



Stantec Consulting Services Inc.
61 Commercial Street, Suite 100
Rochester NY 14614-1009
Tel: (585) 475-1440
Fax: (585) 272-1814

July 10, 2014
File: 190500751

Todd Caffoe, P.E
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
Division of Environmental Remediation
6274 East Avon-Lima Road
Avon, NY 14414

**Reference: Brownfield Cleanup Program
Monthly Progress Report #16
Site #C828184
Former Carriage Factory
33 Litchfield Street
Rochester, Monroe County, New York**

Dear Todd,

On behalf of Carriage Factory Special Needs Apartments, LP (CFSNA), Stantec Consulting Services Inc. (Stantec) has prepared this Monthly Progress Report #16 for the Brownfield Cleanup Program (BCP) at the Former Carriage Factory located at 33 Litchfield Street in the City of Rochester, Monroe County, New York (Site). This report covers activities that took place during the month of June 2014.

1. Actions During The Previous Month

- On June 5 analytical results of a sample obtained May 27 of elevator pit water being discharged to the sanitary sewer under the Short-Term Discharge Permit ST-256 were transmitted to Monroe County Department of Environmental Services (MCDES). A request was made to scale back the sampling frequency to a monthly schedule and MCDES agreed that monthly sampling was now acceptable. MCDES also provided a letter on June 6 extending the permit expiration date to August 30, 2014.
- On June 5-9 clean soil generated from western site grade cuts in May (sample LI-Y-S15) were placed as backfill on the east side of the "sign wall" excavation, northwest planter, and northwest bank.
- On June 6-9, the contractor loaded out 1,209.8 tons of impacted soil previously stockpiled from excavations for the planter, outbuilding, and sign wall (sample LI-EXT-S7) to Mill Seat Landfill. Approval for disposal of this material (represented by soil sample LI-EXT-S7) had been received from NYSDEC on May 28.



Reference: Brownfield Cleanup Program
Monthly Progress Report #16
Site #C828184
Former Carriage Factory
33 Litchfield Street, Rochester, NY

- During the period June 9 through 11, Stantec completed the ERD injection program by adding approximately 800 gallons of lactate solution to well RW-4 and 700 gallons to well B102-MW.
- On June 10, the contractor excavated the grass area between north end of parking lot and northern site entrance to a maximum of 2 feet below finish grade. The eastern majority of this area had no positive PID readings and was excavated to approximately 1.5 feet below finish grade. Soil in the western portion of this area, where the driveway turns south to the parking lot had PID readings from 5 to 83 ppm and was mostly gray-stained. This excavated material was stockpiled for sampling and offsite disposal. Stantec collected soil sample LI-EW-S7 from this proposed grass area prior to placement of Mirafi® fabric and clean fill soils. The area was backfilled to a point just below finish grade; topsoil will be placed at a later date.

The contractor also excavated the southeast parking lot grass “island” (located just north of the southern entrance to parking lot) to 2 feet below finish grade where necessary. No positive PID readings were observed. Excavated soil was primarily urban fill which was also stockpiled for testing and disposal. The area was covered in Mirafi® and backfilled with clean soil.

- On June 10/11 the contractor excavated the roadcut for the northern entrance driveway. Much of the western portion of this excavation was gray-stained with PID readings ranging from 5 to 165 ppm. This material was added to existing impacted soil pile. A small quantity of the eastern portion of this roadcut, which had no positive PID readings, staining, odors or evidence of urban fill, was placed in the northeast corner grass area to reach finish grade. This was done with verbal approval from NYDEC Project Manager Todd Caffoe. Sample LI-EW-S8 was collected from the northeast grass area prior to placement of Mirafi® and the clean soil.
- On June 12 soil sample LI-EXT-S8 was collected from the impacted soil stockpile, in accordance with the CID Work Plan and to satisfy landfill waste characterization requirements. Results of the analyses were submitted to NYSDEC on June 23; see Item No. 3 below.
- On June 12, a site meeting was conducted with NYSDEC project manager Todd Caffoe.
- On June 18 NYSDEC central office and regional staff visited the site briefly with Todd Caffoe to observe project progress.
- On June 19, a permit application was submitted to MCDES for a permanent connection of the sump pump discharge to the sewer system.



Reference: Brownfield Cleanup Program
Monthly Progress Report #16
Site #C828184
Former Carriage Factory
33 Litchfield Street, Rochester, NY

- On June 24 the contractor installed surface completions (flush-mounted curb boxes and sample port connections) for all vacuum monitoring points connected to the sub-slab depressurization system (SSDS).

