Jakub, Barbara, Env. Health

From: Jakub, Barbara, Env. Health
Sent: Monday, November 09, 2009 3:06 PM
To: 'Mehrdad Javaher'
Cc: Jing Heisler
Subject: RE: RO # 0000134, Former Val Strough Chevrolet, 327 34th Street, Oakland, CA

Mehrdad,
I approve of your analyzing the wells one additional time in order to make a decision as to which method is appropriate. Please submit your results and your proposed changes to ACEH to the ftp site in a stamped report with a perjury letter.
Thank you,
Barb Jakub

-----Original Message-----
From: Mehrdad Javaher [mailto:mjavaherian@lrm-consulting.com]
Sent: Monday, November 09, 2009 2:49 PM
To: Jakub, Barbara, Env. Health
Cc: Jing Heisler
Subject: RO # 0000134, Former Val Strough Chevrolet, 327 34th Street, Oakland, CA

Hi Barb-

This email is a follow up to our recent quarterly monitoring report, which included baseline sampling of the two new monitoring wells installed in support of our iSOC pilot test at the above-referenced site. As you may recall, the ACDEH requested installation of two new monitoring wells (one deep and one shallow) approximately 15 feet downgradient of the historical source area slated for interim remediation via iSOC technology. The baseline sampling was conducted during the 3rd quarter 2009 monitoring event, revealing TPH-g concentrations as high as 160,000 ug/L in one of the newly installed observation wells (MW-9A) slated for monitoring as part of the iSOC pilot test. However, since this concentration is measurably higher than that present over the past few years at the source area well (45,000 to 98,000 ug/L of TPH-g in source area well MW-2), we had concerns over the effectiveness of iSOC at such elevated hydrocarbon levels and the use of MW-9A to evaluate the effectiveness of the technology as planned in the addendum to the IRAP.

We have since followed up with the iSOC vendor and from our past experience using this technology, we recommend delaying the start of the iSOC test until we conduct one more round of sampling at MW-9A and MW-2. With the 4th quarter 2009 event scheduled for December, we plan on conducing this sampling at that time and determine whether moving forward with iSCO, rather than the second preferred alternative (chemical oxidation) identified in the approved IRAP, would be best. In short, should the TPH-g concentrations in the MW-2/MW-9A wells be closer to one another and measurably lower than 160,000 ug/L, we believe that moving forward with iSOC technology as previously approved by the ACDEH is appropriate. Alternatively, should the concentrations remain consistent with the 3rd Quarter event and remain in the 150,000 ug/L range at observation well MW-9A, we would recommend submitting an addendum to the IRAP to outline implementation of in-situ chemical oxidation as previously discussed in the approved IRAP.

Please let us know if you have any questions or concerns over this approach. You can reach me, or Jing Heisler, PG, of LRM at 415-706-8935 or via email.

Thanks as always for your help.

Regards,
Mehrdad