

## Detterman, Mark, Env. Health

---

**Subject:** RO57\_Lerer\_Bros\_Transmission  
**Entry Type:** Phone call  
**Start:** Wed 8/17/2011 12:20 PM  
**End:** Wed 8/17/2011 12:50 PM  
**Duration:** 30 minutes

Receive call from Will Mast and Rob Creps of PES Environmental @ 11:45 to discuss recent directive letter.

They wanted to determine explicitly that letter accepted that construction could proceed, rather than the implied acceptance contained in the letter. Yes, this is correct, I had not thought to include this wording, not understanding this was important.

Also wanted to discuss timing of remedial document, it would likely not be available by time line as work will likely occur next year. I had assumed the rush indicated work would occur this year before the rains. Request they send a short letter notifying us of that and we would adjust due dates appropriately. The intent was not to interfere with the process already in place.

Thirdly they wanted to discuss Technical Comment #3 "UST Excavation Confirmation Soil Sampling", with concern that since ACEH did not have UST removal confirmation samples we wanted confirmation samples with this comment. No, more likely poor choice of wording. I wanted to confirmation removal below elevated soil concentrations, while bore data indicates should be gone, this would help ease closure issues. Discuss that existing data shows this, I agree, but additional data provides additional indication that it has all been removed; and if not maybe some simple scratching would suffice. Sidewall samples in the remaining two sidewalls (two will be removed) also has the potential to eliminate future concerns and also eliminates need to conduct or rationalize in-place residual concentration. I also note that two adjacent sites have their own petroleum issues, the intent is not to confuse with this site's own issues. Their intent is to dewater to 14 ft, no more than necessary (necessary maybe deeper to allow firm soils that support heavy equipment).