2. Data Received or Generated in the Previous Month

- Laboratory results were received as follows (QA/QC samples are not included in this tally):
 - Results for clean soil stockpile sample LI-EW-S2 were received on June 4.
 - Results for an elevator pit water discharge sample obtained on May 27 were received on June 4.
 - Results for the ERD quarterly groundwater sampling event performed on May 28 were received on June 16 (Table 1). Most noteworthy is the reduction in the PCE concentration in off-site well RW-6 from 3,380 micrograms per liter (ug/l) or parts per billion (ppb) to 85 ppb and reduction in total VOCs in this same well from 3,745 ppb to 1,640 ppb, suggesting that the ERD injection program is starting to have the desired effect.
 - Results for impacted stockpile soil sample LI-EXT-8 were received on June 23.

3. Deliverables Completed and Submitted during the Previous Month

- Water discharge sample results were provided to MCDES on June 5.
- Monthly Progress Report No. 15 was submitted on June 10, 2014.
- Results of impacted soil stockpile sampling and analysis were submitted to NYSDEC in Albany on June 23 with a request for approval for landfill disposal; written approval was received on June 23.

4. Actions Scheduled for the Next Reporting Period

The following activities are anticipated to occur in July 2014:

- Monitoring of construction-related activities, which is expected to include off-site disposal of staged soil and minor shallow excavations for parking lot lighting;
- Completion of the SSDS system installation activities;
- Installation of the permanent sump pump and cover in the elevator pit;
- Conducting the second round of ERD groundwater sampling;



July 10, 2014
Todd Caffoe, P.E.
Page 4

Reference: Brownfield Cleanup Program
Monthly Progress Report #16
Site #C828184
Former Carriage Factory
33 Litchfield Street, Rochester, NY

- Sampling topsoil to be imported for placement on site; and
- Ongoing preparation of the IRM Construction Completion Report, Alternatives Analysis Report, and Site Management Plan.

5. Completion, Delays and Future Schedule

Construction delays have occurred due to groundwater infiltration in the elevator shaft pit and the need for a permanent sump enclosure design. Exterior excavation backfill delays also resulted in a later completion of the groundwater ERD injection program.

Closing

If you have any questions or require further information, please call me at any time.

Regards,

STANTEC CONSULTING SERVICES INC.

Michael P. Storonsky
Managing Principal
Phone: 585-413-5266
mike.storonsky@stantec.com

Attachment – Table 1

ec:	Bart Putzig (NYSDEC)	Al Floro (Nixon Peabody)
	James Mahoney (NYSDEC)	Jonathan Penna (Nixon Peabody)
	Justin Deming (NYSDOH)	Mark Gregor (City of Rochester)
	Stephanie Selmer (NYSDOH)	Eleonora Bershanskaya (Goldman Sachs)
	James Whalen (CFSNA)	Daniel Alger (Goldman Sachs)
	Mark Fuller (CFSNA)	Linda Kaiser (Goldman Sachs)
	Gillian Conde (CFSNA)	Patrick Miller (CPC)
	Joy Cromwell (CFSNA)	David Lent (IVI)
	Chris Betts (Betts Housing)	

Table 1
Summary of Analytical Results in Groundwater
Former Carriage Factory
33 Litchfield Street, Rochester, New York

