

Contact Log (997 Grant Ave., S.L.)

- 5/11/97 Realized that Sequoia's analytical results for from Jan '96 onward did not contain original signatures in the copies that were sent to the County, which is something that was agreed upon in 1995, when it was discovered that Chevron had been submitting incorrect analytical results. Contacted Peggy Penner, Sequoia, to compare analytical results.
- 5/20/97 Since Ms. Penner never contacted the County, I contacted Phil Biggs, Chevron, to have him either contact Ms. Penner or submit info to County that could confirm that analytical results submitted from Jan '96 ~~was~~ onward were accurate.
- 5/21/97 Ms. Peggy Penner, Sequoia, 415-364-7600 #156, called re: analytical result comparison (left message)
- 5/21/97 I returned Ms. Penner's call & left message. (Phil Biggs called earlier to say that he contacted Ms. Penner & requested that she call me).
- 5/29/97 Peggy Penner, Sequoia, called to compare galy sample results from Jan '96.
- 5/29/97 Left message for Peggy Penner, Sequoia.
- 5/29/97 Left another message for Peggy Penner requesting that she send copies of her analytical results from the 12/95 sampling event to the present directly to the County for comparison purposes.
- 5/29/97 Called Peggy Penner. She will fax me copies of lab results from 12/95 & on.

PHONE LOG

- 11/14/95 left message for Mark Miller, in response to his request for file search, that he should contact Larry Blazer at DA's office to arrange for mutual protection for file search.
- 11/14/95 Spoke to Larry Blazer re Mr. Miller's file search request
- 11/15/95 Spoke to Mark Miller re additional sites that should be added to review list.
- 11/20/95 left message for Larry Blazer & John Samuelson to update them on COP's review of Chevron files and to discuss the delivery of original ^{of actual} files to DA's office.
- 11/30/95 Spoke to Mark Miller re my review of Oct/Nov '95 Q'tly. According to Mr. Miller, ~~the~~ Well C-3 could not be located for monitoring. The site is not paved & Mr. Miller is guessing that someone may have covered it w/ some debris. I mentioned that since they will eventually have to locate Well C-3 to properly destroy it, they might as well try and locate it now so that we can access it for monitoring. I suggested the use of a geophysical surveying device to locate it. Mr. Miller stated that he would look into it.
- 2/27/96 Most recent Q'tly report still shows that Well C-3 could not be found. I left message for Mark Miller inquiring about whether they attempted to use a geophysical survey to locate well.

7/3/95

Received message from Mark Miller on status of site. Currently Chevron is trying to figure out which set of lab analysis is correct for Well C-2. Chevron will then put together RA for site using residential scenario. This case should be resolved in one wk or so.

9/27/95

Mr. Miller stated that Chevron has some preliminary conclusions/ findings on the reasons behind the ~~single~~ inaccurate lab results. Is waiting to hear back from their legal dept. before presenting to County.

10/3/94

Mark Miller again stated that he felt no further study monitoring was required at site & requested that I run the site by Scott Seery & Kevin Brown. I did run it by Scott S. and he concurred that additional quarterly monitoring and gradient determinations would be required. I relayed this info to Mark Miller & he stated that Chevron would go ahead w/ plans to conduct two additional quarterly monitoring wells.

997 Grant

8/25/94

- Why weren't soil samples collected from 11.5' bgs, where soil contamination was identified in past? Was it due to the fact that water table was shallower?
- Was it confirmed whether water is semi-confined?
 - Should continue to sample well c-6. Will this well need to be destroyed for construction in Spring?
 - If not semi-confined, what is new gradient determination?
 - When will report documenting work be submitted?

Meeting

8/29/94

- Additional glycol events in c-6 + c-5.
(Will talk to property owner + buyer) re timeframe ^{for} construction
- If levels in c-6 remain ~ same w/in next two quarters, can close case

9/13/94

Mr. Miller called to request no further monitoring at site. According to him, continued monitoring will pose problems for property owner in selling property. I stated that one or two additional quarters of ^{addit} monitoring should be conducted on Wells c-6 + c-5 to confirm that benzene levels will remain below MCL.

9/14/94

Spoke to Mr. Bauman on the phone regarding addit. monitoring.

Chevron
997 Grant
S. Lorenzo

4/29/94

MEMO to file

I spoke w/ Larry Cogan, attorney for property owner, regarding case closure request status, UST closure and investigation history, and the issues I previously discussed with Chevron's Mark Miller on 4/25/94. These topics are memorialized in a "memo to file" of the same date.

SLS

Chevron
997 Grant Ave
S. Lorenzo

4/25/94

MEMO TO FILE:

I spoke w/ Mark Miller (Chevron) regarding the following issues:

① Depth to water (DTW) reported for wells installed on-site (C-1 → C-4) are significantly different than the DTW reported for off-site ~~well~~ well C-5. DTW for C-1, -2, -3, -4 was ~ 17-19' BG; DTW for well C-5 was ~ 8.5' BG. These data are from boring logs for initial DTW observed during drilling. Stabilized historical water levels between all wells, whether on- or off-site, have been comparable, leading the reader to believe all are monitoring the same zone. GW stabilized between 11.0-12.5' BG in wells C-1, -2, -3, -4.

