

## Drogos, Donna, Env. Health

---

**Subject:** RO175 - 6600 Foothill  
**Entry Type:** Phone call  
**Start:** Mon 10/29/2007 2:25 PM  
**End:** Mon 10/29/2007 2:25 PM  
**Duration:** 0 hours

Dylan Radke, attorney for LeBlanc's, he indicted clients feel they cannot do anything with property ongoing court case, stay on case pending remedaiton plan (hence the calls) they are suing for loss of property value due to contamination - I told him ACEH does not get invloved in this type of issue we provide oversight of contamianted site.

maybe developed in to residential or a restaurant  
CEDA at city of oakland , working with  
senor housing has also been discussed

Told him will be assigning to a pending new hire CW to review & issue directive ltr.

Depending on contamination persent ([C], type) it may not necissarily be a barrier to construction, depends on what constructed & how it is constructed. This is something their development needs to consider. Currently only ideas for development no specifics.

## Drogos, Donna, Env. Health

---

**Subject:** RO175 - 6600 Foothill  
**Entry Type:** Phone call  
**Start:** Mon 10/29/2007 11:30 AM  
**End:** Mon 10/29/2007 11:30 AM  
**Duration:** 0 hours

Maud Leblanc, 510-569-8375 & husband Joseph

Maud

plans to develop into senior housing, cannot because contaminated by neighbor sued neighbor, judge declined to rule, said site under oversight of county & needs to follow county process. she wants to know what is next on gas station site.

She stated I had discussed site with her realtor Dominic, no I had not. (left unreturned voice mail for Dominic based on a call he made to RWQCB that was referred to me). made

Discuss site, look over recent reports

majority of plume appears to be across the street, her property (adjacent to site) appears to be at side of plume. some discussion of location of her site, not depicted on maps, MW-4 on her property appears TPH on her property, not benzene what are development plans, type of construction, continuation not necessarily prohibit development depends on what contaminant is, concentration & how they plan to construct. Who is prohibiting their development? Uncertain, they think that they cannot develop, no prepared plans for construction, also some uncertainties about what the final development will actually be, might be something else.

Re development can wait for RP to perform cleanup. Also can undertake cleanup themselves as part of development activities.

Will be assigning a new CW to review, in hiring process, will assign CW then to review. Site needs review & issuance of directive letter to RP & will have new CW do this

Spoke also to Joseph

He is frustrated with city & county. He indicated he was told various things about the site verbally & in letters by county? city?? prohibiting him from developing?? But he did not identify specifics & I was unable to obtain specific information from him. He was dissatisfied by my responses & inquires on this issue, left unresolved.

Attempted to explain possibilities for development, he was dissatisfied with my responses.

Told Him & Maud that I will contact their attorney & discuss the site with him. they were satisfied with this.