Area of Investigation Sample Location Sample Date Sample ID Sampling Company Laboratory Laboratory Work Order Laboratory Sample ID Sample Type	Units	TOGS	Off-Site Locations						QA/QC				
			8-Jun-12 RW-12	RW-12 20-May-13 LI-RW-12-GW1	28-May-14 LI-RW-12-P11	12-Jun-12 RW-13	RW-13 20-May-13 LI-RW-13-GW1	27-Mar-14 LI-RW-13	12-Jun-12 Trip Blank 7346	20-May-13 Trip Blank	21-May-13 Trip Blank	27-Mar-14 Trip Blank	29-May-14 LI-Trip Blank-P11
DECI PARAROCH 12:2431 12:2431-02				STANTEC CCGE E2301 E2301-04	STANTEC PARAROCH 142196 142196-03	DECI PARAROCH 12:2486 12:2486-01	STANTEC CCGE E2301 E2301-05	STANTEC PARAROCH 141138 141138-10	DECI PARAROCH 12:2486 12:2486-03	STANTEC CCGE E2301 E2301-07	STANTEC CCGE E2314 E2314-08	STANTEC PARAROCH 141138 141138-15	STANTEC PARAROCH 142196 142196-08
General Chemistry													
Total Organic Carbon	µg/L	n/v	-	-	103000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Metals													
Arsenic	µg/L	25 ^B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Iron	µg/L	300 ^B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Manganese	µg/L	300 ^B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sodium	µg/L	20000 ^B	-	-	20000 ^B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Volatile Organic Compounds													
Acetone	µg/L	50 ^A	-	25 U	10.0 U	-	25 U	10.0 U	-	25 U	25 U	10.0 U	10.0 U
Benzene	µg/L	1 ^B	-	5 U	0.700 U	-	5 U	0.700 U	-	5 U	5 U	0.700 U	0.700 U
Bromodichloromethane	µg/L	50 ^A	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Bromoform (tribromomethane)	µg/L	50 ^A	5.00 U	5 U	5.00 U	5.00 U	5 U	5.00 U	5.00 U	5 U	5 U	5.00 U	5.00 U
Bromomethane (Methyl bromide)	µg/L	5 ^{-B}	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Carbon Disulfide	µg/L	60 ^A	-	5 U	2.00 U	-	5 U	2.00 U	-	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Carbon Tetrachloride (Tetrachloromethane)	µg/L	5 ^B	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene)	µg/L	5 ^{-B}	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Chlorobromomethane	µg/L	5 ^{-B}	-	5 U	5.00 U	-	5 U	5.00 U	-	5 U	5 U	5.00 U	5.00 U
Chloroethane (Ethyl Chloride)	µg/L	5 ^{-B}	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Chloroform (Trichloromethane)	µg/L	7 ^B	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Chloromethane	µg/L	5 ^{-B}	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Cyclohexane	µg/L	n/v	-	5 U J	10.0 U	-	5 U J	10.0 U	-	5 U J	5 U	10.0 U	10.0 U
Dibromo-3-Chloropropane, 1,2- (DBCP)	µg/L	0.04 ^B	-	5 U	10.0 U	-	5 U	10.0 U	-	5 U	5 U	10.0 U	10.0 U
Dibromochloromethane	µg/L	50 ^A	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Dichlorobenzene, 1,2-	µg/L	3 ^B	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Dichlorobenzene, 1,3-	µg/L	3 ^B	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Dichlorobenzene, 1,4-	µg/L	3 ^B	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Dichlorodifluoromethane (Freon 12)	µg/L	5 ^{-B}	-	5 U	2.00 U	-	5 U	2.00 U	-	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Dichloroethane, 1,1-	µg/L	5 ^{-B}	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Dichloroethane, 1,2-	µg/L	0.6 ^B	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Dichloroethene, 1,1-	µg/L	5 ^{-B}	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2-	µg/L	5 ^{-B}	24.5 ^B	26.5 ^B	79.5 ^B	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-	µg/L	5 ^{-B}	2.00 U	1.2 J	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Dichloropropane, 1,2-	µg/L	1 ^B	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Dichloropropene, cis-1,3-	µg/L	0.4 ^B	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Dichloropropene, trans-1,3-	µg/L	0.4 ^B	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Dioxane, 1,4-	µg/L	n/v	-	R	20.0 U	-	R	20.0 U	-	R	100 U	20.0 U	20.0 U
Ethylbenzene	µg/L	5 ^{-B}	-	5 U	2.00 U	-	5 U	2.00 U	-	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Ethylene Dibromide (Dibromoethane, 1,2-)	µg/L	0.0006 ^B	-	5 U	2.00 U	-	5 U	2.00 U	-	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Hexanone, 2- (Methyl Butyl Ketone)	µg/L	50 ^A	-	25 U	5.00 U	-	25 U	5.00 U	-	25 U	25 U	5.00 U	5.00 U
Isopropylbenzene	µg/L	5 ^{-B}	-	5 U	2.00 U	-	5 U	2.00 U	-	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Methyl Acetate	µg/L	n/v	-	5 U	2.00 U	-	5 U	2.00 U	-	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Methyl Ethyl Ketone (MEK)	µg/L	50 ^A	-	25 U	10.0 U	-	25 U	10.0 U	-	25 U	25 U	10.0 U	10.0 U
Methyl Isobutyl Ketone (MIBK)	µg/L	n/v	-	25 U	5.00 U	-	25 U	5.00 U	-	25 U	25 U	5.00 U	5.00 U
Methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE)	µg/L	10 ^A	-	0.85 J	2.00 U	-	5 U	2.00 U	-	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Methylcyclohexane	µg/L	n/v	-	5 U	2.00 U	-	5 U	2.00 U	-	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Methylene Chloride (Dichloromethane)	µg/L	5 ^{-B}	5.00 U	5 U	5.00 U	5.00 U	5 U	5.00 U	5.00 U	5 U	3.4 J	5.00 U	5.00 U
Styrene	µg/L	5 ^{-B}	-	5 U	5.00 U	-	5 U	5.00 U	-	5 U	5 U	5.00 U	5.00 U
Tetrachloroethane, 1,1,2,2-	µg/L	5 ^{-B}	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Tetrachloroethylene (PCE)	µg/L	5 ^{-B}	2.71	4.9 J	5.52 ^B	2.00 U	2.8 J	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Toluene	µg/L	5 ^{-B}	-	5 U	2.00 U	-	5 U	2.00 U	-	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Trichlorobenzene, 1,2,3-	µg/L	5 ^{-B}	-	5 U	5.00 U	-	5 U	5.00 U	-	5 U	5 U	5.00 U	5.00 U
Trichlorobenzene, 1,2,4-	µg/L	5 ^{-B}	-	5 U	5.00 U	-	5 U	5.00 U	-	5 U	5 U	5.00 U	5.00 U
Trichloroethane, 1,1,1-	µg/L	5 ^{-B}	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Trichloroethane, 1,1,2-	µg/L	1 ^B	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Trichloroethylene (TCE)	µg/L	5 ^{-B}	6.80 ^B	15 ^B	25.1 ^B	2.00 U	0.99 J	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Trichlorofluoromethane (Freon 11)	µg/L	5 ^{-B}	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Trichlorotrifluoroethane (Freon 113)	µg/L	5 ^{-B}	-	5 U	2.00 U	-	5 U	2.00 U	-	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Vinyl Acetate	µg/L	n/v	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vinyl chloride	µg/L	2 ^B	2.00 U	0.55 J	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Xylene, m & p-	µg/L	5 ^{-B}	-	10 U	2.00 U	-	10 U	2.00 U	-	10 U	10 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Xylene, o-	µg/L	5 ^{-B}	-	5 U	2.00 U	-	5 U	2.00 U	-	5 U	5 U	2.00 U	2.00 U
Total VOC	µg/L	n/v	34.01	49	110.12	ND	3.79	2	ND	3.4	ND	ND	ND

