

Environmental Management & Engineering, Inc.

437 Industrial Lane Post Office Box 19866 Birmingham, AL 35219

March 21, 1997

(205) 940-7700 Fax (205) 940-7701

VIA AIRBORNE EXPRESS

Ms. Susan L. Hugo Senior Hazardous Materials Specialist Alameda County Health Care Services Agency Department of Environmental Health 1131 Harbor Bay Parkway Alameda, CA 94502-6577

RE:

Grove Valve and Regulator Company, Emeryville, CA

Groundwater Monitoring Program

DRS-95-E942

Dear Ms. Hugo:

Thank you for your time and assistance during our telephone conversation of March 19, 1997 regarding our request on behalf of Grove Valve and Regulator Company to reduce the sampling frequency from a quarterly to annual basis for a period of two years, followed by an assessment of the need for continued sampling. As we discussed, EME conducted an unrelated investigation of two machine sumps in the main shop area of the plant at the request of Mr. Brian Oliva of your department in December of 1996. Although this investigation was targeted on possible Total Oil and Grease contamination, one soil sample from the impacted soil was analyzed for Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC's). The laboratory analysis revealed no detectable concentrations of VOC's. This provides additional evidence indicating that the Trichloroethane (TCE) which has been detected in the groundwater is a migrating plume from an off-site service.

As you requested, the following documents regarding the sump investigations are submitted in support of our pending request for a reduction of the required groundwater monitoring frequency from a quarterly to annual basis.

- EME correspondence to the Alameda County Department of Environmental Health (ACDEH) dated July 2, 1996 entitled "Sump Analytical Report". This letter report summarizes the initial soil sampling associated with the sump investigation.
- EME report entitled "Updated Facility Closure Activity" dated December 27, 1996. This report summarizes the follow-up water sampling activities in the sump area as requested by the ACDEH.
- EME correspondence to the ACDEH dated February 13, 1997. documents the telephone conversation of January 29, 1997 in which Mr. Brian Oliva (ACDEH) relays the decision that no further action is required in relation to the sump area.

Specialist in Environmental, Engineering, and Related Business Services

Environmental Management & Engineering, Inc.

Ms. Susan L. Hugo Alameda County Health Care Services Agency March 21, 1997 Page 2

We hope this information proves helpful to your assessment of our request. Please let us know if you have any questions or require further information. We very much appreciate your assistance with this project.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Sincerely,

Kevin Holloran

Manager, Technical Services

3- Hel-

KH/jjf

cc: Mr. Lee DeNooyer (w/o attachments)

Mr. Bill Tallent (w/o attachments)

ATTACHMENT 1 -- EME Correspondence to Alameda County Department of Environmental Health dated July 2, 1996



Environmental Management & Engineering, Inc

437 Industrial Lane Post Office Box 19866 Birmingham, AL 35219 (205) 940-7700 Fax (205) 940-7701

July 2, 1996

Mr. Brian Oliva Senior Hazardous Materials Specialist Division of Environmental Protection Department of Environmental Health 1131 Harbor Bay Parkway, 2nd Floor Alameda CA 94502

RE: Grove Valve and Regulator Company, Emeryville, California

Sump Analytical Report

DRS-95-E942

Dear Mr. Oliva:

As you are aware, on May 21, 1996, Environmental Management & Engineering, Inc. (EME) collected soil samples associated with two (2) machine sumps located at the Grove Valve and Regulator Company facility in Emeryville, California.

The machine sumps in question were constructed of steel and were an integral part of shallow one-piece pans on which machine tools were located. The sump portion of the pan was approximately 18 x 18 x 12 inches in size. When the pans were installed, a hole was cut through the concrete pad to allow the sump to be recessed into the floor. When the pan/sump was removed, free product (primarily cutting oils) was noted on the underlying soils in one of the sumps. This free product was removed and included with other waste oil to await subsequent proper disposal. The pan/sump has been inspected and water tested and determined to be sound with no apparent leaks, therefore, it appears that the source of the contamination was incidental spillage and overfilling of the machine, resulting in overflow of the pan in the area of the sump.

