

From: @.
To: @.; @...
Subject: NJDEP A310 Incident Notification - Communication Center ID:22-10-04-1149-48 (Medford Twp / Burlington County)
Date: Wednesday, October 5, 2022 5:53:54 AM
Attachments: [0_C01229931_32426769.pdf](#)

SUSPECTED HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE DISCHARGE NOTIFICATION:
NJDEP INCIDENT NOTIFICATION NUMBER: 22-10-04-1149-48

The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection has received notification of an incident that may have resulted in a discharge of a hazardous substance within your jurisdiction.

Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 13.1K-15 et seq., (P.L. 1984, c 210) "Hazardous Substance Discharge - Reports and Notices Act" and N.J.A.C. 7:1E-5.1 et seq., Hazardous Substance Discharge: Reports Notices, attached to this email is a copy of our Incident Notification Form which contains details of the suspected discharge.

Further information concerning this incident may be obtained by reviewing attached Notification Letter and Incident Report.

From: [Marc Selover](#)
To: [Robertson, Paige \[DEP\]](#)
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Reporting Question - PI 991749, 17 North Main St, Medford Twp
Date: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 5:39:42 PM

thanks

On Wed, Sep 21, 2022 at 5:10 PM Robertson, Paige [DEP] <[xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xx](#)> wrote:

Hi Marc,

Yes, that is correct. You will create an RAO that includes the number you already called in and get a new number that you will add to the OSS notice in the RAO, that we send to the RST group.

Thanks

Paige

From: Marc Selover <[xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xx](#)>
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 4:30 PM
To: Robertson, Paige [DEP] <[xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xx](#)>
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Reporting Question - PI 991749, 17 North Main St, Medford Twp

Thanks. We will complete and issue a RAO-E.

Since there is an existing incident # due to the contamination detected at the property boundary and there are no on-site discharges, do we need to call the communications center to report the OSS and get a new number?

On Wed, Sep 21, 2022 at 3:26 PM Robertson, Paige [DEP] <[xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xx](#)> wrote:

Hi Marc

At a quick glance, I will think that a well upgradient would be needed in making this determination.

That being said, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:26E-3.9, a background investigation and preliminary assessment is required to determine an OSS. The OSS notice also states that a background investigation and PA have been performed.

Thanks

Paige

From: Marc Selover <xxxxxxxx@xxxxx.xx>
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 3:03 PM
To: Robertson, Paige [DEP] <xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.x>
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Reporting Question - PI 991749, 17 North Main St, Medford Twp

A Phase I ESA was completed by the contract purchaser. We are working for the current owner (Medford Township) and we weren't planning to certify their Phase I as a PA.

There is no on-site GW or soil contamination.

Benzene & xylenes > Class IIA

others > Class IA (in Pinelands)

We completed a RE. No wells with 500' downgradient or sidegradient of the plume.

On Wed, Sep 21, 2022 at 2:48 PM Robertson, Paige [DEP]

<xxxxx.xxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xx> wrote:

Hi Marc

Be sure that a PA has been submitted already. This is an SI report submittal. Did you call in a new number for the GW OSS claim? You can call the AOC GW OSS sampling or the like. Also, you said below that the results are below VI, are they above GWQS? Is there GW contamination from on-site source also?

Thanks

Paige

From: Marc Selover <xxxxxxx@xxxxx.xx>

Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 2:36 PM

To: Robertson, Paige [DEP] <xxxxx.xxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xx>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Reporting Question - PI 991749, 17 North Main St, Medford Twp

Paige,

As part of a due diligence investigation, we collected groundwater samples from Temporary Wells at the property boundary due to a potential source on the adjacent property (former gas station).

Gasoline constituents (BTEX) and potential heating oil or diesel constituents (naphthalene / 2-methylnaphthalene) were detected and the Department was notified. (Below VI screening levels),

We have completed a geophysical investigation, installed and sampled additional

temporary wells on our clients property, and evaluated the direction of groundwater flow. We have determined that the source of the groundwater contamination is offsite and we plan to issue a ROA-A based on this determination.

Should the report be a SIR or a RIR ?

What should we call the AOC ?

