

Phone Log

Date: May 3, 2021
Site Name: Frei Oil Co. (former)
BRRTS # 02-14-287206
Contact Name: Mark Fryman of Seymour Environmental
608-220-4847

RE: Soil Remediation and Post-Remedial Groundwater Monitoring Report and Proposed Closure Submittal

I spoke to Mark about the Soil Excavation Report received April 8, 2021. I told Mark that I had some observations (see below):

Indicate the depth of excavation on the maps. He said that could be done.

The depth of soil samples in the Loading Rack Excavation area were 2, 2.5, and 3-foot deep, but the previously collected SI samples showed contamination at the 3 and 3.5-foot depth. Is it possible that contamination remains in this area, because the excavation did not go deep enough? Mark said he would look into that. He said that he thought the objective in that area was to address direct contact RCLs, and there may be residual contamination. Mark said he figured that this site would not get closure without residual soil contamination.

West of the loading rack area, sample DP-9 in the ROW had PAHs and arsenic exceeding the RCLs, and it appears that soil was not excavated. If so, the ROW holder should be notified of the residual contamination, 30-days prior to submitting the closure request. Soil was excavated in the Main Street (STH 33) ROW during DOT-related road reconstruction and widening, but I was not sure this soil had been excavated. Mark said he would prepare a notification letter and also likely one for the railroad ROW, and he thought that notification should go to DOT also.

Further southwest along the ROW, soil at borings DP-4 and DP-5 were contaminated, but it was likely this soil was excavated out during the DOT-related road reconstruction. If that appears to be the case, some mention should be made of that. I told him I would send him a DOT report summarizing this work. Mark said that would be appreciated.

At boring B-8, located east of a former building, had a PAH exceedance for the gw pathway RCL, but did not exceed the cumulative risk values (for seven carcinogenic PAHs). I told Mark that we would need to be notified if the cumulative risk values were applied. Mark understood, and he said he would mention that the method was applied in the appropriate section of the Closure Request.

At the southeast end of the Bulk Fuel Storage Excavation, DP-15 had trimethylbenzene and naphthalene that exceeded the NR 720 RCLs for the groundwater pathway, so it appeared that soil would also be residual soil contamination. Mark said it was difficult to figure out the extend of residual contaminated soil in that area, and he will look at that again.

I noticed that there were no base samples obtained in the Bulk Fuel Storage Excavation, and that should be explained. Mark said he will indicate that soil was excavated to the water table.

Mark said he will address emerging contaminants (evaluation) in the Closure Request. He did not think those compounds were used because this site was associated with petroleum fuels. I told him to provide background information on the site and should check with the RP.

I told him that a detailed site map should show the entire property boundary of the affected property. He said he had done this on other sites, where one detailed site map shows the entire parcel(s), and another focuses in on the contaminated area.

It is my understanding the site is a commercial site, and not an industrial site, so it probably is not important to show extent of industrial site RCLs.

Mark said he may ask the RP to consider obtaining another round of groundwater sampling. He then checked, and the last sample was collected in March 2020, so maybe that will not be necessary.

John Mason