Duration: Approximately 20 minutes

Received a call from Mr. Jim Gribi regarding the status of the RFC submitted about 40 days ago. An initial review of the RFC has been performed. I mentioned I had several questions. With regard to the basement-I inquired about the depth and extent of the basement and the raised floor of the structures. Mr. Gribi said the older portion of the structure along 40th street has a basement which was measured to be extending about 8.5 feet below grade. He mentioned the raised loading dock was only about 1.5 to 2 feet above grade as there is a ramp down to the loading to complete the dock height of 3.5- 4 feet. Though the basement slab approaches reported DTW in the monitoring wells, groundwater appears confined so may be deeper, at approx. 18-19 feet.

Mr. Gribi thought collecting soil gas samples at 5 feet below the base of the foundation (in the basement) may encounter groundwater.

I inquired about the basement in the newer portion of the building where the supply well was located. Mr. Gribi indicated that portion of the building floor was at the same level of the older side, but that there was no basement per se, but the well was situated in a sump.

Mr. Gribi & I discussed the bore logs and reported DTW. The clay layer across the site, which extends to a depth of 18-19 feet bgs, appears to act as a confining layer. Thus the discrepancy between the DTW data in the MWs and those found in the soil bores.

We discussed the anomalous grab-groundwater TPHg concentrations in MW-4, as the concentration is not supported by the soil analyses, the adjacent soil gas sample, and other nearby bores. He said he'd look into it.

I mentioned none of the DTW data was uploaded to GeoTracker. I said that, at a minimum, the 2015 data should be submitted. I also requested historic well data also be submitted, especially the data that includes free product thicknesses.

Keith Nowell