--

Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG

Project Manager / Partner



Direct 856-840-4479 Cell 856-906-7245

--

Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG

Project Manager / Partner



Direct 856-840-4479 Cell 856-906-7245

|

--

Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG

Project Manager / Partner



Direct 856-840-4479 Cell 856-906-7245

--

Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG

Project Manager / Partner



Direct 856-840-4479 Cell 856-906-7245

From: [Robertson, Paige \[DEP\]](#)
To: [Marc Selover](#)
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Reporting Question - PI 991749, 17 North Main St, Medford Twp
Date: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 5:10:00 PM

Hi Marc,

Yes, that is correct. You will create an RAO that includes the number you already called in and get a new number that you will add to the OSS notice in the RAO, that we send to the RST group.

Thanks
Paige

From: Marc Selover <xxxxxxx@xxxx.xxx>
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 4:30 PM
To: Robertson, Paige [DEP] <xxxxx.xxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xxx>
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Reporting Question - PI 991749, 17 North Main St, Medford Twp

Thanks. We will complete and issue a RAO-E.

Since there is an existing incident # due to the contamination detected at the property boundary and there are no on-site discharges, do we need to call the communications center to report the OSS and get a new number?

On Wed, Sep 21, 2022 at 3:26 PM Robertson, Paige [DEP] <[xxxxx.xxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xxx](#)> wrote:

Hi Marc

At a quick glance, I will think that a well upgradient would be needed in making this determination.

That being said, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:26E-3.9, a background investigation and preliminary assessment is required to determine an OSS. The OSS notice also states that a background investigation and PA have been performed.

Thanks
Paige

From: Marc Selover <[xxxxxxx@xxxx.xxx](#)>
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 3:03 PM
To: Robertson, Paige [DEP] <[xxxxx.xxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xxx](#)>
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Reporting Question - PI 991749, 17 North Main St, Medford Twp

A Phase I ESA was completed by the contract purchaser. We are working for the current owner (Medford Township) and we weren't planning to certify their Phase I as a PA.

There is no on-site GW or soil contamination.

Benzene & xylenes > Class IIA
others > Class IA (in Pinelands)

We completed a RE. No wells with 500' downgradient or sidegradient of the plume.

On Wed, Sep 21, 2022 at 2:48 PM Robertson, Paige [DEP] <xxxxx.xxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xxx> wrote:

Hi Marc

Be sure that a PA has been submitted already. This is an SI report submittal. Did you call in a new number for the GW OSS claim? You can call the AOC GW OSS sampling or the like. Also, you said below that the results are below VI, are they above GWQS? Is there GW contamination from on-site source also?

Thanks
Paige

From: Marc Selover <xxxxxxx@xxxxx.xxx>

Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 2:36 PM

To: Robertson, Paige [DEP] <xxxxx.xxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xxx>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Reporting Question - PI 991749, 17 North Main St, Medford Twp

Paige,

As part of a due diligence investigation, we collected groundwater samples from Temporary Wells at the property boundary due to a potential source on the adjacent property (former gas station).

Gasoline constituents (BTEX) and potential heating oil or diesel constituents (naphthalene / 2-methylnaphthalene) were detected and the Department was notified. (Below VI screening levels),

We have completed a geophysical investigation, installed and sampled additional temporary wells on our clients property, and evaluated the direction of groundwater flow. We have determined that the source of the groundwater contamination is offsite and we plan to issue a ROA-A based on this determination.

Should the report be a SIR or a RIR ?

What should we call the AOC ?

--

Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG
Project Manager / Partner



Direct 856-840-4479 Cell 856-906-7245

--

Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG
Project Manager / Partner



Direct 856-840-4479 Cell 856-906-7245

--

Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG
Project Manager / Partner



Direct 856-840-4479 Cell 856-906-7245

From: [Marc Selover](#)
To: [Robertson, Paige \[DEP\]](#)
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Reporting Question - PI 991749, 17 North Main St, Medford Twp
Date: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 4:30:33 PM

Thanks. We will complete and issue a RAO-E.

Since there is an existing incident # due to the contamination detected at the property boundary and there are no on-site discharges, do we need to call the communications center to report the OSS and get a new number?

