation does not refer to RREM for NEP applications.

6) Q12. Sole Source Aquifers section. Initially the proposed project was to include private groundwater wells for drinking water supply (Louis Berger letter to USEPA May 1, 2014). Berkeley Township required that the proposed project be connected to the Township public water supply system as a condition of approval. The July 11 2014 letter from Michele Nugent, Executive Director, Berkeley Township, to Donna Mahon NJDEP indicating that the proposed project is eligible to and required to connect to the Township public utility water service was not included in the project folder.

Reviewer (Robert Lanza) uploaded the PDF File to the project folder 07-29-2014. Please make sure this file is included in all future uploads and referenced in the Compliance Documentation section. In addition, the July 2 2014 soil report indicates that the area of interest is 2.1 acres, while the proposed project description in the EA indicates that the proposed project is 2.75 acres. See Comment #1 above. In addition, please make reference to the supporting documentation like is done in other sections (e.g., See data in Supporting Documentation Folder titled XXX).

7) Part II EA Checklist section - Soil Suitability subsection. The soil certification letter dated June 27, 2013 referred to in the Part II Summary is not included in the project folder. Please provide and verify that the soil certification letter conforms to the July 2, 2014 Custom Soil Survey report that is included in the project folder. Note that the Custom Soil Survey Report identifies WobB Woodmansie sand as one of the three soil types in the area of interest rather than AtsA: Atison sand noted in the Soil Suitability subsection summary. The summary should be updated to reference the findings of the Custom Soil Report and other analyses conducted in 2014. The USDA Soil Survey document referenced in the Soil Suitability summary is also not included in the project folder. Please provide.

8) Waste Water/Sanitary Sewers subsection. The summary should also reference the July 2, 2014 Custom Soil Report and other analyses conducted in 2014. Also, the referenced USDA Soil Survey is not included in the project folder. Please provide.

9) Cultural Facilities subsection. The specific mitigation required for cultural resources should be referenced in the summary.

10) Water Resources and Surface Water subsections under "Natural Features." These subsections should reference the storm water management requirements and public water connection requirements that are included in the previous summary sections.

11) Vegetation and Wildlife subsection. This subsection should reference the finding by the consultation final determination letter that no mitigation is required for the listed bat.

12) Conditions for Approval and Summary of Findings and Conclusions sections.

Make sure the specified conditions for approval and required mitigation and project modifications appropriately match in both EA locations. Also include the required mitigation for historic preservation (fees per site).

Please submit a new version of the complete set of files, including the requested updates, to the Document Library by 8/4/14.

Thanks and let me know if you have any questions.

Best regards,

Jonathan

This message, including any attachments hereto, may contain privileged and/or confidential information and is intended solely for the attention and use of the intended addressee(s). If you are not the intended addressee, you may neither use, copy, nor deliver to anyone this message or any of its attachments. In such case, you should immediately destroy this message and its attachments and kindly notify the sender by reply mail. Unless made by a person with actual authority conferred by Louis Berger, the information and statements herein do not constitute a binding commitment or warranty by Louis Berger. Louis Berger assumes no responsibility for any misperceptions, errors or misunderstandings. You are urged to verify any information that is confusing and report any errors/concerns to us in writing.