

Drogos, Donna, Env. Health

Subject: Ro129 - 1721 Webster
Entry Type: Phone call

Start: Wed 6/13/2007 4:17 PM
End: Wed 6/13/2007 4:17 PM
Duration: 0 hours

6/13/07, 417p, Robert Cave, BAAQMD, 415-749-5048
#4070, Douglas Parking Co
Pangea SVE proposal
Contact him for public notice mailing

6/14/07, 1050a
Gave him contact nfo for me for notice
Discussed public comment received,
Approving permit for system & addressing public concerns with direct correspondence, FYI to ACEH, oaky.

2-1-2000

Spoke to Bob-Clark Riddell with
Cambria Environmental. He has rec'd my
letter dated Feb 25, 2000 requesting Douglas Baskin
to submit a workplan to determine whether
their plume has migrated to 1750 Webster.
He is going to schedule a site review to
~~for~~ review the site of 1750 Webster St.
He will ~~also~~ also include a receptor
survey in his workplan.

7-20-92 left mes. for Ernie informing him I
need the following before I can
approve his closure plan:

- 1) EPA I.D. number
- 2) Submit forms A+B
- 3) Deposit/Refund sheet identifying
who gets the money left over.

7/18/97

returned mess fm Lee Douglas (to Tom Peacock on 7/15): looking to purchase prop in downtown Oakland. Wants to know if prop is in compliance with our Dept. They already did a Phase I, and it shows up fairly clean. But they suspect a gw plume. No gw samples yet from the subject site. He wants to do a Phase II, and get gw samples. If it is just a trace amt, will we issue some sort of closure letter? Cambria is doing it. If we do not have any other file for the site, and we think the investigation was well done, we can write a closure ltr.

As for 1721 Webster, we're doing semi-annual mon.

8/16/96

spoke w/John Espinoza: I'll write RP a letter for more QM. RE increase in MW2, it's still same order of mag. MW3 is decreasing. He wants to stop analyzing MW1. Maybe the former Chevron at 17th and Harrison was the source of contam for the Hps at 1750 Webster St. Told him his MW4 is not in a good location to monitor CG contam from the Hps (if his Fig 3 is correct). There's some question as to where the Hps really are. It costs \$1600 to do a QM. Why did MW4 go down the road that far? He wanted a DG well; MW2 was hot. He said they defined their plume. We just have a co-mingling problem. He wants me to mention the Chevron invest in my letter (ie is it a source?). Let's do a MapInfo for the spatial graphics.

Checked the Chevron file (1633 Harrison St). GW flowed E on 2/28/96, East on 12/30/95, East on 9/28/95, E-NE on 6/27/95, E-NE on 3/22/95, NE on 9/7/94, NE in 6/94, NE on 3/10/94, E-NE on 9/27/93, E on 6/9/93, E on 4/7/93, E on 12/16/92. So it's been consistently E to NE since 12/92. That makes the Douglas Parking site and the 1750 Webster St. sites UG or CG of the Chevron site.

Discussed w/Tom. I should do my own historical search for this property. Check Assessor's office, Sanborn maps. Just because 1750 Webster has been a parking lot since 1947 doesn't mean that they didn't have a Ust. The patched asphalt is near HP2, the hottest sample.

8/20/96

Im John E. The Hps for 1750 Webster St. Are actually 220' from 17th St. So that makes them closer to MW4, and that makes MW4 more readily crossgradient from the Hps. Good news! Checked Sanborn maps in main library, but they only go to about 1930. I'm looking for 40s, 50s, 60s. I will go to UC's Doe Library, to the Bancroft Library inside it, and the Map Room to the microfiche, and make a copy of the Sanborn maps. They have more recent Sanborns: 1940s+.

9/17/96

WROTE LETTER TO RP, requesting biannual sampling.

10/25/96

Reviewed "Second Semi-Annual 1996 Mon Rpt" by Cambria, dated 10/15/96. **GW sampled on 10/2/96 flowed NE at 0.006 ft/ft**. MW2 was only well w/benzene (2,200 ppb), located immediately DG of the former USTs. We have stopped analyzing MW1, as per my 9/17 letter. **Douglas included a cover letter!**

2/25/97

spoke w/John Espinoza: doing QM this wk or next.

4/21/97

Reviewed 4/7/97 "First Semi-Annual 1997 Mon Rpt" by Cambria. **GW sampled on 2/28/97 flowed NE at 0.006 ft/ft**. Concs in DG MW2 increased: 4,700 ppb benzene, 39,000 ppb TPHg. GWE also increased. Low MTBE concs.

