

Cosson, Michael

From: Olson-Martin, Nancy@Waterboards <Nancy.Olson-Martin@waterboards.ca.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, September 07, 2016 10:24 AM
To: Cosson, Michael
Subject: RE: Closure Denial Review - Mobil # 04-407 (T0606500083)

Importance: High

Mr. Cosson,

The report was uploaded on September 2, 2016. My supervisor had a chance to review the report and based on the SVE results (low recovery) he believes that closure is warranted. I have updated the Paths for Closure on GeoTracker to reflect the SVE findings.

Since I'll be out of the office from next Friday through October 3rd, I won't have a chance to complete the draft closure before I leave. However, I should have it completed in November depending upon my workload involved with Region's upcoming two-year bid solicitation and several bid items that are due to Sacto by November 1st.

I hope this information will help you with your review.

Regards,
Nancy Olson-Martin

From: Olson-Martin, Nancy@Waterboards
Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2016 4:21 PM
To: Cosson, Michael
Cc: Williams, Ken@Waterboards
Subject: RE: Closure Denial Review - Mobil # 04-407 (T0606500083)

Mr. Cosson

I am still waiting for the report to appear on GeoTracker so that I may approve the upload. I have not had a chance to review GeoTracker today.

I have an urgent project (a SWRCB deadline) that I must work on during the next two weeks. I am then out of the office from September 19 through October 2nd. Mobil Chemical and their consultants are aware of my schedule. We are currently trying to schedule a meeting with them sometime in late October 2016 after I have a chance to review this report in early-mid October when I return.

This is all I can tell you at this time with respect to your review for the UST Cleanup Fund and site closure.

Regards,
Nancy Olson-Martin

From: Cosson, Michael [michael.cosson@redhorsecorp.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2016 3:48 PM

To: Olson-Martin, Nancy@Waterboards
Subject: RE: Closure Denial Review - Mobil # 04-407 (T0606500083)

Hi Nancy,

I wanted to follow up with you about this case as I need to move forward with my review. Based on the notes in GeoTracker, it appears that the SVE rebound test was completed. Do you plan to close this case or will additional assessment or remediation be required? If you do not plan to close the case at this time, can you please review the impediments to closure listed in the below email and let me know if they are still a concern and also let me know if there are any additional reasons for denying the request for closure of this case.

Thanks,

Ms. Michael Cosson, EIT
Environmental Engineer
Redhorse Corporation
12 Geary Street, Suite 806
San Francisco, CA 94108
C (850) 261-2321
W (619) 241-4609 Ext 855
michael.cosson@redhorsecorp.com
www.redhorsecorp.com

From: Cosson, Michael
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2016 12:44 PM
To: 'nolson-martin@waterboards.ca.gov' <nolson-martin@waterboards.ca.gov>
Subject: Closure Denial Review - Mobil # 04-407 (T0606500083)

Hi Nancy,

I am a contractor working for the State Water Resources Control Board and have been asked by George Lockwood to review closure denials for several Leaking Underground Storage Tank cases. These reviews are required when a request for closure is denied in GeoTracker. One of the cases I have been assigned is Mobil # 04-407 (T0606500083) located at 4526 Commerce Street in Riverside. I'm contacting you to confirm that I have a full and accurate list of the reasons for denial of case closure before I complete the review.

The LTCP checklist, last updated June 29, 2016, indicates that remaining impediments to closure are:

- 1) The conceptual site model is incomplete. The vertical extent of contamination is not defined.
- 2) Secondary source has not been removed to the extent practicable. Asymptotic reduction was achieved, however upcoming confirmation assessment will confirm that the system was effective and no further remediation is required for this site.
- 3) A nuisance exists. Further vertical and soil confirmation assessment will provide confirmation whether a nuisance condition continues for the site as well as meets Region 8's Basin Plans groundwater management zones directive for this area of Riverside.
- 4) Direct contact media specific criteria are not met. Concentrations of naphthalene and PAHs in shallow soil are unknown.

The email from the RP describing planned work and the June 23, 2016 letter to the RP, indicate an SVE rebound HIT event is planned at the Site which was agreed to at a meeting between Region 8 and the RP. The June 23rd letter indicates this SVE event will replace the previous requirement for confirmation borings. Assuming results of the SVE event are acceptable, is this the only remaining requirement necessary to show the case is ready for closure?

Can you confirm that the impediments listed above remain as reasons for denying closure of this case and also let me know if you have any additional objections that I have not listed?

Thanks,

Ms. Michael Cosson, EIT
Environmental Engineer
Redhorse Corporation
12 Geary Street, Suite 806
San Francisco, CA 94108
C (850) 261-2321
W (619) 241-4609 Ext 855
michael.cosson@redhorsecorp.com
www.redhorsecorp.com

