Remedial Investigation Report #2
with Proposed Remedial Investigation/Action
Former SGA Facility
8 Lion Gate Drive
Bloomfield Borough, Essex County, New Jersey
NJDEP Case No.: 930607SP01
EWMA Project No. 200261

depth of 3.5-4' bsg.

Each boring was advanced to a depth of 4' bsg. No evidence of visual discoloration was noted; nor were any elevated PID readings detected. Ground water was not encountered in any of the samples.

As requested and approved by the NJDEP in their letter of March 21, 2005, the samples were analyzed for arsenic, copper, lead, mercury, zinc, asbestos and formaldehyde.

The analytical results are summarized in **Table 6**. The IAL analytical data package and haz site disk are included in **Appendix 4**. The EMSL analytical data package is included in **Appendix 5**.

Figure 6 from EWMA's June 2003 Amended Preliminary Assessment Report has been revised to include sample locations AOC20-B1, AOC20-B2 and AOC20-B3, and the corresponding analytical results and has been included in **Appendix 11**. The summary tables for all data points collected to investigate and remediate this AOC are also included in this appendix.

No asbestos or formaldehyde was detected. None of the metal analytes were present at concentrations above the most stringent SCC; therefore, no further action is proposed for this AOC.

AOC 26, Waste Piping: No waste piping had previously been identified at the subject site. However, the NJDEP noted waste piping as an AOC due to the potential for waste piping to exist.

During the investigation of the former concrete pit (AOC 3) on August 16, 2005, a 16" pipe (Pipe 1) was discovered. The invert of the pipe was approximately 10' bsg. An attempt was made to determine the pipe's terminus; however, it was aborted when several additional pipes were discovered. Three additional pipes (Pipes 2, 3 and 4) were discovered. Pipe 2 was associated with the historic fire suppression system. The purpose of Pipes 3 and 4 are not known; however, they were empty.

No elevated PID readings were noted in the soil adjacent to, and beneath, these pipes. No visual evidence of discoloration was noted either.

Limited sampling was conducted to evaluate potential contamination concerns associated with Pipe 1. Two samples (AOC3 Pipe 1-A and Pipe 1-B) were