Sampling was conducted using a stainless steel hand auger. At the first machine sump, a hand auger boring (Boring M-1) was advanced to a depth of 10 feet, at which depth groundwater was encountered. Soil samples were collected at depths of 4, 6, 8 and 10 feet. This was the boring observed by you during your visit. In addition, soil samples at the second machine sump location (Boring M-2) were collected from the underlying fill material at depths of 2 and 4 feet. A profile of the boring M-1 revealed a layer of stained silty gravel underlain by heavy clay with no apparent visible staining or odor. Boring M-2 was terminated in the silty gravel due to the fact that no visible staining was apparent. The samples were submitted to the American Environmental Network (AEN) laboratory located in Pleasant Hill, California and per your request analyzed for Total Oil and Grease (TOG)

Mr. Brian Oliva Department of Environmental Health July 2, 1996 Page 2

and Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons as diesel (TPH-D). Also per your request, one sample from below the visibly stained zone in Boring M-1 was analyzed for Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC).

I am pleased to report that the sample results for sample M1-B revealed no detectable concentrations of VOC's, which are, of course, the contaminants of greatest potential concern. The TPH-D and TOG concentrations in the samples from both borings were somewhat elevated, even in the soils which were not visibly stained. This is not surprising in that impact to soil by light cutting fluids is often difficult to assess by visual/olfactory field screening. A summary of analytical results are presented in Table 1. A copy of the laboratory analytical report is included as Attachment 1.

As you are aware, Grove is currently conducting quarterly groundwater monitoring at the facility. Oil and grease, which is included as a parameter in this monitoring, has never been detected in facility monitoring wells, two of which are located downgradient from the subject machine sumps. This, combined with the point source nature of the subject sumps, appears to indicate that the area of impact is localized and that groundwater has not been impacted. Also, the fact that the impacted area is covered by the building slab means that there are no apparent human exposure pathways and thus no apparent threat to human health or the environment. Due to the fact that the sumps were located immediately adjacent to main building support columns, excavation of even minimal amounts of soil from the areas would compromise the buildings integrity. For these reasons, Grove proposes that the impacted soils be left in place. Oil and grease will continue to be included as a parameter in the quarterly groundwater monitoring program in order to assess any future impact.

We appreciate your assistance with the above project. If you have any questions or need additional information, please call me at (205) 940-7700.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Sincerely,

Kevin Holloran

Environmental Specialist

Ken Holl

KH/iif

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Lee DeNooyer

Mr. Bill Tallent

TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF ANALYTICAL RESULTS - SOIL
RESULTS IN PPM

Sample	Depth	TPH as	Oil &	VOC
Numbers	(Ft)	Diesel	Grease	
M1 A	4	NA	NA NA	NA
M1 B	6	4	50	ND
M1 C	8	96	680	NA
M1 D	10	1000	1700	NA
M2 A	2	720	2600	NA
M2 B	4	1000	7300	NA

ND - Non Detect

NA - Not Analysed

VOC - Volatile Organic Compounds

M1 - Machine # 1

M2 - Machine # 2

ATTACHMENT 1 – Laboratory Analytical Results

American Environmental Network

Certificate of Analysis

DOHS Certification: 1172

AIHA Accreditation: 11134

PAGE 1

ENV. MANGT & ENGINEERING INC. PO BOX 19866 BIRMINGHAM. AL 35219

ATTN: KEVIN HOLLORAN CLIENT PROJ. ID: DRS-95-E942 CLIENT PROJ. NAME: GROVE VALVE

REPORT DATE: 06/20/96

DATE(S) SAMPLED: 05/21/96

DATE RECEIVED: 05/21/96

AEN WORK ORDER: 9605282

PROJECT SUMMARY:

On May 21, 1996, this laboratory received 6 soil sample(s).

Client requested 5 sample(s) be analyzed for chemical parameters: one sample was placed on hold. Portion for EPA 8010 was subcontracted to a DOHS certified laboratory; subcontract report will follow at a later date. Results of analysis are summarized on the following page(s). Please see quality control report for a summary of QC data pertaining to this project.

Samples will be stored for 30 days after completion of analysis, then disposed of in accordance with State and Federal regulations. Samples may be archived by prior arrangement.

If you have any questions, please contact Client Services at (510) 930-9090.