- 4/25/96 John Espinoza phoned: is having problems w/getting permit fm City of Oakland. Last consultant didn't get permit. He doesn't think sidewalk is bad, but City does, and wants it repaired. City thinks it's a tripping hazard. City sent a warning notice to RP to fix sidewalk. It's \$500 for encroachment permit; city wants them to replace 6 square of cement. Total cost \$3-5,000. Looking at 2nd wk of May before they sample wells. Joe Tyson is the Pres, Scott is the VP. JE will be a PE soon, Civil. So we will wait til May to sample all the wells.
- 6/24/96 Phoned John Espinoza: MW2 still dirty (63 ppm TPHg and 7.4 ppm benzene), MW3 had 8.6 ppm TPHg and ND benzene. The cross gradient well (MW4) had 14 ppm TPHg and ND benzene). MW5 is new well near 19th St and was ND TPHg and BTEX. They have to summarize data for grab water samples (9) plus two wells. A big report; but it's not written yet. When? Within a month QS date was 5/10. He thinks the report goes directly to me, not to RP first.
- 7/16/96 John Espinoza phoned: he wants me to fax him the two reports done by AGI (6/1/93 and 4/1/93) for the site across the street, known as 1750 Webster St. So I faxed them. Report was supposed to be edited and out the door by today, as per a call from Joe Thiessen to me on 7/15.
- 7/17/96 Received the report.
- 8/16/96 Reviewed 7/16/96 "Subsurface Invest Report" by Cambria. They drilled 7 borings in February, and got one soil and one grab gw sample from each. (The 1/26/96 wp said they'd analyze 2 soil samples fm each boring.) They installed 2 Mws on 5/3/96. They disposed ten 55-gal drums of purge water, soil cuttings, and steam clean rinsate (form says 220 gal and does not specify # of drums). Soil results: ND benzene, and 580 and 660 ppm TPHg in cross and down gradient borings SBB and SBD. GW results: highest TPHg conc was in CG boring SBB (20,000 ppb). But that boring only had 100 ppb benzene. The highest benzene conc was in DG boring SBD (550 ppb). . . . All five Mws (including the 2 new Mws) were sampled on 5/10/96. MW1 and MW5 were completely ND. The others had hits. **Note how DG MW2 had an increase in conc from 7/95: benz is now 7400 ppb and TPHg is now 63,000 ppb. TEX was also elevated. What is the source of this?** Note that the GWE decreased since 7/95. Hmm. Our new CG well, MW4, is actually DG and CG from the Douglas site and the 1750 Webster St. site. MW4 had 14,000ppb TPHg and ND benzene, but some TEX. Degraded gasoline? Cambria just recommends QM to document natural biodeg for one year, then review. **GW flowed NE at 0.007 ft/ft on 5/10/96; see Fig 2. I'd like a clearer copy of Table 3. Mine won't copy well. Are they under contract to do QM? For how long? The standard year?**

1/24/96 spoke w/Joe Tyson: they will go forward w/SWI wp. Try to submit it asap. Told him I'm on vacation 2/9 for 2 wks. He thinks they can get SWI done first Q 96, and still have time to sample wells at same time as new well. They want to do rapid site assessmt first (ie Geoprobe), then install the MW.

1/29/96 Received workplan

2/2/96 Reviewed 1/26/96 "Proposed Subsurface Invest Wp" by Cambria. Drill "up to five" soil borings to 22'bgs (2' below water table), and collect soil and grab water samples from each boring. Then determine whether 1 or 2 Mws will be installed. Submit a map to AlCo showing the MW location(s). Looks pretty good.

John Espinoza of Cambria phoned. They will use a Geoprobe.

Gil Jensen phoned: thinks it's time to write an order (delayed from the 6/94 PERP). This was probably prompted by his receipt of my 1/19/96 Second NOV ltr to RP. Lm Gil: let's hold off on the order. They did submit a wp, which looks good.

Wrote wp acceptance letter

2/26/96 spoke w/John Espinoza: Drilled last week. How hot was grab sampling across street? It cleaned up in lane 2, and near 19th St. Will send me results, and proposed MW locations. All 4 locations were hot: SB-A thru SB-D.

3/4/96 JEspinoza phoned: has a philosophical question. Can they place Mws w/low ppb concs, or do we want ND? Low ppb is ok. They also drilled SB-EFG. Thinks the plume from across the st is co-mingling w/theirs. One well near 19th St. (DG of MW2), and another one. But 19th St. is 200' DG! Too far! But soil is very sandy. Even 100' is a long way. I told him not to go farther than 100' DG. The other well should go across Webster St. He wants to put it in lane 2, UG of SB-B, but how about in sidewalk? He'll talk w/Joe Tyson, and City of Oakland. Douglas got their wells in the sidewalk! If that cross gradient well is hot, then I think we should get that po to determine the source, or do it ourselves.

