

Detterman, Mark, Env. Health

Subject: RO2737_Impulse_Motors
Entry Type: Phone call
Start: Wed 3/27/2013 11:54 AM
End: Wed 3/27/2013 11:54 AM
Duration: 0 hours

Return a second call from Marisa Frain (sp?) in regards to their residential backyard well (returned a 3/19 call on Friday 3/22 as I was out of town). There appears to be confusion in regards to what the County (ACEH) requested in our most recent directive letter. ACEH requested well destruction of “onsite” wells at the former service station, and not of her backyard well. Their well was not requested to be destroyed based on the analytical data which indicates a concentration of 68 ug/l TPHd, and non-detectable TPHg, and BTEX all at standard reporting limits. MTBE or other fuel oxygenates were not tested for in this well as they had been nondetectable onsite over a number of groundwater monitoring and sampling events. When I spoke with Ms. Frain I stated she could keep the well, as is her preference, as ACEH had not requested it be destroyed. I also let her know that because the consultant did not request Silica Gel Cleanup on the TPHd, I suspect, but have no proof, that the concentration also includes diesel breakdown products that have been demonstrated to be of low health risk concern, so in reality the diesel concentration is likely to be less. I also let her know that the RWQCB has set ESLs for the protection of groundwater at 83 ug/l and 68 (or less) is obviously less than that. I stated that I would probably not drink the water if it were my well, but any concentration of diesel that might be there will break down quickly in the surface environment at that concentration (sunlight, microbes, etc.). She reports it is used only for watering the garden and lawn, and was very pleased to hear these options.