Laboratory Director

ENV. MANAGEMENT & ENGINEERING

SAMPLE ID: M1B

AEN LAB NO: 9605282-02 AEN WORK ORDER: 9605282 CLIENT PROJ. ID: DRS-95-E942

DATE SAMPLED: 05/21/96

DATE RECEIVED: 05/21/96 REPORT DATE: 06/20/96

ANALYTE	METHOD/ CAS#	RESULT		REPORTING LIMIT	UNITS	DATE ANALYZED
#Extraction for TPH	EPA 3550	-			Extrn Date	05/23/96
TPH as Diesel	GC-FID	4	*	1	mg/kg	05/29/96
#Soil Extrn for O&G (GR)		-			Extrn Date	05/29/96
Oil & Grease (Gravimetric)	SM 5520E	50	*	30	mg/kg	05/29/96

ND = Not detected at or above the reporting limit
 * = Value at or above reporting limit

ENV. MANAGEMENT & ENGINEERING

SAMPLE ID: M1C AEN LAB NO: 9605282-03 AEN WORK ORDER: 9605282 CLIENT PROJ. ID: DRS-95-E942

DATE SAMPLED: 05/21/96 DATE RECEIVED: 05/21/96 REPORT DATE: 06/20/96

ANALYTE	METHOD/ CAS#	RESULT	I	REPORTING LIMIT	UNITS	DATE ANALYZED
#Extraction for TPH	EPA 3550	-			Extrn Date	05/23/96
TPH as Diesel	GC-FID	96	*	1	mg/kg	05/29/96
#Soil Extrn for O&G (GR)		-			Extrn Date	05/29/96
Oil & Grease (Gravimetric)	SM 5520E	680	*	30	mg/kg	05/29/96

ND = Not detected at or above the reporting limit
 * = Value at or above reporting limit

ENV. MANAGEMENT & ENGINEERING

SAMPLE ID: M1D

AEN LAB NO: 9605282-04

AEN WORK ORDER: 9605282 CLIENT PROJ. ID: DRS-95-E942

DATE SAMPLED: 05/21/96

DATE RECEIVED: 05/21/96 REPORT DATE: 06/20/96

ANAL VIII	METHOD/	DECIN T	REPORTING RESULT LIMIT UNITS				
ANALYTE	CAS#	KESULI	FILIT	UNITS	ANALYZED		
#Extraction for TPH	EPA 3550	-		Extrn Date	06/03/96		
TPH as Diesel	GC-FID	1,000	* 20	mg/kg	06/05/96		
#Soil Extrn for O&G (GR)		-		Extrn Date	06/13/96		
Oil & Grease (Gravimetric)	SM 5520E	1,700	* 30	mg/kg	06/13/96		

Reporting limit elevated for diesel due to high levels of target compounds. Sample run at dilution.

ND = Not detected at or above the reporting limit
* = Value at or above reporting limit

ENV. MANAGEMENT & ENGINEERING

SAMPLE ID: M2A AEN LAB NO: 9605282-05 AEN WORK ORDER: 9605282 CLIENT PROJ. ID: DRS-95-E942

DATE SAMPLED: 05/21/96 DATE RECEIVED: 05/21/96 REPORT DATE: 06/20/96

ANALYTE	METHOD/ CAS#	RESULT	REPORTING LIMIT	G UNITS	DATE ANALYZED
#Extraction for TPH	EPA 3550	<u>-</u>		Extrn Date	05/28/96
TPH as Diesel	GC-FID	720 -	, 1	mg/kg	05/29/96
#Soil Extrn for O&G (GR)		-	·	Extrn Date	05/29/96
Oil & Grease (Gravimetric)	SM 5520E	2.600	30	mg/kg	05/29/96

ND = Not detected at or above the reporting limit
* = Value at or above reporting limit

ENV. MANAGEMENT & ENGINEERING

SAMPLE ID: M2B AEN LAB NO: 9605282-06 AEN WORK ORDER: 9605282

CLIENT PROJ. ID: DRS-95-E942

DATE SAMPLED: 05/21/96

DATE RECEIVED: 05/21/96 REPORT DATE: 06/20/96

ANALYTE	METHOD/ CAS#	RESULT	REPORTING LIMIT	UNITS	DATE ANALYZED
#Extraction for TPH	EPA 3550	-		Extrn Date	06/03/96
TPH as Diesel	GC-FID	1,000 7	50	mg/kg	06/05/96
#Soil Extrn for O&G (GR)		-		Extrn Date	06/13/96
Oil & Grease (Gravimetric)	SM 5520E	7,300 %	30	mg/kg	06/13/96

Reporting limits elevated due to high levels of target compounds. Sample run at dilution.