On Wed, Sep 21, 2022 at 3:26 PM Robertson, Paige [DEP] <[xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xx](#)> wrote:

Hi Marc

At a quick glance, I will think that a well upgradient would be needed in making this determination.

That being said, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:26E-3.9, a background investigation and preliminary assessment is required to determine an OSS. The OSS notice also states that a background investigation and PA have been performed.

Thanks

Paige

From: Marc Selover <[xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xx](#)>
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 3:03 PM
To: Robertson, Paige [DEP] <[xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xx](#)>
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Reporting Question - PI 991749, 17 North Main St, Medford Twp

A Phase I ESA was completed by the contract purchaser. We are working for the current owner (Medford Township) and we weren't planning to certify their Phase I as a PA.

There is no on-site GW or soil contamination.

Benzene & xylenes > Class IIA

others > Class IA (in Pinelands)

We completed a RE. No wells with 500' downgradient or sidegradient of the plume.

On Wed, Sep 21, 2022 at 2:48 PM Robertson, Paige [DEP] <xxxxx.xxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xx> wrote:

Hi Marc

Be sure that a PA has been submitted already. This is an SI report submittal. Did you call in a new number for the GW OSS claim? You can call the AOC GW OSS sampling or the like. Also, you said below that the results are below VI, are they above GWQS? Is there GW contamination from on-site source also?

Thanks

Paige

From: Marc Selover <xxxxxxx@xxxxx.xx>
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 2:36 PM
To: Robertson, Paige [DEP] <xxxxx.xxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xx>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Reporting Question - PI 991749, 17 North Main St, Medford Twp

Paige,

As part of a due diligence investigation, we collected groundwater samples from Temporary Wells at the property boundary due to a potential source on the adjacent property (former gas station).

Gasoline constituents (BTEX) and potential heating oil or diesel constituents (naphthalene / 2-methylnaphthalene) were detected and the Department was notified. (Below VI screening levels),

We have completed a geophysical investigation, installed and sampled additional temporary wells on our clients property, and evaluated the direction of groundwater flow. We have determined that the source of the groundwater contamination is offsite and we plan to issue a ROA-A based on this determination.

Should the report be a SIR or a RIR ?

What should we call the AOC ?

--

Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG

Project Manager / Partner



Direct 856-840-4479 Cell 856-906-7245

--

Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG

Project Manager / Partner



Direct 856-840-4479 Cell 856-906-7245

--

Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG

Project Manager / Partner



Direct 856-840-4479 Cell 856-906-7245

From: [Robertson, Paige \[DEP\]](#)
To: [Marc Selover](#)
Cc: [Robertson, Paige \[DEP\]](#)
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Reporting Question - PI 991749, 17 North Main St, Medford Twp
Date: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 3:26:15 PM

Hi Marc

At a quick glance, I will think that a well upgradient would be needed in making this determination.

That being said, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:26E-3.9, a background investigation and preliminary assessment is required to determine an OSS. The OSS notice also states that a background investigation and PA have been performed.

Thanks
Paige

From: Marc Selover <xxxxxxx@xxxxx.xxx>
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 3:03 PM
To: Robertson, Paige [DEP] <xxxxx.xxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xxx>
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Reporting Question - PI 991749, 17 North Main St, Medford Twp

A Phase I ESA was completed by the contract purchaser. We are working for the current owner (Medford Township) and we weren't planning to certify their Phase I as a PA.

There is no on-site GW or soil contamination.

Benzene & xylenes > Class IIA
others > Class IA (in Pinelands)

We completed a RE. No wells with 500' downgradient or sidegradient of the plume.

On Wed, Sep 21, 2022 at 2:48 PM Robertson, Paige [DEP] <[xxxxx.xxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xxx](#)> wrote:

Hi Marc

Be sure that a PA has been submitted already. This is an SI report submittal. Did you call in a new number for the GW OSS claim? You can call the AOC GW OSS sampling or the like. Also, you said below that the results are below VI, are they above GWQS? Is there GW contamination from on-site source also?

