

Detterman, Mark, Env. Health

From: Detterman, Mark, Env. Health
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 3:06 PM
To: 'Erik Oehlschlager'
Cc: pelco1969@sbcglobal.net; Michael Lamphere (mlamphere@lampherelaw.com)
Subject: RE: 1550 Park Ave, Emeryville UST/Pellegrini

Erik,
Our thinking was a shallower screen interval, still at 5 feet in length. This was mainly based on the depth interval groundwater was encountered at; in several bores it was at 3.5 ft bgs and the 2.5 ft depth seemed to give a higher chance of encountering the top of the groundwater interval and still get the well sealed.

*Mark Detterman
Senior Hazardous Materials Specialist, PG, CEG
Alameda County Environmental Health
1131 Harbor Bay Parkway
Alameda, CA 94502
Direct: 510.567.6876
Fax: 510.337.9335
Email: mark.detterman@acgov.org*

PDF copies of case files can be downloaded at:

<http://www.acgov.org/aceh/lop/ust.htm>

From: Erik Oehlschlager [<mailto:erik.oehlschlager@errg.com>]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 2:55 PM
To: Detterman, Mark, Env. Health
Cc: pelco1969@sbcglobal.net; Michael Lamphere (mlamphere@lampherelaw.com)
Subject: RE: 1550 Park Ave, Emeryville UST/Pellegrini

Mark,
You also mention that "a slightly shallower screen interval may be appropriate" for the proposed monitoring well at 1550 Park Ave., Emeryville. I only see 5-foot screen lengths available. Would raising the interval from 3 - 8 feet bgs to 2.5 - 7.5 feet bgs be acceptable? Or, did you have a shorter screen interval in mind? Let me know. Thanks.

Erik Oehlschlager
Geologist
ERRG
4585 Pacheco Blvd.
Martinez, CA 94553
925.969.0750 **Main**
925.839.2274 **Direct**
925.577.4423 **Mobile**
erik.oehlschlager@errg.com **Email**

From: Detterman, Mark, Env. Health [<mailto:Mark.Detterman@acgov.org>]
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2014 3:00 PM
To: Erik Oehlschlager
Cc: pelco1969@sbcglobal.net; Michael Lamphere (mlamphere@lampherelaw.com)
Subject: RE: 1550 Park Ave, Emeryville UST/Pellegrini

Hi Erik,

Thanks for checking. It is an error on my part, the removal of two commas or two parentheses. It should be "...generally detected at a depth of 4.5 to 5.5, below groundwater, at the site...". In order to define the vertical extent will require going below that depth. I'd be a bit cautious, as 6 ft may not define it vertically, especially heavy end petroleum in the bay margin or bay muds. I recall you are doing silica gel cleanup on the extractable TPH; that likely will be critical for site delineation.

Mark Detterman
Senior Hazardous Materials Specialist, PG, CEG
Alameda County Environmental Health
1131 Harbor Bay Parkway
Alameda, CA 94502
Direct: 510.567.6876
Fax: 510.337.9335
Email: mark.detterman@acgov.org

PDF copies of case files can be downloaded at:

<http://www.acgov.org/aceh/lop/ust.htm>

From: Erik Oehlschlager [<mailto:erik.oehlschlager@errg.com>]
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2014 2:50 PM
To: Detterman, Mark, Env. Health
Cc: pelco1969@sbcglobal.net; Michael Lamphere (mlamphere@lampherelaw.com)
Subject: 1550 Park Ave, Emeryville UST/Pellegrini

Mark,

I just left you a voicemail regarding Technical comment 1.a. You indicate that high TPH is 4.5 to 5.5 feet below groundwater. However, the previous investigation showed high TPH at 4.5 to 5.5 feet below ground surface with relatively low TPH at 8.5 and 9 feet below ground surface. Are you asking that we soil sample down to 9 feet below ground surface at all locations, or, just extend the depths to 6 feet below ground surface instead of the proposed 1 foot below the observed water table?

Erik Oehlschlager
Geologist
ERRG
4585 Pacheco Blvd.
Martinez, CA 94553
925.969.0750 **Main**
925.839.2274 **Direct**
925.577.4423 **Mobile**
erik.oehlschlager@errg.com **Email**