ND = Not detected at or above the reporting limit

* = Value at or above reporting limit

American Environmental Network	Client Projec	Client Project ID: # 9605282			pled: 05/21/96	
3440 Vincent Road				Date Rec	eived: 05/21/96	
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523	Client Conta	act: Bill Svoboda		Date Extr	acted: 05/22/96	
	Client P.O:	# 9605282		Date Analyzed: 05/22/96		
	Vola	tile Halocarbons				
EPA method 601 or 8010			H		4	
Lab ID	65330					
Client ID	M1 B					
Matrix Control	<u> </u>		*			
Compound	NIP.	Conce	ntration		1	
Bromodichloromethane Bromoform ^(b)	ND ND		 		 	
Bromotorm Bromomethane	ND ND					
Carbon Tetrachloride ^(c)	ND ND				1	
Chlorobenzene	ND ND					
Chloroethane	ND ND					
2-Chloroethyl Viny I Ether (d)	ND ND					
Chloroform (e)	ND ND			 	1	
Chloromethane	ND		<u> </u>			
Dibromochloromethane	ND		1			
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	ND					
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	ND					
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	ND					
Dichlorodifluoromethane	ND			1. · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
1,I-Dichloroethane	ND					
1,2-Dichloroethane	ND		1		ĺ	
1,1-Dichloroethene	ND					
cis 1,2-Dichloroethene	ND					
trans 1,2-Dichloroethene	ND					
1,2-Dichloropropane	ND					
cis 1,3-Dichloropropene	ND		1			
trans 1,3-Dichloropropene	ND					
Methylene Chloride ^(f)	ND					
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	ND					
Tetrachloroethene	ND					
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ND					
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	ND				1	
Trichloroethene	ND					
Trichlorofluoromethane	ND					
Vinyl Chloride ^(g)	ND					
% Recovery Surrogate	95			- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Comments						
* water and vapor samples are reported in	ug/L. soil samples	in ug/kg and all TCLP ext	acts in ug/L.			

Reporting limit unless otherwise stated: water/TCLP extracts, ND< 0.5ug/L; soil, ND< 5ug/kg

ND means not detected above the reporting limit; N/A means analyte not applicable to this analysis

⁽b) tribromomethane; (c) tetrachloromethane; (d) (2-chloroethoxy) ethene; (e) trichloromethane; (f) dichloromethane; (g) chloroethene; (h) a lighter than water immiscible sheen is present; (i) liquid sample that contains greater than ~ 5 vol. % sediment.

AEN (CALIFORNIA) QUALITY CONTROL REPORT

AEN JOB NUMBER: 9605282

CLIENT PROJECT ID: DRS-95-E942

Quality Control and Project Summary

All laboratory quality control parameters were found to be within established limits.

<u>Definitions</u>

Laboratory Control Sample (LCS)/Method Spike(s): Control samples of known composition. LCS and Method Spike data are used to validate batch analytical results.

Matrix Spike(s): Aliquot of a sample (aqueous or solid) with added quantities of specific compounds and subjected to the entire analytical procedure. Matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate QC data are advisory.

Method Blank: An analytical control consisting of all reagents, internal standards, and surrogate standards carried through the entire analytical process. Used to monitor laboratory background and reagent contamination.

Not Detected (ND): Not detected at or above the reporting limit.

Relative Percent Difference (RPD): An indication of method precision based on duplicate analysis.

Reporting Limit (RL): The lowest concentration routinely determined during laboratory operations. The RL is generally 1 to 10 times the Method Detection Limit (MDL). Reporting limits are matrix, method, and analyte dependent and take into account any dilutions performed as part of the analysis.

Surrogates: Organic compounds which are similar to analytes of interest in chemical behavior, but are not found in environmental samples. Surrogates are added to all blanks, calibration and check standards, samples, and spiked samples. Surrogate recovery is monitored as an indication of acceptable sample preparation and instrumental performance.

- D: Surrogates diluted out.
- #: Indicates result outside of established laboratory QC limits.

