Drogos, Donna, Env. Health

Subject: RO80 - 203 2nd -CLOSED CASE
Entry Type: Phone call

Start: Thu 11/18/2004 2:54 PM
End: Thu 11/18/2004 2:54 PM
Duration: 0 hours

RO80 - 203 2nd -CLOSED CASE
11/18/04, Rob Brown, 206 2nd st, 415-284-1200, file review
--> fwd to roseanna

Drogos, Donna, Env. Health

Subject: RO80 - 203 2nd -CLOSED CASE
Entry Type: Phone call

Start: Fri 10/22/2004 12:15 PM
End: Fri 10/22/2004 12:15 PM
Duration: 0 hours

10/22/04, 1214p, rob brown, copy of clearance? Fax 284-1200 --> fwd to Roseanna for file review

Drogos, Donna, Env. Health

Subject: RO80- 206 2nd - closed case
Entry Type: Phone call

Start: Thu 10/21/2004 3:30 PM
End: Thu 10/21/2004 3:30 PM
Duration: 0 hours

RO80- 206 2nd - closed case
10/19/04, 246p, rob brown, 206 2nd st , oakalnd, UST clearance 415-284-1200
10/21/04, l lft msg, yes closed in 2002

Drogos, Donna, Env. Health

Subject: RO80- 206 2nd - closed case
Entry Type: Phone call

Start: Fri 10/8/2004 2:30 PM
End: Fri 10/8/2004 2:30 PM
Duration: 0 hours

10/08/04, 937a, heather, city of oakland, 200-206 2nd st, USTs w/approval frm ACEH for investigation, USTs removed, 238-3659
10/08/04, 235p, lft msg

5-2-2000 Spoke to Bill McCartney with Scott Co. @ 510-895-2333 and asked him to send me another copy of the Scott report "Analytical Results for 1 Water Sample and 7 Soil Samples" dated 9-9-96

895 - 2333
Paul Ferreira : Scott Co
Miller Meat (Trucking)

11:30 Joes (1 Tank).

---

call Madhulla to Confirm

- 201 2nd St. - Check needed
  mail receipt
- Will have Form A for 201 2nd St.
- Same property owner for both sites

Questions
Risk Assessment dated February 3, 1997
718 San Pablo Ave., Albany
March 19, 1997

(Answers by Meg Mendoza, SCI, per conversation on March 20, 1997)

Q: The site used GSI software, however, the geomean is not acceptable for lognormal distributions per RAGS.

A: Ms. Mendoza did use the geomean, however, in her review of the Gilbert Statistics book, she stated that it was reasonable. She will submit a copy of the equations she utilized and some rationale as to why she feels the application of the geomean was reasonable.

Q: On Table 3, the SSTL value listed for benzene does not match the value listed on Worksheet 9.2.

A: That is because the SSTL value on Table 3 was multiplied by a factor of 0.29 to adjust for CAL EPA standards.

Q: How did they obtain the Mean On-Site Concentrations and UCLs listed on Table 3?

A: The mean is the geomean. Ms. Mendoza will submit the equations she used to calculate the mean as well as the UCL values.

Q: Why was the vadose zone thickness and DTW parameters noted as 300cm(~10feet), when the most recent quarterly samping event noted DTW to be at ~6.8feet bgs.

A: Ms. Mendoza will go ahead and change these parameters to 6.8 feet bgs.

Q: Why was Lsubs value given as 5 feet when the depths of contaminated soil samples ranged between 5-feet and 14-feet bgs, which would give a Lsubs value of 9 feet.

A: It is Ms. Mendoza's understanding that you can only look at soil samples above the water table. Since the deepest water table has been ~10-feet bgs, the thickness of contaminated soil is only from 5 feet to 10-feet bgs.

Q: SCI needs to provide rationale for how they obtained the values for the length of affected soil parallel to wind and the contaminated soil area.

A: Ms. Mendoza will submit this rationale.

Q: What is the site zoned for?

A: Ms. Mendoza will check and get back to me.

Comments:

- Although groundwater parameters and scenarios for construction workers being exposed to ingestion and inhalation were given in Output Table 1, SCI is apparently only looking at soil pathways and assuming that the site will always be paved.
  What does "definition of surficial soils"(Lss) stand for?

Questions for Madhulla:

- Under "Matrix of Target Risks", what does Option 1 mean?
- Check again to see what Class C risk represents.
- What is adjusted soil ingestion rate and adjusted dermal area?
  -Adjusted soil ingestion and dermal area means that they've brought the values for both adults and children together.

- Why was the skin surface area of 5800 used over ASTM's value of 3160?
- Why was a Soil to Skin adherence factor of 1 used instead of the 0.5 value given in ASTM?