

Detterman, Mark, Env. Health

From: Detterman, Mark, Env. Health
Sent: Friday, October 16, 2009 1:20 PM
To: 'kwaldo@closureolutions.com'
Subject: RE: Palace Garage RO#208

Hi Kate,
It was good to talk to you yesterday; we made contact!

In general I think that covered most of the items, although I should note in bore SB-17 the soil sample was also collected what appears to be 3.5 ft below groundwater. While the soil analytical results were reasonably low and the PID response reasonably within the higher range of what was detected in the bore, the collection depth can induce problems with soil delineation. If additional delineation bores are installed downgradient it could be appropriate to mitigate potential downgradient soil delineation issues this induced.

In regards to SB-16, I also noticed that there are some really elevated PID responses (1,221 PID units; but with no odor; huh?) in soil that did not get sampled to confirm either a positive or negative detection. Don't know if it was in the workplan at the time, but it would have been appropriate to sample soil to rule it out (with luck).

Now for some caveats. These observations and the ones we spoke of yesterday were made based on my "Impediments to Closure" review all agencies are mandated to do by the state as a part of Resolution 2009-0042 (my site review is not yet posted). As part of that resolution all agencies need to review ALL sites before ANY letters of request can be issued (unless a health risk [human or environment] or immanent development exist such as stimulus fund money is in jeopardy). All of which is designed to save the USTCF money until that time. As mentioned the resolution gives us to next August, but we are attempting to complete by January-ish, and in my case as a new case worker with a full load of new sites, more likely longer. So to the point, this is not a directive letter or letter of request, but a technical discussion of a site. If a work plan is submitted, once I can start reviewing sites again and issuing letters, and provided the work plan is approved and / or modified, the work would become eligible for reimbursement as a request from the LOP. I also noticed after we hung up that unfortunately this site has yet an additional impediment for reimbursement currently, a suspended LOC.

It definitely makes the current work environment difficult....

Regardless, it was good to talk to you yesterday.
Best,

Mark Detterman
Hazardous Materials Specialist, PG, CEG
Alameda County Environmental Health
1131 Harbor Bay Parkway
Alameda, CA 94502
Direct: 510.567.6876
Fax: 510.337.9335
Email: mark.detterman@acgov.org

PDF copies of case files can be downloaded at:

<http://www.acgov.org/aceh/lop/ust.htm>

From: kwaldo@closureolutions.com [mailto:kwaldo@closureolutions.com]
Sent: Friday, October 16, 2009 9:56 AM
To: Detterman, Mark, Env. Health
Subject: Palace Garage RO#208

Hay Mark,

Thanks for taking the time to chat with me about the Palace Garage site yesterday. As I mentioned, our client is very interested in moving this case toward closure. We talked about the need for a vapor survey and that since there were no groundwater samples collected from SB-17 the downgradient extent of impacted groundwater has not been identified. We also talked about how the survey info has not been uploaded to GeoTracker. The last couple of questions that you had were in regard to the use of the neighboring buildings and the results of the utility survey and how it may relate to the plume shape in the northern portion of the property.

In order to address these data gaps and get this site on the road to closure, Closure Solutions will prepare a work plan to address these issues. The subsequent report will include geologic cross-sections and a recommendation for mitigation or site closure as warranted. Does this sound reasonable and appropriate to move this site toward closure?

Thanks,

Kate

Kathleen Waldo
Project Engineer

Closure Solutions, Inc.
1243 Oak Knoll Drive
Concord, California 94521
Direct: (916) 760-7025
Cell: (916) 213-2058