QUALITY CONTROL DATA

METHOD: EPA 3550 GCFID

AEN JOB NO: 9605282 DATE EXTRACTED: 05/23-06/03/96 INSTRUMENT: C MATRIX: SOIL

Surrogate Standard Recovery Summary

Date Analyzed	Client Id.	Lab Id.	Percent Recovery n-Pentacosane
05/29/96 05/29/96 06/05/96 05/29/96 06/05/96	M1B M1C M1D M2A M2B	02 03 04 05 06	99 86 D D
QC Limits:			59-118

D: Surrogates diluted out.

DATE EXTRACTED: 05/23/96 DATE ANALYZED: 05/28/96 SAMPLE SPIKED: 9605273-01 INSTRUMENT: C

Matrix Spike Recovery Summary

				QC Lim	its
Analyte	Spike Added (mg/kg)	Average Percent Recovery	RPD	Percent Recovery	RPD
Diesel	40.0	61	10	50-115	20

Daily method blanks for all associated analytical runs showed no contamination at or above the reporting limit.

QUALITY CONTROL DATA

METHOD: SM 5520

AEN JOB NO: 9605282

DATE EXTRACTED: 05/29/96 DATE ANALYZED: 05/29/96 SAMPLE SPIKED: LCS

INSTRUMENT: GRAVIMETRIC

MATRIX: SOIL

Laboratory Control Sample

Analyte	Spike Added (mg/kg)	Average Percent Recovery	QC Limits Percent Recovery
011	100	93	70-105

QC REPORT FOR EPA 8010/8020/EDB

Date: 05/22/96

Matrix: Soil

Analyte	i	entrati	% Reco				
	1 48		Amount Spiked	i ms msd		RPD	
1,1-DCE	0	101	101	100	101	101	0.0
Trichloroethene	0	102	102	100	102	102	0.0
EDB	0	75	75	100	75	75	0.0
Chlorobenzene	0	94	96	100	94	96	2.1
Benzene	0	104	104	100	104	104	0.0
Toluene	0	104	104	100	104	104	0.0
Chlorobz (PID)	0	105	105	100	105	105	0.0

% Rec. = (MS - Sample) / amount spiked \times 100

RPD = (MS - MSD) / (MS + MSD) \times 2 \times 100

Environmental Management & Engineering, Inc. Bicoinglam Office: (205) 910-7700 (205) 910-7701 Pak [Houston Office: (713) 939-7028 (205) 939-7029 Pak

9605282

CHAIN OF CUSTODY RECORD/ANALYSIS REQUEST

Client Grov	e Vah	Project	1 DR5-95-E9	42	Daté Delivered	ă	Ana	lyses i	teques	ted	Send Report to KEVIN HOLLORAN ENV. MANAGEMENT + ENGINEERING, INC	
Samplers, Kevin	(Signate	ran	Ken Hal			-0-	20	Due 10 E			Dhasa	ENGINEERING, INC PO BOX 19866 BIRMINGHAM, AL 3:219 (205) 940-7700 (RESUITS TO (205) 940-7701
Sample #	Date Sampled	Time Sampled	Sample Desc	Iption LAB	No. of Containers	7 PH 355	300	FOTAL CUC SS20E			Please FAD	(RESULTS 70 (205) 940-770 Remarks
MIA	5/21/46	8:15A	Soil	OIA							Н	old
MIB	ır .	<u>8:151</u>		02A		<u> </u>	/			_		
MIC	11	8:40A	11	03A	1	V	i	<u>V</u>				
M1D	/!	1130A	//	D4A	1	<u> </u>			<u> </u>	<u> </u>		old
MaA	h	10:15 A	//	05A		1		\checkmark				
MaB	"	10:30/	/1	06A							_\H	old
]		<u> </u>				
	,	l							<u> </u>		6-3-96	additional
					ļ			ļ. <u></u>	<u> </u>		anal	vis sequeted - ange Order Rig R. Bypus
		<u> </u>						<u> </u>	<u> </u>		526 9	range Order Rig
 												R. Brack
							<u> </u>		<u> </u>			<i>F</i>
	ļ	ļ. 		·-·				<u> </u>				
				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			_	<u> </u>		<u> </u>		
 	ļ							<u> </u>				
		<u> </u>			1							
Relionuis	hed by	Signatur	e) Date Jime 5/21/96 12:00	Received by calginate		Relli	repulse in	A	Signa	thre	Date Time	Received by (Signature)
Relinquis	hed by (Signatur		Received by (Signate	ure)	Reli	xqu I sh	ed by (Signa	ture)	Date Time	Received by (Signature)
Rel inquis	hed by (Signatur	e) Date Tima	Received by Laborate (Signature)	ory by	Indi	cate \$	ecial	liazar	ds Here	<u>, </u>	