Thanks

Paige

From: Marc Selover <xxxxxxx@xxxx.xxx>

Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 2:36 PM

To: Robertson, Paige [DEP] <xxxxx.xxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xxx>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Reporting Question - PI 991749, 17 North Main St, Medford Twp

Paige,

As part of a due diligence investigation, we collected groundwater samples from Temporary Wells at the property boundary due to a potential source on the adjacent property (former gas station).

Gasoline constituents (BTEX) and potential heating oil or diesel constituents (naphthalene / 2-methylnaphthalene) were detected and the Department was notified. (Below VI screening levels),

We have completed a geophysical investigation, installed and sampled additional temporary wells on our clients property, and evaluated the direction of groundwater flow. We have determined that the source of the groundwater contamination is offsite and we plan to issue a ROA-A based on this determination.

Should the report be a SIR or a RIR ?

What should we call the AOC ?

--

Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG
Project Manager / Partner



Direct 856-840-4479 Cell 856-906-7245

--

Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG
Project Manager / Partner



Direct 856-840-4479 Cell 856-906-7245

From: [Robertson, Paige \[DEP\]](#)
To: [Marc Selover](#)
Cc: [Robertson, Paige \[DEP\]](#)
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Reporting Question - PI 991749, 17 North Main St, Medford Twp
Date: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 3:26:00 PM

Hi Marc

At a quick glance, I will think that a well upgradient would be needed in making this determination.

That being said, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:26E-3.9, a background investigation and preliminary assessment is required to determine an OSS. The OSS notice also states that a background investigation and PA have been performed.

Thanks
Paige

From: Marc Selover <xxxxxxx@xxxxx.xxx>
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 3:03 PM
To: Robertson, Paige [DEP] <xxxxx.xxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xxx>
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Reporting Question - PI 991749, 17 North Main St, Medford Twp

A Phase I ESA was completed by the contract purchaser. We are working for the current owner (Medford Township) and we weren't planning to certify their Phase I as a PA.

There is no on-site GW or soil contamination.

Benzene & xylenes > Class IIA
others > Class IA (in Pinelands)

We completed a RE. No wells with 500' downgradient or sidegradient of the plume.

On Wed, Sep 21, 2022 at 2:48 PM Robertson, Paige [DEP] <[xxxxx.xxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xxx](#)> wrote:

Hi Marc

Be sure that a PA has been submitted already. This is an SI report submittal. Did you call in a new number for the GW OSS claim? You can call the AOC GW OSS sampling or the like. Also, you said below that the results are below VI, are they above GWQS? Is there GW contamination from on-site source also?

Thanks

Paige

From: Marc Selover <xxxxxxx@xxxx.xxx>

Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 2:36 PM

To: Robertson, Paige [DEP] <xxxxx.xxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xxx>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Reporting Question - PI 991749, 17 North Main St, Medford Twp

Paige,

As part of a due diligence investigation, we collected groundwater samples from Temporary Wells at the property boundary due to a potential source on the adjacent property (former gas station).

Gasoline constituents (BTEX) and potential heating oil or diesel constituents (naphthalene / 2-methylnaphthalene) were detected and the Department was notified. (Below VI screening levels),

We have completed a geophysical investigation, installed and sampled additional temporary wells on our clients property, and evaluated the direction of groundwater flow. We have determined that the source of the groundwater contamination is offsite and we plan to issue a ROA-A based on this determination.

Should the report be a SIR or a RIR ?

What should we call the AOC ?

--

Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG
Project Manager / Partner



Direct 856-840-4479 Cell 856-906-7245

--

Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG
Project Manager / Partner



Direct 856-840-4479 Cell 856-906-7245

From: [Marc Selover](#)
To: [Robertson, Paige \[DEP\]](#)
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Reporting Question - PI 991749, 17 North Main St, Medford Twp
Date: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 3:04:09 PM
Attachments: [Groundwater Results Map2.pdf](#)
[GW Flow Map.pdf](#)

A Phase I ESA was completed by the contract purchaser. We are working for the current owner (Medford Township) and we weren't planning to certify their Phase I as a PA.

There is no on-site GW or soil contamination.

Benzene & xylenes > Class IIA
others > Class IA (in Pinelands)

We completed a RE. No wells with 500' downgradient or sidegradient of the plume.

