

Wickham, Jerry, Env. Health

From: Wickham, Jerry, Env. Health
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2011 3:26 PM
To: 'Jacob_Henry@URSCorp.com'
Cc: KTourloukis@chevron.com; Rachel_Naccarati@URSCorp.com; Drogos, Donna, Env. Health
Subject: RE: Sunol Spill Site

Jacob,

- 1) Your summary of our discussions of cleanup goals during the meeting is limited and therefore, lacks context. Some of the subtle but important points got left out. Therefore, I don't think it is a good starting point. I will try to explain this more clearly. Here in the words of the State Water Resources Control Board, is the level of water quality to be obtained:

State Water Board [Resolution 92-49](#), *Policies and Procedures for Investigation and Cleanup and Abatement of Discharges Under Water Code Section 13304* is a state policy for water quality control. State Water Board Resolution 92-49 directs that water affected by an unauthorized release attain either background water quality or the best water quality that is reasonable if background water quality cannot be restored. (State Water Board Resolution 92-49, Section III.G.) Any alternative level of water quality less stringent than background must be consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the state, not unreasonably affect current and anticipated beneficial use of affected water, and not result in water quality less than that prescribed in the water quality control plan for the basin within which the site is located. (*Ibid.*) Resolution 92-49 does not require, however, that the requisite level of water quality be met at the time of site closure. Resolution No. 92-49 specifies compliance with cleanup goals and objectives within a reasonable time frame. (*Id.* at section III.A.) Therefore, even if the requisite level of water quality has not yet been attained, a site may be closed if the level will be attained within a reasonable period.

Regional Water Boards adopt Regional Water Quality Control Plans (Basin Plans) for their respective regions and Basin Plans are approved by the State Water Board. Basin Plans include beneficial uses of water for the applicable region and water quality objectives to protect specific beneficial uses of water. Each Case Closure Summary identifies relevant beneficial uses and water quality objectives from the applicable Basin Plan.

- 2) Groundwater at your site has a beneficial use as a source of municipal and domestic water supply. THAT WILL NOT CHANGE. Your cleanup goals must apply for that beneficial use, ie. – “not result in water quality less than that prescribed in the water quality control plan for the basin within which the site is located.” However, the next phrase indicates that you don't need to get to drinking water levels at the time of closure if water quality will be attained with a reasonable period. You may consider a variety of site-specific factors in determining a reasonable period of time. Will a site reach water quality goals sooner (within a reasonable time) if you remove the source?
- 3) I will not be providing a letter such as you requested. You need to apply the above and propose your own goals.
- 4) It does not appear that you need a letter from me to prepare a work plan for data gaps. Your email in on way relieves your client from submitting the requested work plan.

Regards,

Jerry Wickham

Alameda County Environmental Health

1131 Harbor Bay Parkway

Alameda, CA 94502-6577

phone: 510-567-6791

From: Jacob_Henry@URSCorp.com [mailto:Jacob_Henry@URSCorp.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2011 12:51 PM
To: Wickham, Jerry, Env. Health
Cc: KTourloukis@chevron.com; Rachel_Naccarati@URSCorp.com
Subject: Sunol Spill Site

Jerry,

First, I should have sent a confirmatory email to you after our meeting in January. As you recall, we discussed the CSM and ultimately, you agreed that GW was unlikely to be used as a domestic/municipal supply and that your main concern was the hillside source. Furthermore, you indicated that you wanted the hillside source removed and a decline in the GW concentrations in MW-8 (eastern side of Calaveras) before beginning the site closure process. Please confirm this or provide your interpretation in a letter to CPL.

CPL and URS need a goal to work towards that is mutually beneficial for all parties. Can you please provide, in a letter, your recommended soil and groundwater concentration goals for site closure. If you truly just want to see a decreasing trend in MW-8 GW concentrations, please indicate the magnitude of the decrease. Establishment of a reachable goal that is feasible, for short/long term resource protection, is of the utmost importance to CPL and URS.

CPL and URS will await your letter to develop an appropriate plan of action. Therefore, no WP will be submitted until this plan of action can be developed.

Thank you

Jacob T. Henry, P.G.
Senior Geologist
URS Corporation
1333 Broadway, Suite 800
Oakland, CA 94612-1924
Office: 510-874-3252
Cell: 510-926-0464
Fax: 510-874-3268
jacob_henry@urscorp.com

This e-mail and any attachments contain URS Corporation confidential information that may be proprietary or privileged. If you receive this message in error or are not the intended recipient, you should not retain, distribute, disclose or use any of this information and you should destroy the e-mail and any attachments or copies.