Reporting I	nformation:	A		. .			,			4	777	17							J		1		
1. Client: Address:			American Environmental Network 3440 Vincent Road, Pleasant Hill, CA 94523 Phone (510) 930-9090							A	El	V	A	EQL	JES1	r FOI	R ANA	Page L YSIS /	•	of _ OF CUS	(_ STOD		
Contac All. Co			FAX (510) 930-0256						Lab	Dest	Numb Ination	1:		6444AENX64									
Address Re	eport To:	Se	ņd involca To:						Lab	e San Cont	nples act:	Shippe	ed:										
2.			3.						Date Results Required: 5/31/96 Date Report Required: Client Phone No.: Client FAX No.:														
Client P.O.	rt To: 1 or 2 (Circle one) No.: <u>460.5282</u> Clie am Member (s)	nt Project I.D. No	.: 160	52	82	•		<u>_</u>]		//	7/	//	ANA	LYSI	s		//	7					
Lab Number	Client Sample Identification	Air Volume	Date/ Time Collected	Sample Type*	Pres.	No. of Cont.	Type of Cont.	1			//	//	$^{\prime}/$					Comm	ients / ł	Hazards	S,		
02.4	MIB		5/21/94	Sail				X											6533	30	; ; ; , ,		
												LIN4	s [O	20 I a	ACTAI	100	m .						
					ICE/I GOOG INEAD	CON SPAC	DITION S E ABSEN	<u>/</u>	7	RES APPRO ON V	RYAN PRIA VIJER:	VE.		A 4 .	in in	- 1011	111						
Relinquishe (Signature)	ed by: Bill Anloge		DATE /2//4		TIME 15:45		Receive		iz.			21			97		DATE			IME			
Relinquished by: (Signature) Relinquished by:			DATE	TIME Received to (Signature)			id by:	ur A	sei	d' W	14	ch cc	<u> </u>						-				
(Signature)			DATE		TIME		Receive (Signatu Lab Cor	ite)	s	· · · · · · ·			·				DATE	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ТІ	ME			
		Sample type (S	neciful: 1) 37m	nm () R vin	MOSE	OE me-	<u> </u>	10CC	01.0	<u> </u>										~~~			

*Sample type (Specify): 1) 37mm 0.8 µm MCEF 2) 25mm 0.8 µm MCEF 3) 25mm 0.4 µm polycarb. filter

4) PVC filter, diam. _____ pore size _____ 5) Charcoal tube 6) Silica gel tube 7) Water 8) Soil 9) Bulk Sample

10) Other _____ 11) Other _____ 11) Other _____

ATTACHMENT 2 - EME Report entitled
"Updated Facility Closure
Activity" dated December 27,
1996

ATTACHMENT 3 -- EME Correspondence to
Alameda County Department
of Environmental Health
dated February 13, 1997



Environmental Management & Engineering, Inc.

437 Industrial Lane Post Office Box 19866 Birmingham, AL 35219
(205) 940-7700 Fax (205) 940-7701

February 13, 1997

Mr. Brian Oliva Senior Hazardous Materials Specialist Alameda County Health Care Services Department of Environmental Health 1131 Harbor Bay Parkway Alameda, CA 94502

RE: Grove Valve and Regulator Company, Emeryville, California

DRS-95-E942

Dear Mr. Oliva:

This letter is to confirm our telephone conversation of January 29, 1997, concerning the report entitled "Updated Facility Closure Activity" dated December 27, 1996. This report discussed the groundwater sampling conducted in the machine sump area at the referenced facility in December 1996. As you know the analytical results from the groundwater sampled revealed no detectable concentration of Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon (TPH).

It is my understanding from our conversation that no further action will be required in relation to the machine sump area.

Should this be different from what you and I discussed, please contact me at (205) 940-7700. As always, we appreciate your assistance with this project.

Sincerely,

Dennis A Lewis

Environmental Engineer

DL/jjf

cc:

Mr. Lee DeNooyer

Mr. Bill Tallent