On Wed, Sep 21, 2022 at 2:48 PM Robertson, Paige [DEP] <[xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xx](#)> wrote:

Hi Marc

Be sure that a PA has been submitted already. This is an SI report submittal. Did you call in a new number for the GW OSS claim? You can call the AOC GW OSS sampling or the like. Also, you said below that the results are below VI, are they above GWQS? Is there GW contamination from on-site source also?

Thanks

Paige

From: Marc Selover <[xxxxxxxxx@xxxxxx.xx](#)>
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 2:36 PM
To: Robertson, Paige [DEP] <[xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xx](#)>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Reporting Question - PI 991749, 17 North Main St, Medford Twp

Paige,

As part of a due diligence investigation, we collected groundwater samples from Temporary Wells at the property boundary due to a potential source on the adjacent property (former gas station).

Gasoline constituents (BTEX) and potential heating oil or diesel constituents (naphthalene / 2-methylnaphthalene) were detected and the Department was notified. (Below VI screening levels),

We have completed a geophysical investigation, installed and sampled additional temporary wells on our clients property, and evaluated the direction of groundwater flow. We have determined that the source of the groundwater contamination is offsite and we plan to issue a ROA-A based on this determination.

Should the report be a SIR or a RIR ?

What should we call the AOC ?

--

Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG

Project Manager / Partner



Direct 856-840-4479 Cell 856-906-7245

--

Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG

Project Manager / Partner



Direct 856-840-4479 Cell 856-906-7245

From: [Robertson, Paige \[DEP\]](#)
To: [Marc Selover](#)
Cc: [Robertson, Paige \[DEP\]](#)
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Reporting Question - PI 991749, 17 North Main St, Medford Twp
Date: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 2:48:04 PM

Hi Marc

Be sure that a PA has been submitted already. This is an SI report submittal. Did you call in a new number for the GW OSS claim? You can call the AOC GW OSS sampling or the like. Also, you said below that the results are below VI, are they above GWQS? Is there GW contamination from on-site source also?

Thanks
Paige

From: Marc Selover <xxxxxxxx@xxxxx.xxx>
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 2:36 PM
To: Robertson, Paige [DEP] <xxxxx.xxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xxx>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Reporting Question - PI 991749, 17 North Main St, Medford Twp

Paige,

As part of a due diligence investigation, we collected groundwater samples from Temporary Wells at the property boundary due to a potential source on the adjacent property (former gas station).

Gasoline constituents (BTEX) and potential heating oil or diesel constituents (naphthalene / 2-methylnaphthalene) were detected and the Department was notified. (Below VI screening levels),

We have completed a geophysical investigation, installed and sampled additional temporary wells on our clients property, and evaluated the direction of groundwater flow. We have determined that the source of the groundwater contamination is offsite and we plan to issue a ROA-A based on this determination.

Should the report be a SIR or a RIR ?

What should we call the AOC ?

--

Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG
Project Manager / Partner



Direct 856-840-4479 Cell 856-906-7245

From: [Marc Selover](#)
To: [Robertson, Paige \[DEP\]](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Reporting Question - PI 991749, 17 North Main St, Medford Twp
Date: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 2:36:59 PM

Paige,

As part of a due diligence investigation, we collected groundwater samples from Temporary Wells at the property boundary due to a potential source on the adjacent property (former gas station).

Gasoline constituents (BTEX) and potential heating oil or diesel constituents (naphthalene / 2-methylnaphthalene) were detected and the Department was notified. (Below VI screening levels),

We have completed a geophysical investigation, installed and sampled additional temporary wells on our clients property, and evaluated the direction of groundwater flow. We have determined that the source of the groundwater contamination is offsite and we plan to issue a ROA-A based on this determination.

Should the report be a SIR or a RIR ?

What should we call the AOC ?

--

Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG
Project Manager / Partner



Direct 856-840-4479 Cell 856-906-7245

From: [Marc Selover](#)
To: [Cowan, Michael \[DEP\]](#)
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Re: 17 North Main St, Medford, Incident no. 22-06-28-1335-00
Date: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 1:33:00 PM

thanks

On Wed, Jul 13, 2022 at 11:57 AM Cowan, Michael [DEP] <xxxxxxxx.xxxxx@xxx.xx.xxx> wrote:

We have it listed as a LSRP case, due to elevated BTEX in the ground water so that would indicate a gasoline leak.

