

Detterman, Mark, Env. Health

From: Xinggang Tong [xtong@otgenv.com]
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2009 2:43 PM
To: Detterman, Mark, Env. Health
Subject: RE: status of RO0000267, 3310 Powell St, Emeryville

Hi Mark,

Yes, please send an email or a letter to Mr. Maurice Kaufman, his address and email are:

Mr. Maurice Kaufman
Public Works Director/City Engineer
City of Emeryville
1333 Park Avenue
Emeryville, CA 94608
phone (510)596-4334
email: mkaufman@ci.emeryville.ca.us

Thank you.

--

Xinggang Tong, PhD, PE
Principal
OTG EnviroEngineering Solutions, Inc.
7700 Edgewater Drive, Suite 260
Oakland, CA 94612
(510)465-8982

On Mon, September 21, 2009 2:18 pm, Detterman, Mark, Env. Health wrote:
Hi Xinggang,

Sorry for the delayed response to your last email. ACEH can't approve work scopes as this is the purpose of a work plan. The points of work we have discussed are a reasonable outline for a work plan and can be used towards scoping that work plan, but should not be used as definitive.

Should I also direct this to the City? Let me know who is your contact and their email address. Would it be Maurice Kaufman?
Regards,

Mark Detterman
Hazardous Materials Specialist, PG, CEG
Alameda County Environmental Health
1131 Harbor Bay Parkway
Alameda, CA 94502
Direct: 510.567.6876
Fax: 510.337.9335
Email: mark.detterman@acgov.org

PDF copies of case files can be downloaded at:

<http://www.acgov.org/aceh/lop/ust.htm>

-----Original Message-----

From: Xinggang Tong [mailto:xtong@otgenv.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 25, 2009 1:24 PM
To: Detterman, Mark, Env. Health
Subject: RE: status of RO0000267, 3310 Powell St, Emeryville

Hi Mark,

Thank you for the information. I agree with your points below. Very little investigation was conducted after the original USTs were removed in April 1992, except the installation of monitoring well MW-1 and the initial sampling in April 1993 and then again in September 2008. The State guideline for leaking UST sites requires a series steps of investigation. However, 17 years has passed since the UST removal and many of those investigation steps may be unnecessary by now. Plus, this site is located in a very narrow strip of filled land (only about 300 feet wide). The fill materials are very heterogeneous and appear permeable. (Bricks, metals, wood etc were observed in drill cuttings from WM-1 installation). My sense is that the residual TPH may have been largely attenuated (diluted to sea water) given 17 years of tidal washing and the permeable nature of the fill material.

Can you please issue a letter to the City approving the work scope, plus additional points as you suggested. Thank you.

--

Xinggang Tong, PhD, PE
Principal
OTG EnviroEngineering Solutions, Inc.
7700 Edgewater Drive, Suite 260
Oakland, CA 94612
(510)465-8982

On Tue, August 25, 2009 10:13 am, Detterman, Mark, Env. Health wrote:
Hi Xinggang,

Thanks for the information. I should make two points. It would be a bit difficult for the County to scope investigation tasks without fully understanding the actual depths of the utilities and how they might potentially allow seawater to interact with UST pit water (and any contamination), or how the those depths might allow migration through a series of utilities, if that is happening. Additional bores or locations may be appropriate depending on what is found. That was one reason I suggested you / the city might consider a utility survey and cross sections before specifying bore locations in a work plan. I also note that there are transitions in some utility corridors from underground to aboveground. Those transitions may require investigation as discharge points to the estuary / bay. You might also consider the tidal range and the depth of your soil sample collection from any proposed bore. But I'm not sure those are all the tasks that should be investigated; these are potential tasks I can see with currently incomplete (currently uninvestigated) information.

Secondly and hopefully, this will be the last investigation prior to closure, but as you're aware new information can point to new areas of investigation. This is something we both hope does not happen, but can.

