

2/13/92

10: - 11:50

meeting w/ Tom Moffatt, Vorelco, and Sue Wickham & Burt Miller
w/ ESTE.

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the potential offsite chlorinated problem. The representative from the property owner and the consultant feel that enough evidence exists from mw-5 that the source of the chlorinated problem appears to be coming from upgradient.

They requested me to pursue possible offsite migration from an offsite source. I requested that they provide me with a work plan proposing to determine the zero line of both the chlorinated and the petroleum problem.

They wanted to know if hydroprobe would suffice to survey groundwater. I told them I would check w/ Eddy So.

A concern was expressed by Tom Moffatt that they didn't want to treat the chlorinated problem for fear that they would pull who knows how much upgradient contamination from offsite.

Discussion re: a vapor extraction system to deal with the pollutants if/when the source of the chlorinated problem could be identified.

Vorelco, Tom Moffatt said that from past experience it was not feasible to seek/obtain compensation legally from the perpetrator of the pollution (because it was too big of a hassle).

① Ask Eddy about Hydroponch to confirm or dispute groundwater problem. This info will be used to illicit work from adjacent property owners

ibrogen motors mw's data - check on halocarbon data

Eddy's Comments:

- 1 - inconsistent gradient
- 2 - Hydroponch manufacturer get opinion
- 3 - prove no onsite sources -
- 4 - 826s Cyogenic focusing