Being a LSRP case I would think a CDN would be required.

Michael Cowan

UHOT Coordinator

Unregulated Heating Oil Tanks (UHOT)

Bureau of Southern Field Operations

New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection

Phone: 609.984.1731

Email: xxxxxxxx.xxxxx@xxx.xx.xxx ←-----Always quicker to get a response to your questions and/or inquiry

"I don't deal with excuses, I deal with solutions"

NOTE: This e-mail is protected by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. Sections 2510-2521. This E-Mail and its contents may be Privileged & Confidential due to the Attorney-Client Privilege, Attorney Work Product, Deliberative Process or under the New Jersey Open Public Records Act. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, please notify the sender, delete it and do not read, act upon, print, disclose, copy, retain or redistribute it.

Nothing in this correspondence affects your potential liability and obligations to the State

Trustee, the Department, or its Commissioner regarding natural resource injuries, restoration, or damages

From: Marc Selover <xxxxxxxx@xxxxx.xx>
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 11:43 AM
To: Cowan, Michael [DEP] <xxxxxxxx.xxxxxx@xxx.xx.xxx>
Cc: Pointin-Hahn, Kirstin [DEP] <xxxxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx>, Chris Noll <xxxxxx@xxxxxx.xx>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: 17 North Main St, Medford, Incident no. 22-06-28-1335-00

Michael,

Is this site LSRP or UHOT?

Is a CDN required?

On Tue, Jun 28, 2022 at 2:06 PM Marc Selover <xxxxxxxx@xxxxx.xx> wrote:

Michael,

We are completing an investigation for Medford Township due to the planned sale of the former municipal office property. The investigation was initiated to assess whether contamination from the adjacent former gas station / current auto repair facility is migrating on to the property.

Results (see attached) are indicative of no 2 heating oil. There are no records that diesel was stored at the adjacent facility.

The 17 North Main St property was most recently heated by gas. But it is an old building that originally used coal and may have also used heating oil. We will be completing additional investigations to identify the source.

Is this a UHOT or a LSRP site ?

What is the procedure if we determine that the source is offsite?

--

Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG

Project Manager / Partner

Direct 856-840-4479 Cell 856-906-7245

--

Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG

Project Manager / Partner

Direct 856-840-4479 Cell 856-906-7245

--

Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG
Project Manager / Partner



Direct 856-840-4479 Cell 856-906-7245

From: [Cowan, Michael \[DEP\]](#)
To: [Marc Selover](#)
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: 17 North Main St, Medford, Incident no. 22-06-28-1335-00
Date: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 11:57:00 AM

We have it listed as a LSRP case, due to elevated BTEX in the ground water so that would indicate a gasoline leak.

Being a LSRP case I would think a CDN would be required.

Michael Cowan
UHOT Coordinator
Unregulated Heating Oil Tanks (UHOT)
Bureau of Southern Field Operations
New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection
Phone: 609.984.1731
Email: xxxxxxx.xxxxx@xxx.xx.xxx ←-----Always quicker to get a response to your questions and/or inquiry

"I don't deal with excuses, I deal with solutions"

NOTE: This e-mail is protected by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. Sections 2510-2521. This E-Mail and its contents may be Privileged & Confidential due to the Attorney-Client Privilege, Attorney Work Product, Deliberative Process or under the New Jersey Open Public Records Act. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, please notify the sender, delete it and do not read, act upon, print, disclose, copy, retain or redistribute it.

Nothing in this correspondence affects your potential liability and obligations to the State Trustee, the Department, or its Commissioner regarding natural resource injuries, restoration, or damages

From: Marc Selover <xxxxxxx@xxxxx.xxx>
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 11:43 AM
To: Cowan, Michael [DEP] <xxxxxxx.xxxxx@xxx.xx.xxx>
Cc: Pointin-Hahn, Kirstin [DEP] <xxxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx.xxx>; Chris Noll <xxxxxx@xxxxx.xxx>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: 17 North Main St, Medford, Incident no. 22-06-28-1335-00

Michael,

Is this site LSRP or UHOT?