See last page for notes.

Table 1
Summary of Analytical Results in Groundwater
Former Carriage Factory
33 Litchfield Street, Rochester, New York

Notes:

TOGS	NYSDEC TOGS 1.1.1 (Reissued June 1998 with errata in January 1999 and addenda in April 2000 and June 2004)
A	TOGS 1.1.1 - Table 1 - Ambient Water Quality Standards and Guidance Values, Division of Water, Technical and Operational Guidance Series (TOGS 1.1.1): Guidance
B	TOGS 1.1.1 - Table 1 - Ambient Water Quality Standards and Guidance Values, Division of Water, Technical and Operational Guidance Series (TOGS 1.1.1): Standards
C	TOGS 1.1.1 - Table 1 - Ambient Water Quality Standards and Guidance Values, Division of Water, Technical and Operational Guidance Series (TOGS 1.1.1): Standards
D	TOGS 1.1.1 - Table 1 - Ambient Water Quality Standards and Guidance Values, Division of Water, Technical and Operational Guidance Series (TOGS 1.1.1): Guidance
6.5^A	Concentration exceeds the indicated standard.
15.2	Concentration was detected but did not exceed applicable standards.
0.50 U	Laboratory reportable detection limit exceeded standard.
0.03 U	The analyte was not detected above the laboratory reportable detection limit.
n/v	No standard/guideline value.
-	Parameter not analyzed / not available.
-	The standard for Iron and Manganese is 500 ug/L, which applies to the sum of these substances. As individual standards, the standard is 300 ug/L.
..	The principal organic contaminant standard for groundwater of 5 ug/L (described elsewhere in the TOGS table) applies to this substance.
^{BC} P	Applies to the sum of cis- and trans-1,3-dichloropropene.
B	Indicates analyte was found in associated blank, as well as in the sample.
D	Indicates reanalysis of sample with additional dilution to address exceedance of instrument calibration range.
J	The reported result is an estimated value.
NJ	The analysis indicates the presence of an analyte that has been "tentatively identified" and the associated numerical value represents its approximate concentration.
Q	Indicates LCS control criteria did not meet requirements
R	The sample results are rejected due to serious deficiencies in the ability to analyze the sample and meet quality control criteria. The presence or absence of the analyte cannot be verified.
CCGE	Chemtech Consulting Group, Mountainside, NJ
PARAROCH	Paradigm Environmental Services, Rochester, NY