

Jurek, Anne, Env. Health

From: Ella Mitchell <emitchell@midpen-housing.org>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2017 8:42 AM
To: Roe, Dilan, Env. Health; Jurek, Anne, Env. Health
Cc: Apolonio Munoz; Ian Sutherland; Allyson Ujimori
Subject: RE: ACEH Correspondence RO3179

Hi Anne and Dilan,

My name is Ella, and I am the new project associate on Chestnut Square, as Allyson has moved to a new role here at MidPen.

Have you been able to review the draft work plan? We would like to keep the project moving forward as we aim to start construction before the end of the year.

Thanks for your help!

Best,
Ella

Ella Mitchell | Project Associate

MidPen Housing Corp.

East Bay Development Office

1970 Broadway, Suite 440, Oakland, CA 94612

t. 510.380.8922



From: Roe, Dilan, Env. Health [mailto:Dilan.Roe@acgov.org]
Sent: Thursday, April 13, 2017 12:31 PM
To: Allyson Ujimori <aujimori@midpen-housing.org>
Cc: Apolonio Munoz <amunoz@midpen-housing.org>; Ian Sutherland <isutherland@accenv.com>; Jurek, Anne, Env. Health <Anne.Jurek@acgov.org>
Subject: RE: ACEH Correspondence RO3179

Hi Allyson:

We will try to review the work plan within the next two weeks.

Dilan

From: Allyson Ujimori [mailto:aujimori@midpen-housing.org]
Sent: Thursday, April 13, 2017 10:28 AM
To: Jurek, Anne, Env. Health <Anne.Jurek@acgov.org>; Roe, Dilan, Env. Health <Dilan.Roe@acgov.org>
Cc: Apolonio Munoz <amunoz@midpen-housing.org>; Ian Sutherland <isutherland@accenv.com>
Subject: RE: ACEH Correspondence RO3179

Hi Dilan & Anne,

I left a message for Anne earlier this week and have not heard back. Can you please give us an update with regards to the Chestnut Square project in Livermore?

We are eager to get things going so that we can meet our anticipated construction start date at the end of this year.

Thank you for your time,
Allyson

From: Allyson Ujimori
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 8:00 AM
To: Jurek, Anne, Env. Health; 'Dilan.Roe@acgov.org'
Cc: Apolonio Munoz; 'Ian Sutherland'
Subject: RE: ACEH Correspondence RO3179

Good Morning Anne & Dilan,

I spoke with Anne last week and wanted to follow-up to see if you are still planning to review the Chestnut Square draft work plan (see attached).

To reiterate our discussion last week, we are hoping to start construction by the end of the year and are aiming to keep the project moving forward.

Thank you for your time,
Allyson

From: Ian Sutherland [<mailto:isutherland@accenv.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2017 11:17 AM
To: Jurek, Anne, Env. Health
Cc: Apolonio Munoz; Allyson Ujimori
Subject: Re: ACEH Correspondence RO3179

Good afternoon Anne,

Attached please find the Draft Work Plan for 1625 Chestnut Street, Livermore in response to ACDEH correspondence dated October 24, 2016. It's been a while since we last corresponded, have you had a chance to review the email I sent last November (please see below)? At the discretion of ACDEH we'd like to adjust the attached Draft Work Plan in order to reflect the comments below. We appreciate your input on this matter, please let me know if you have any questions or would like to discuss.

Thanks

Ian Sutherland, PG
Project Manager
ACC Environmental Consultants
7977 Capwell Drive, Suite 100
Oakland, California 94621

Office: 510.638.8400 x110
Cell: 510.773.0752
Fax: 510.638.8404

On Tue, Nov 29, 2016 at 12:56 PM, Ian Sutherland <isutherland@accenv.com> wrote:

Good afternoon Anne,

Hope you had a nice Thanksgiving. I just have a couple questions regarding the draft work plan for 1625 Chestnut Street. The October 24, 2016 ACEH letter requesting a draft work plan notes that samples collected from 0-5 ft bgs were not analyzed for naphthalene. Please see the attached Table 4 indicating that URS samples between 0 and 5 ft bgs in the vicinity of the former gas station were analyzed for naphthalene and other PNAs. I additionally attached the updated Table 3, which has been revised to show the correct reporting limits for MBTEX. ACC's opinion is that the 0 to 5 ft bgs range in the vicinity of the former gasoline service station has been sufficiently characterized for TPH-g/-d/-mo, MBTEX and PNAs. Based on available data, URS did not use silica gel cleanup for TPH analyses, so we already have conservative TPH concentrations. In an effort to lessen analytical costs we respectfully request that ACEH consider whether additional characterization is required in the 0 to 5 ft bgs range in the area of the former gasoline service station.

ACC agrees that additional sampling from 5 to 10 ft bgs at the location of the former gasoline service station is warranted. In an effort to minimize analytical costs, would it be acceptable to analyze all TPH samples (including other areas of the Site) without silica gel cleanup and half of those with silica gel cleanup (or vice versa)?

The ACEH letter requests that a soil vapor sample be collected at the base of the proposed elevator shaft as well as at locations where BTEX was detected in soil and groundwater. Although minor concentrations of BTEX were detected in soil vapor, BTEX has not been detected in soil or groundwater at the site. At this point it looks like we'd be collecting only one soil vapor sample at the base of the elevator shaft. Are any soil vapor sample duplicates warranted for one sample? Is that a location where we'd want to consider multiple depths?

Thank you for your assistance, we appreciate your feedback.

Ian Sutherland, PG
Project Manager
ACC Environmental Consultants
7977 Capwell Drive, Suite 100
Oakland, California 94621

Office: [510.638.8400](tel:510.638.8400) x110

Cell: [510.773.0752](tel:510.773.0752)

Fax: [510.638.8404](tel:510.638.8404)

On Tue, Oct 25, 2016 at 8:28 AM, dehloptoxic, Env. Health <deh.loptoxic@acgov.org> wrote:

Dear Interested Parties,

Attached is Alameda County Environmental Health's (ACEH) correspondence for your case, RO0003179

Please add our email address to your book to prevent future e-mails from being filtered as spam.

Sincerely,

ACEH