

## Nowell, Keith, Env. Health

---

**From:** Nowell, Keith, Env. Health  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 02, 2017 2:28 PM  
**To:** 'Martin Hohensee'  
**Cc:** Roe, Dilan, Env. Health  
**Subject:** FW: 321 and 323 63rd; Site Cleanup Case No. RO2981, Red Hanger Kleaners, 6235-6239 College Ave  
**Attachments:** RO2981\_CORRES\_L\_2016-02-23.pdf; DOC042517.pdf

Dear Mr. Hohensee,

As indicated in previous phone conversations, Alameda County Department of Environmental Health (ACDEH) would like the opportunity to review the work plan for the proposed scope of work at the 321-323 63<sup>rd</sup> Street property. In these cases, you have indicated that there is not enough time to perform a review and perform the work to meet your time frame. ACDEH has found through experience that it is very easy to collect expensive and useless vapor data.

Therefore, ACDEH staff requests a meeting with your consultant to discuss the proposed work to facilitate proper data collection. ACDEH requests that you provide your consultants contact information in order for us to arrange a meeting.

Regards,  
Keith Nowell

**From:** Martin Hohensee [mailto:martinhohensee@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, May 01, 2017 3:23 PM  
**To:** Nowell, Keith, Env. Health <Keith.Nowell@acgov.org>  
**Cc:** john@jgutierrezlaw.com; Jon Shahoian <jon@laphamcompany.com>; Benjamin Lewis <ben@laphamcompany.com>  
**Subject:** 321 and 323 63rd

**The county can have access at suitable notice to this property for the purpose of conducting your environmental study, now that the situation has been accurately described in your April 20, 2017 memo.**

I have commissioned my own study for my own purposes that should give a very strong prior on what the county will find when they do their work, to satisfy participants of the transactions underway.

For your reference, note the substantive change in message from your communication last year, which asks for cooperation for an undisclosed environmental study, and the second, which describes a potential health and safety hazard for occupants. In response to the first request for cooperation, I clearly indicated the reasons why it was not prudent of me to allow access at that time. No further communication came from the county to reschedule, until suddenly April 20, fourteen months after the first communication.

It is my point of view that county could have either

- been clear about the environmental risks in its initial communication,
- responded to my response to your request for cooperation to reschedule at another time.

Either of those courses would have better served the community in my opinion.

Martin Hohensee

Skype: Martin.Hohensee

(541) 848 7019