[The highest soil contaminant levels observed in borings C-2, -3, and 4 are in the 9.0-10.5' BG range.]

∴ Are wells screened appropriately??

(Apparent) GW encountered @ the ~ 11' BG depth in UST pit. ["Sheen" was observed upon puddles in pit bottom and moisture on bottom soils.]

② Bottom sample results have not been submitted to document results of overexcavation sampling @ reported 14.5' BG depth.

③ Additional boring(s) may be needed to: 1) verify depth to 1st GW; and, 2) extent soil contamination levels at base of UST pit

Solution?

Phone Conversation

11/3/92

From: Larry Cogan, attorney for
property owner
(415) 328-6561

To: Juliet Shin

RE: 997 Grant Ave., San Lorenzo

Mr. Cogan was calling to find out whether Chevron submitted a work plan like they said they would in an Oct 6 1992 letter. Ms. Shin stated that they did not.

Mr. Cogan requested that the County place them on a timetable. Ms. Shin stated that she would remain on top of it oversight for Chevron's compliance.

Ms. Shin stated that she would give Chevron a week, after the work plan due date of Oct 30, '92, to submit the plan.

STIS 775
Chevron - 99 Grant Ave, S. Lorenzo

memo to file:

3-18-92

I spoke to Beth Castleberry of Wave + Freidenrich today. Her firm represents the property owner. Chevron has been investigating an UST leak at the site since ~1990, but not on any consistent basis. The property ^{owner} is concerned that Chevron is not doing their best to evaluate the extent of the problem.

The property owner has since hired their own consultant to evaluate the work of Chevron's. A report of their findings will be sent to us.

Ms. Castleberry inquired whether Chevron had sent the requested (Dec. 31, 1991 - P.E.) work plan for the installation of additional wells. I told her that, instead of a work plan, Chevron requested an extension until May 15, 1992 for this submittal, because they wanted to evaluate the GW gradient an additional quarter before installing more wells. This request was in a letter dated January 27, 1992.

~~It~~

A copy of this letter was FAXed to Ms. Castleberry.

SOS

8/12/91

997 Grant - Chevron

Nancy said that wells were installed + sampled 12/90 - low levels found in GW. Have not been sampled since because of stockpiles sitting on them. Expect to have access to wells by early Sept - Results to us by 10/1/91.

JE

IMPORTANT MESSAGE

FOR Tom
DATE 01-10-90 TIME 12:20 A.M.
M JEFF MONROE
OF GETTLER RYAN
PHONE 783-7500 (?)
AREA CODE NUMBER EXTENSION

TELEPHONED	PLEASE CALL
CAME TO SEE YOU	WILL CALL AGAIN
WANTS TO SEE YOU	RUSH
RETURNED YOUR CALL	SPECIAL ATTENTION

MESSAGE 997 Grant Ave.
ENGINEER R N doubt
of what they want &
do so he is holding off
sending u info.
over excavation - using field camp
equipment now. Not for
lab analysis yet (1/6/91)
SIGNED _____
LITHO IN U.S.A.

IMPORTANT MESSAGE

FOR P.E. re: site 775
DATE 2/13 TIME 10:15 A.M.
M Sal Germanas
OF McLaren-Hart
PHONE 748-5628
AREA CODE NUMBER EXTENSION

TELEPHONED	PLEASE CALL
CAME TO SEE YOU	WILL CALL AGAIN
WANTS TO SEE YOU	RUSH
RETURNED YOUR CALL	SPECIAL ATTENTION

MESSAGE voice mail 2/13/92 - he called
2 sites - previously inv. by other
consultants.
San Lorenzo - 997 Grant - Chevron
will Alaco req. further work? Yes
don't ? on an Oakland site
SIGNED w/USTS - 50 TPH (?) heating
LITHO IN U.S.A. oil -

NOTES

Jeff Monroe w/
Gettler-Ryan
backfilling of 5. pipe trenches with
ND stockpiled soil - OK?
T said - for over lab reports summary
including diagram of site + stockpile
map - all look it over - call
back. Give caveats:

- Need official lab results
- ND soil could be contaminated if trenches are dirty
- May have to be dug up
- Keep close track of piles

FR Tom
DATE Feb 5 TIME 8:40 A.M.
M John Barber
PHONE 949-0172
AREA CODE NUMBER EXTENSION

TELEPHONED	PLEASE CALL
CAME TO SEE YOU	WILL CALL AGAIN
WANTS TO SEE YOU	RUSH
RETURNED YOUR CALL	SPECIAL ATTENTION

MESSAGE _____