Hope this helps. I'll look forward to a work plan! And as always, should you have questions, just let me know.
Best,

Mark Detterman
Hazardous Materials Specialist, PG, CEG
Alameda County Environmental Health
1131 Harbor Bay Parkway
Alameda, CA 94502
Direct: 510.567.6876
Fax: 510.337.9335
Email: mark.detterman@acgov.org

PDF copies of case files can be downloaded at:

<http://www.acgov.org/aceh/lop/ust.htm>

-----Original Message-----

From: Xinggang Tong [mailto:xtong@otgenv.com]
Sent: Monday, August 24, 2009 5:50 PM
To: Detterman, Mark, Env. Health
Subject: RE: status of RO0000267, 3310 Powell St, Emeryville

Hi Mark,

Thank you for your response. The City's letter (dated May 18, 2009) requested clarification of the tasks (work scope), which were identified in the ACEH's letter (April 28, 2009). A formal work plan will be prepared and submitted to ACEH.

The purpose of the City's letter is to clarify all tasks required by ACEH that will lead to case closure. So, if you see any other potential tasks please spell them out in your letter. The City wants this to be the last round of work before closure.

Thank you,

--

Xinggang Tong, PhD, PE
Principal
OTG EnviroEngineering Solutions, Inc.
7700 Edgewater Drive, Suite 260
Oakland, CA 94612
(510)465-8982

On Mon, August 24, 2009 4:19 pm, Detterman, Mark, Env. Health wrote:

Hi Xinggang,

I was looking at the letter from the City and I'm perhaps a bit confused.

Is the City's letter a work plan or is it requesting a clarification of the work? On page 2 of the City's letter, it states that a consultant will be retained to generate a work plan for the site characterization.

If it is a work clarification document I would find it a reasonable and acceptable first step; however, as a work plan it would not be. If the work plan referenced on page 2 will be generated, that should be signed and stamped, otherwise the letter dated May 18, 2009 does not need to be stamped. All points in the city's letter (utility survey, soil bores, tidal effect survey of well MW-1, wellhead survey, and report), as well as a scaled drawing with proposed bore locations and potentially other items I'm not thinking of, should be included in the workplan with standard work procedures. You may also want to conduct the utility survey and / or cross sections before submitting a work plan. Should it become apparent that utility conduits may be a preferential pathway additional sampling near those utilities might be appropriate. But I will need to leave those decisions with you and the City.

Questions? Let me know.

Best,

Mark Detterman
Hazardous Materials Specialist, PG, CEG
Alameda County Environmental Health
1131 Harbor Bay Parkway
Alameda, CA 94502
Direct: 510.567.6876
Fax: 510.337.9335
Email: mark.detterman@acgov.org

PDF copies of case files can be downloaded at:

<http://www.acgov.org/aceh/lop/ust.htm>

-----Original Message-----

From: Xinggang Tong [mailto:xtong@otgenv.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2009 7:18 PM
To: Detterman, Mark, Env. Health
Subject: RE: status of RO0000267, 3310 Powell St, Emeryville

Hi Mark,

If you approve the City's letter work plan, I'll make sure that an official work plan stamped by a PE or a PG will be submitted to the County.

Thank you for your review of this case.

--

Xinggang Tong, PhD, PE
Principal
OTG EnviroEngineering Solutions, Inc.
7700 Edgewater Drive, Suite 260
Oakland, CA 94612
(510)465-8982

On Wed, August 12, 2009 4:24 pm, Jakub, Barbara, Env. Health wrote:

Xinggang,

I am no longer the case worker for this site. We have a new caseworker working on the Emeryville sites, Mark Detterman, and he will review the work plan. We have been directed by the state board to review every site before we submit directive letters so we are now facing this task along with trying to complete the regular reviews of documents submitted for the sites. I am unable to estimate the time frame in which he will be able to review the work plan.

I do have one concern about the work plan. It is not stamped by a licensed professional. Since Maurice is the RP, I don't believe a perjury letter is necessary but the work plan should be stamped.

Regards,
Barb Jakub

-----Original Message-----

From: Xinggang Tong [mailto:xtong@otgenv.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2009 3:55 PM
To: Jakub, Barbara, Env. Health
Subject: status of RO0000267, 3310 Powell St, Emeryville

Hi Barbara,

For the site located at 3310 Powell St in Emeryville (County fuel leak case #RO0000267), the City of Emeryville sent a letter (dated May 18, 2009) to your attention. The City's letter is a response to your 28 April 2009 letter to the City. The City is eager to move this case forward and to bring it to closure. Please let the City know whether the proposed addition work scope meets the County's requirement.

Regards,

--

Xinggang Tong, PhD, PE
Principal

OTG EnviroEngineering Solutions, Inc.
7700 Edgewater Drive, Suite 260
Oakland, CA 94612
(510)465-8982