Is a CDN required?

On Tue, Jun 28, 2022 at 2:06 PM Marc Selover <xxxxxxx@xxxxx.xxx> wrote:

Michael,

We are completing an investigation for Medford Township due to the planned sale of the former municipal office property. The investigation was initiated to assess whether contamination from the adjacent former gas station / current auto repair facility is migrating on to the property.

Results (see attached) are indicative of no 2 heating oil. There are no records that diesel was stored at the adjacent facility.

The 17 North Main St property was most recently heated by gas. But it is an old building that originally used coal and may have also used heating oil. We will be completing additional investigations to identify the source.

Is this a UHOT or a LSRP site ?

What is the procedure if we determine that the source is offsite?

--

Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG
Project Manager / Partner

Direct 856-840-4479 Cell 856-906-7245

--

Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG
Project Manager / Partner

Direct 856-840-4479 Cell 856-906-7245

From: [Marc Selover](#)
To: [Cowan, Michael \[DEP\]](#)
Cc: [Pointin-Hahn, Kirstin \[DEP\]](#); [Chris Noll](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: 17 North Main St, Medford, Incident no. 22-06-28-1335-00
Date: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 11:43:36 AM
Attachments: [NJDEP Site Remed Ltr-17 N Main.pdf](#)

Michael,

Is this site LSRP or UHOT?

Is a CDN required?

On Tue, Jun 28, 2022 at 2:06 PM Marc Selover <[xxxxxxxx@xxxxx.xx](#)> wrote:

Michael,

We are completing an investigation for Medford Township due to the planned sale of the former municipal office property. The investigation was initiated to assess whether contamination from the adjacent former gas station / current auto repair facility is migrating on to the property.

Results (see attached) are indicative of no 2 heating oil. There are no records that diesel was stored at the adjacent facility.

The 17 North Main St property was most recently heated by gas. But it is an old building that originally used coal and may have also used heating oil. We will be completing additional investigations to identify the source.

Is this a UHOT or a LSRP site ?

What is the procedure if we determine that the source is offsite?

--

Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG
Project Manager / Partner



Direct 856-840-4479 Cell 856-906-7245

--

Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG
Project Manager / Partner



Direct 856-840-4479 Cell 856-906-7245

From: @.._____
To: @.._____; @..._____
Subject: NJDEP A310 Incident Notification - Communication Center ID:22-06-28-1335-00 (Medford Twp / Burlington County)
Date: Wednesday, June 29, 2022 6:23:58 AM
Attachments: [0_C01226410_31920718.pdf](#)

SUSPECTED HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE DISCHARGE NOTIFICATION:
NJDEP INCIDENT NOTIFICATION NUMBER: 22-06-28-1335-00

The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection has received notification of an incident that may have resulted in a discharge of a hazardous substance within your jurisdiction.

Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 13.1K-15 et seq., (P.L. 1984, c 210) "Hazardous Substance Discharge - Reports and Notices Act" and N.J.A.C. 7:1E-5.1 et seq., Hazardous Substance Discharge: Reports Notices, attached to this email is a copy of our Incident Notification Form which contains details of the suspected discharge.

Further information concerning this incident may be obtained by reviewing attached Notification Letter and Incident Report.

From: [Marc Selover](#)
To: [Cowan, Michael \[DEP\]](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 17 North Main St, Medford, Incident no. 22-06-28-1335-00
Date: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 2:08:01 PM
Attachments: [Groundwater Results Map.pdf](#)

Michael,

We are completing an investigation for Medford Township due to the planned sale of the former municipal office property. The investigation was initiated to assess whether contamination from the adjacent former gas station / current auto repair facility is migrating on to the property.

Results (see attached) are indicative of no 2 heating oil. There are no records that diesel was stored at the adjacent facility.

The 17 North Main St property was most recently heated by gas. But it is an old building that originally used coal and may have also used heating oil. We will be completing additional investigations to identify the source.

Is this a UHOT or a LSRP site ?

What is the procedure if we determine that the source is offsite?

--

Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG
Project Manager / Partner



Direct 856-840-4479 Cell 856-906-7245