

4/4/91

Meeting with John Groh of Scott Co.

Matt Shier, attorney for former owner

Christine Noma, attorney for tenant (assuming responsibility)

Kenneth Franey, attorney for ?

Discussing expedited closure of case;

Their argument

- 1) 3 wells on site now, GW data shows no problem
- 2) Over a year has passed since tank pull.
- 3) Bankruptcy proceedings require a tie case be closed before all legal matters can be finalized
- 4) Tidally influenced area, no plume migration concerns.

My Response:

- 1) Tidal influence not particularly significant as 3 wells present on site.
- 2) Over a year has passed but only 1 data point to show.
- 3) Over oversight, closure process is not set up to consider bankruptcy or other property related matters.

I have no basic objection for closing this case. There does not seem to be a ground water problem now and slight potential for one in the future (only TOC concern)

natrium in soil \approx 400 ppm.

I recommended that they conduct the quarterly monitoring currently due. I would discuss the case with the Board during next workers meeting to see what, if any, objections they would have to considering the case for closure without 4 quarterly samples. If not, I will consider signing off the case if the next round of sampling supports the first, indicating no ground water problem exists.