I reviewed the 1/6/93 "Env. Assmt" report by Applied Geosciences for the 1750 Webster St. site. There is another site known as 1746 Webster St. (Pg 7), listed to Douglas Motors Parking Lot in 1969. Strange. Phoned Eric Nunneman and asked him to do history search.

3/21/96 JE phoned: getting encroachment permits for the 2 wells. Looks like they'll have to go in sidewalk. One well is cross gradient. Yeah! He wants to know how long bet const and develop: 72 hours (Title 23). And 24 hrs bet develop and sampling.

8/18/95

Im S. Solomon at Piers: I need copy of well survey plat.

8/21/95

Reviewed fax from Piers. It's the well survey plat and report, dated 11/20/94. There are two different well elevations: top of handhole, and PVC casing. Which to use? It probably doesn't matter, as long as they're consistent. But they were NOT consistent. Look in the 3/6/95 Piers QR: their "casing elevations" used the "top of handhole" for MW1, while the "PVC casing" for MW2 and MW3. Weird. Left mess Chris Solomon: he is the field tech who did the DTW measurements during that event. So he should know whether he took DTW fm TOC or fm the handhole.

Wrote letter to Piers; faxed it, cc'd RP

8/23/95

Reviewed 8/21 fax from Piers. They account the discrepancies to "typos." They changed the Casing Elev for MW1 to "PVC casing." They also changed the Depth (of well) for MW2 and MW3. **Gradient on 2/22/95 was E-SE at 0.041 ft/ft (they said East with unknown gradient).**

Reviewed 8/20 transmittal from Cambria. They revised Fig 1 and Table 1 from their Third Q 95 QR. It includes a survey report (done for Cambria) dated 6/28/95, which has different TOCs than the survey done for Piers, dated 11/20/94. **Why the discrepancy in TOCs?** Left mess surveyor (Hammond). Spoke w/Mr. Hammond: it looks like they used different benchmarks. The data is approx 0.3' different in EACH well; so that's good. **Anyway, the flow direction is the same (NE), and the gradient is 0.007 ft/ft on 7/11/95.** I double checked their work: it's good.

Revised and sent letter to RP

1/16/96

spoke w/John Espinoza: The \$11,890 covers 5 borings w/grab water samples (geoprobe), soil samples, and one MW, and a well survey, encroachment permit (\$735 for City). Borings are likely located in the street. Cambria has not done QM or anything for RP. Time to write a NOV.

Wrote NOV

1/24/96

mess fm Joe Tyson: RP asked him to do QS, but he suggests postponing it until the new wells are in. Mess to JT: no, I want to sample the wells during the rainy season, as per my NOV. This RP is notorious for delays. Who knows when the new wells are going in. I haven't even received a wp yet. It could be months.

SECRET - ORIGINAL
PROFESSIONAL
95 JAN 24 PM 3:19

- 6/15/95 spoke w/Gil: if the mtg goes nowhere, ask them if they want another PERP, or the RWQCB order.
- 6/19/95 spoke w/B. Rose: They're probably going w/Cambria instead of Piers for next QS; should be this week. John Esposito is their contact at Cambria. Wants to meet when they get the data from this next QS. That means mtg won't be til early July. Told him we'll have to have our lawyer there if he attends. Maybe he need not attend the mtg. He'll see; maybe Cambria will attend. He'll make calls and get back to me.
- 6/22/95 Im B Rose: re status
phoned John Esposito at Cambria: he just sent the contract to Leland Douglas. He's spoken w/Bernie Rose re this QS. Must wait for signed contract.
- 6/26/95 mess fm B. Rose: Cambria has submitted bid to L. Douglas. GW results in by 3rd wk July. Let's meet then. He need not be there (lawyer-free mtg); just RP and Cambria.
- 7/25/95 Reviewed 7/24/95 QR by Cambria. **GW sampled on 7/11/95 flowed NE (towards the Lake).** GW concs decreased, while GWEs were constant or increased; strange. Highest hits: 38,000 ppb TPHg and 3,100 ppb benzene (MW2). Phoned Leland Douglas: do we still need a mtg? Do we still want them to do further investigation? The concs have decreased, which indicates some HC breakdown. Spoke w/Tom: What's weird is the MW3 (the UG well) was initially the hottest well. Now it's MW2 (DG well), and has been MW2 for the past 2 events. RE 1750 Webster St., what's also weird is that the HP sample nearest Webster St. was way less contaminated than the HP sample away from Webster St. (In 1993).
- 8/15/95 discussed case w/TP: is he in the Cleanup Fund?
- 8/16/95 discussed GWE data w/SOS. Drafted letter to RP left mess Stuart Solomon at Piers
- 8/17/95 spoke w/D. Elias at Cambria: they resurveyed the wells prior to the July sampling event. He'll fax the survey report to me. The casing on MW1 is at a slant which varies approx 0.5" from high to low ends. I asked if it was marked by the surveyor? He doesn't know; Bob from Cambria took the samples. Could it change the flow direction? Don't know. We both noted how the flow direction changed during this event. They did not present the gradient, but I'd like to know what it was. Mess fm J. Espinoza at Cambria: TOCs are different than survey report. But direction is about the same. Phil will put new #s in table, and revise the map.

