

## Schultz, Robert, Env. Health

---

**Subject:** Robert FloryAEI  
**Entry Type:** Phone call

**Start:** Fri 11/19/2004 11:45 AM  
**End:** Fri 11/19/2004 11:45 AM  
**Duration:** 0 hours

1075 40th St.  
Oakland  
fidelity roof site

site transferred to me  
pilot study awhile back, he wants to make sure we have study and wants confirmation

925-944-2899 x122

Fidelity Roof  
1075 - 40th  
Oakland

page 1 of 2

12-16-98

memo to file:

I spoke yesterday with Peter McIntyre (All Env. Inc.) regarding issues and concerns with data validity for sample analyses performed by Sun Star Laboratories. I fixed a copy of notes I made while reviewing the lab data. My close scrutiny of these data was prompted by the reporting from Sun Star that all target compounds were "ND." This was the case even for samples collected from boring SB-1, located within 20' of the enlarged UST pit. Historically, up to 29,000 ug/L TPH-C and 5600 ug/L benzene have been detected in groundwater sampled at this site.

Further concern was caused by a "split" sample collected from SB-1. Because of slow recharge into this borehole, insufficient water reportedly entered the hole such that only VOA's for TPH-C/BTEX analysis could be collected the day of drilling. These, along with all samples collected from remaining borings, were submitted to Sun Star. All of these were reported as "ND."

The following day a 1 liter bottle was filled with water sampled from SB-1 and submitted to McCampbell Analytical for analysis. This sample showed 2400 ug/L TPH-D. Footnotes in the lab report indicate: 1) gasoline range compounds are significant, among other comments. Hence, it was expected that Sun Star's data would also reflect this.

Fidelity Roof  
1075 40th St.  
Oakland

page 2 of 2

12.16.98

Other issues:

- 1) The chain-of-custody is not signed by the lab (Sun Star)
- 2) Condition of samples upon receipt by lab is not indicated
- 3) Holding times were exceeded in several cases
- 4) Sample preservation is unknown
- 5) According to Sun Star's lab director, the initial sample runs were "unacceptable" to AEL, and were rerun days later. How samples were handled, stored, or processed is unknown during the interim between GC runs.

~~SOS~~  
SOS

12/16/98

I spoke today with Sun Star's lab owner (?) re: these issues. I requested he provide clarification to any issues relating to his lab's handling, storage, and c.o.c. issues.

SOS

Review notes

12/14/98

- ① Holding times for TPH-D exceed 7 days (9 days) - took two days to get to lab
- ② All Sun Star Laboratories samples were N.D., even TPH-E in SB-1 (which showed 2400 ppb for TPH-D)
- ③ preservation in samples? ("wet ice")
- ④ was water collected from SB-1 on 11/3 or 11/4? <sup>both</sup>
- ⑤ condition of samples received by Sun Star?
- ⑥ C.O.C do not show. Lab's receipt ~~was indicated~~

Sun Star Laboratories 12/14/98

certified? 2250

TPH-G/D  
TRPH  
8020 BTEX

Fidelity Roof  
1075 40th St  
Oakland

MEMO to file:

5/21/98

Site visit today to observe locations/orientations of potential off-site receptor populations. Residential neighborhood essentially encapsulates the site to the west and south across Yerba Buena Ave.

~~205~~

Fidelity Roof  
1075 40th St.  
Oakland

5/20/98

MEMO to file:

I spoke today w/ Jennifer Pucci (All FNU.) re:  
work plan status. She said she had not been able  
to contact w/ Mr. Upsilon, but will again try. She'll  
keep me apprised.

SJS

Fidelity Roofing  
1075-40th  
Oakland

1-6-98

MEMO to file

Barney Chan and I reviewed the QA/QC data submitted by Sun Star Labs. ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ in the ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~, particularly with respect to our comparison of extraction logs with the quantification reports. In many cases, in fact, most cases, the indicated date of extraction was after the date of quantification (e.g., 11/9 and 11/10/98, respectively). At best, this represents in our view to be poor record keeping, and appears to reflect overall on the integrity of all data generated by this lab for this project.

Peter McIntyre (AEI) informed me today that the initial detection limit for TTH-D (TCH) analysis was 500ug/l. This limit was unacceptable to AEI, and they requested a rerun of the samples w/ a lower detection limit. Sun Star reportedly did this. The question remains, though, just why such reportedly "clean" samples had such a high initial limit? He suggested that there may have been so much background "noise" that a high reporting limit was necessary to <sup>cover</sup> over it. This indicates, if true, that the GC was likely contaminated, ~~not~~ and not properly maintained.

SOS

Shore Log #3341

3/6/97

Returned call to Brian w/all Env. (831-5983 pager)

They are drilling wells today - all day

Called again to ask if ok to drill to 20 ft. Have ok

He encountered 2 9' logs