

Wickham, Jerry, Env. Health

From: Olivia Jacobs [OJacobs@clearwatergroup.com]
Sent: Friday, November 06, 2009 11:56 AM
To: Shouldice, John
Cc: Wickham, Jerry, Env. Health
Subject: RE: W2009-0988 (628 Second Street, Oakland), Fuel Leak Case RO0002949; T0619758441

Thank you, John.

Nice to meet you, too. Here are all the details.

1. The well installation work has been completed. Each of the 5 planned Soil Vapor wells was installed in the planned location.
2. The SV-5 location is still in the tree well; however, the corner position had already been bored and we encountered a bentonite slug from 1-5 feet bgs. So we moved over about a foot, towards the building, and still in the tree well.
3. Groundwater - see Detail #3 below
4. Negligible gw was encountered.
5. See #5 below.
6. The cuttings were not scattered over the site. They are boxed and stored at the Clearwater yard.

The County permit requires response to the following parameters:

- 1) Backfill bore hole by tremie grout; Contain cuttings *We will abandon the wells after we sample and receive the results back (next week). The cuttings are labeled and are being stored in labeled soil log boxes pending boring log production.*
- 2) Borings to not be left open *The wells are installed in the boreholes.*
- 3) Permittee takes responsibility *Permittee takes responsibility*
- 4) Applicant shall contact John Shouldice upon installation and upon destruction *Installation - Done; Destruction - We will contact James Yoo to schedule an inspection for the well abandonment.*
- 5) Permittee to assure all generated waste is properly handled *No water was encountered within the 5 foot borehole; Soil samples are boxed for review. A composite soil sample will be submitted for analysis and disposal will depend on the outcome of that result.*
- 6) Copy of permit on site *The permit was on site yesterday and will be on site today and during the borehole destruction.*
- 7) USA contact *USA was contacted prior to the event. The boreholes were also screened with a line locator. City encroachment permits were acquired. A Health and Safety plan was prepared for this work. No Traffic plan was produced for this work.*
- 8) No change in the scope *One change in scope has occurred. In the workplan we stated that we would abandon the vapor wells "when no further sampling is required". The completion date will need to be changed on the permit. At this point it is unknown - we will advise as soon as the abandonment is planned. Otherwise the scope of work is not changed. Five vapor wells were proposed to be installed and five vapor wells have been installed to 5 feet bgs according to the well design in the workplan.*
- 9) DWR forms will be submitted when produced - to Alameda County only. They will also be included in the report to ACEH.
- 10) While overcast and very intermittent 'spitting' precipitation was experienced during the well installation (between 1:00 and 4:00 p.m.), the on-site manager (Dan Altwarg) reported 'dry' sidewalks when he inspected the installation work this morning.

We will let you know as soon as the abandonment is scheduled.

Thanks!

Olivia Jacobs
Clearwater Group
510-590-1099

From: Shouldice, John [mailto:johns@acpwa.org]
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2009 3:51 PM
To: Olivia Jacobs
Subject: W2009-0988 (628 Second Street, Oakland)

Olivia:

Nice meeting you. I presume the project was completed following my visit to the site today. To enable us to review the above permit for closure, we would appreciate if you would forward us an e-mail with the following information:

1. Clarify if the work has been completed and, if so, if the work was completed per the county permit requirements.
2. Clarify if there were any revisions in the number and/or location of boreholes (as shown on the issued permit and project site plan). If modifications were made, clarify such modifications and include a revised site plan indicating such. Additional comments may apply.
3. Clarify if groundwater was encountered in any of the borings. If groundwater was encountered, clarify the specific borings involved indicating both the overall boring depth and the depth where the ground water was first encountered.
4. If groundwater was not encountered, clarify the respective boring depths involved. If the amount of groundwater was very limited or difficult to detect (i.e. trace amounts), such can be clarified as negligible.
5. Clarify the status of the cuttings involved; i.e. whether hazardous or non-hazardous and, if remaining on site, that they have been properly stored and labeled per permit requirements.
6. If the cuttings were placed or scattered on site, clarify the nature (hazardous or non-hazardous) of the cuttings including the location where placed.
7. The e-mail subject should include both the permit # and the property address as indicated above.

Please respond at your earliest convenience to facilitate our review of the permit status. In addition, note the following related comments.

- The response to the individual items may be entered following each item as outlined above **provided** the response is **readily identifiable** from the original comments (i.e. response is in bold/color/etc).
- Alternately, the response should be separate from the original comments and be sequentially numbered in conformance with the items as indicated.
- If a specific item is not applicable, simply indicate N/A.

If the site work has not been completed, please advise when the remainder of the work is proposed to be done so that additional site inspections can be coordinated. In addition, clarify if the additional/remaining work is within the existing project permit description or additional work required due to site conditions. Additional comments may apply.

If, due to preparation of necessary related/additional information (boring logs and/or other data), you anticipate a delay in responding to the above comments, please indicate by return e-mail when you expect to provide the requested response sufficient for permit final review by this agency.

Thanks

John Shouldice