- 12/2/94 **“Soil and GW Invest. And QM Report,” prepared by GTE. Wells installed on 9/8/94 had up to 650 ppm TPHg and up to 0.170 ppm benzene in soil boring EB5. GW had up to 394,000 ppb TPHg (MW3) and up to 10,000 ppb benzene (EB6). Note the sheen on boring logs and MW3 field sampling log. What’s the gradient? No potentiometric map!**
- 12/23/94 Letter fm AlCo to RP. QM should continue. **Their assertion that 1750 Webster St. is the likely source is unfounded.**
- 4/17/95 Letter from AlCo to RP.
- 4/25/95 Date of submittal of QR, by Piers, dated 3/6/95. The 4/25 date is the date on the cover letter from RP. There is no County stamp showing date received!
- 4/27/95 Letter from AlCo to RP. Requests wp within 30 days.
- 5/5/95 Received 5/4/95 letter from RP, with attachment: letter dated 2/8/95 from RP, unsigned, **requesting a mtg, says our request is “unfair and unnecessary.”**
- 5/9/95 Another copy of the 3/6/95 QR by Piers was received by AlCo. **GW sampled on 2/22/95 flowed East at 0.008 ft/ft. There was up to 98,000 ppb TPHg, and up to 8,400 ppb benzene (in DG and/or CG well MW2).**
- 6/6/95 spoke w/Gil: he said he’ll look for his notes from the PERP when he gets back to office on 6/13 Tuesday. He remembers telling RP we’d hold off on the RWQCB order bec RP promised to comply within 30 days. Spoke w/Tom: he’ll also look for his notes fm the PERP. Mess fm and to Stuart Solomon. **Has gw been sampled since 2/22/95?**
- 6/13/95 spoke w/Gil: He confirmed that they suspended the RWQCB order during the last PERP. He said to write a Notice of Further PERP, cite the past PERP, change the lingo to say that they refuse to further delineate, then fax to Gil for review. Next PERP is July 5th. THEN, we’ll issue a RWQCB order. Maybe it’s easier just to write the order? Ask Tom.
- 6/14/95 Spoke w/Tom: John Kaiser was not at the PERP. So maybe he’d be hesitant to sign an “order.” So maybe we’d better have an informal mtg w/RP. RP may be angry if we just go ahead and have another PERP, thinking that we’re unreasonable. Phoned Leland Douglas: he wants his lawyer to attend mtg, but not consultant. Consultants have self interests. His lawyer is Bernie Rose. Told him that if his lawyer comes, we’d have to bring ours. GW hasn’t been sampled since 2/22/95. Discussed possible mtg dates.

2/22/93 Letter from AlCo to RP. Says "the ULR you filed was written on a fax copy, which does not allow for distribution. This is being returned. Please submit (another) on enclosed form." You are still required to do invest. Please submit wp within 60 days (or by 4/22/93). . . . [ULR was subsequently received; signed by Harry Shin of Piedmont Env., dated 8/31/93.]

3/18/93 File search by Mark Borsuk

6/2/93 File search by Mark Borsuk

8/17/93 Letter from AlCo to RP. **Second Notice.** Requests wp within 60 days, or by 10/17/93.

2/23/94 **Final Notice** fm AlCo to RP

3/8/94 **Received the Work Plan for Phase II Env. Ass, prepared by Piedmont Env., dated 12/16/93.** Includes 3 Mws

3/10/94 Letter from AlCo to RP. Accepts wp.

3/29/94 File search by mark Borsuk

6/6/94 Notice of Pre-Enforcement Review Panel, sent to Leland Douglas

6/8/94 **Proposed Exploratory Boring and MW Inst wp, prepared by Gen-Tech Env.** (Received by AlCo on 6/20/94) for 3 Mws and 3 SBs

6/21/94 **Pre-Enforcement Review Panel.** Attended by RWQCB. A RWQCB order was never issued as a result of this panel, bec the RP agreed to cooperate.

6/22/94 Letter from AlCo to RP. Accepts GTE's wp.

9/8/94 Site visit by AlCo (J. Eberle) during MW installation

10/26/94 Fax from GTE to AlCo. Shows soil and water results pictorially (on site map). JE spoke w/Stuart Solomon of GTE. He thinks there may be 2 gw plumes. One is degraded and one is fresh gasoline. Also, the TPH is higher at cap fringe in boring than it was under the UST.