

Nowell, Keith, Env. Health

Subject: RO3084- The Salvation Army
Entry Type: Phone call

Start: Mon 11/26/2012 2:10 PM
End: Mon 11/26/2012 2:50 PM
Duration: 40 minutes

RO3084- The Salvation Army, 601 Webster St, Oakland-

Conference call with ATC (consultant) personnel Ms. Jeanne Homsey, PE, and Mr. Michael Sonke, business developer.

The reason for this conversation is to response to the Nov 14 email Mr. Sonke wrote regarding the Alameda County Environmental Health (ACEH) response to the ATC-prepared revised work plan for The Salvation Army site. When I called Mr. Sonke on Nov 15 to review the revised work plan (WP), he stated he had written his email without reviewing the content of the ACEH Directive letter as it related to the revised ATC WP. Mr. Sonke indicated he was not the author of the revised WP, though he was the signee. He also stated that he had “assumed” the items requested in the directive letter were addressed. He admitted the unidentified WP preparer was confused with the term *transect*. No attempt at clarification of the term was made to our office.

On Nov 20, I spoke briefly with Mr. Sonke. He told me he had read the revised WP and that it “addressed all the items” I outlined in our directive letter, including the soil sampling language which he said was taken verbatim from my directive letter. He said he had not reviewed the map for the revised WP.

Q: Why isn't the revised WP author identified in the work plan?

The reason for the presence of the professional stamping the letter-

1. Mr. Sonke thinks the all the items I outlined in our directive letter have been addressed- only two- peristaltic pump and inclusion of PID readings on the bore logs- out of six items.
2. Mr. Sonke issued a letter based only on a review date and did not looking into the content for his email.
3. Mr. Sonke is not a registered professional and appears unqualified to provide comments of a technical nature.

I spoke of developing the site conceptual model (SCM). The locations of the boring, including those along our requested transects, are based on the SCM. As they develop the SCM, they determine the boring locations as well as considering item such as buildings and underground structures. I presented questions to consider in your SCM – how does your selected boring locations fit in with your initial model; how deep is GW and where is the GW gradient; how does BART fit in- they dewater their tunnels; where is the area of the site for the ATC-proposed “reference” values?

I walked through the revised work plan...

Boring locations:

1. Sampling is identified as at 5-foot intervals. Refer to our directive letter outlining several criteria for what affects the sampling interval.
2. Revised WP says first boring will be a “reference” boring (boring location 1*). Who and how has a reference location been determined? Does Ms. Homsey concur with this concept prior to knowing anything of the site?
3. Revised WP says two borings will be at opposite sides of the former tank pit. These are depicted within the former tank pit (boring locations 2 and 3).

4. Fourth boring will be down gradient and allow for a three point "triangulation" with boring locations 2 and 3. What is being triangulated is not identified.

If groundwater (GW) is *triangulated* - What direction is GW?

- A. How is GW direction established? Revised WP does not discuss.
- B. Is the concrete rubble-backfilled tank pit representative of a native condition? Is the tank pit fill engineered? Is the tank pit a bathtub? Revised WP has no discussion of this.
- C. Will the borings be surveyed as piezometers? Revised WP has no mention of this.
- D. How will the piezometers be secured and for how long of a period of time? ? Not discussed in Revised WP.
- E. If GW, then perhaps "triangulation" premature- one well in the UST pit might be better to evaluate sub-pit [] and determine if mounding issues exist.

Scope of analysis-

1. Diesel tanks initial characterizations should include diesel.

Directive letter requested but not addressed:

1. Revised WP does not address transects
2. Revised WP does not address the boring toward 7th St.
3. Revised WP does not have a Site Map figure.
4. Revised WP does not address ACEH- requested sampling at (several criteria identified).... Not on 5-foot intervals.

Just prior to the start of the conference call Mr. Sonke sent out a revised Figure 2. The "Reference" boring is gone, though two borings remain in the tank pit. As there was no text, there was no discussion of "triangulation". The figure *did* have a photo overlay.

I offered to review a draft figure of the proposed relocated boring locations.

Conference Call Outcome-

1. ATC will provide a revised figure showing adjusted boring locations.
2. ATC will modify its language for collection of soil samples.
3. ATC will issue a revised WP addendum