

## Detterman, Mark, Env. Health

---

**From:** Detterman, Mark, Env. Health  
**Sent:** Monday, September 21, 2009 3:52 PM  
**To:** 'mkaufman@ci.emeryville.ca.us'; 'mniebanck@ci.emeryville.ca.us'  
**Cc:** 'Xinggang Tong'  
**Subject:** RO267; 3310 Powell St Emeryville

Mr. Kaufman,

Xinggang Tong and I have been corresponding for a bit of time in regards to your May 18, 2009 letter seeking clarification on a scope of work for the site. I have included a fragment of the pertinent sections below. I am also forwarding this email to Marcus Niebanck as I understand he may be of some assistance in scoping the project. The items in your letter are reasonable starting point; however, additional reasonable tasks can be identified (see below) to give a more comprehensive understanding of the site. Additional reasonable tasks may also exist that a consultant familiar with case information might propose than my quick review of the file allows. If you could have your consultant submit a work plan it will be appreciated.

Best 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](mailto: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 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](mailto: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](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](mailto:mark.detterman@acgov.org)

PDF copies of case files can be downloaded at:

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