Trip Report
8/5/09 – 8/6/09

PURPOSE OF TRIP: Field oversight of interim NAPL investigation start-up.

Wednesday, 8/5/09
• Depart home at 8:00a, caught 9:00a flight standby to LAX. Taxi to hotel, about 10:30a, walked to jobsite, arriving at SA-12 about 11:00a.
• Connected with URS, Mark Davis and David Meyers.
• 30 ton CPT rig, Gregg Drilling, met Tim and Alex, operator and assistant.
• CPL0088, first CPT/UVOST push, had been performed day before (8/4), located within estimated NAPL plume, western planned sampling location; co-located with CPL0057, CWL0054, SBL0123.
• CPL0089, being performed as I arrive (8/5), southeastern location; co-located with CPL0056.
• Inspected printout of UVOST results for both CPL0089 and CPL0090, compared to ROST from 10 years ago. Surprisingly good comparison. I'd say it is definitely comparable such that a co-located UVOST is unnecessary in this Source Area. Dave had emailed Dudley the CPL0088 result last night.
• Received voice mail message 8/4 from Thad Fukushige (USACE). He said he will try to get me something from FMS system to document that the erroneous charges had been backed out.
• Called Dudley to make sure he sends current results to Marlon and Ted. Left voice mail. Also called Ted and Marlon and left messages.
• Noted that second location was actually southeast location, outside plume. Not co-located with CPL0058. Actually it still compared well with it, which is amazing and perhaps tells us something about continuity of this release.
• CPL0090, push performed 8/5, within plume, eastern location. Co-located with ROST CPL0058. Definite signature at water table zone, 40-50' bgs, correlating with CPL58 signature at that zone. Looking at 0-5 scale printout of CPL58, it doesn't appear at first to correlate the other small hits found in CPL58, but need to look at CPL58 on 0-100 scale to really compare. Comparing on the 0-50 scale, the ROST and UVOST signatures were again strikingly similar. The largest occurrence is at and just below the water table. Much smaller signatures were seen at various other depths.
• Called to Marlon. He agreed that first co-located ones were amazingly good comparison and satisfied our needs for such comfort in this source area. Marlon will be around for the next couple weeks and will watch for more information as it comes in.
• Ted called back after seeing initial location data. Was confused, thinking I said they actually weren't co-located. Noted good comparison though. I called back, left voice mail clarifying that those first ones John sent were co-located, and I thought were good comparison to satisfy our needs.
• On last boring the tip got water in it, probably from trying to jam it into the hard layer, 90' bgs. That caused a false reading, required them to withdraw it and clean it out.
• Departed job site 4:30p, walked to hotel. Checked in, set-up computer, continued working.
• NOTE re: Comment #87, draft final FS report. I looked up the comment, and in it I say I think the rating should be 7 because each uncertainty (one for covenant, one for zoning) brings the IMP score down one. Doesn't look like my reason was based on previous comments on draft FS. In fact, my draft FS comment says to make it an 8, my draft final comment shows I changed my mind. Also, note that my comment said "I think we should . . .", which indicated I was proposing the change. Therefore, I think we can stick with the 8. I emailed John and Jude with this response.
• Back at hotel, worked on Jude's split cost tables, dozed off for awhile (30 min? 45?). Then continued. Worked until 8:30p.
Thursday, 8/6

- Reported to job site 7:00a.
- CPL0091, they first removed asphalt and then inserted probe directly into sand, down to 7 ft. Showed minimal response, which demonstrated that readings in other probes near the surface were from asphalt and asphalt clinging to probe until soil and sand scrubbed it off. Location in northeast corner.
- Reinserted probe and continued. Notable signature in 40-50' interval, enough to require step out. Nothing below that. Again met resistance at 85 ft bgs. Response again indicated that water may have entered probe when pushing against hard layer.
- CPL0092, eastern-most location of initial targeted locations. Same surface response from asphalt as other locations. Nothing until water table at 40', strong HC signature from 40-45' bgs, then nothing again below. Stopped at about 89' when hit hard layer.
- CPL0093, southern middle, adjacent to building. Same result as other outliers, hydrocarbon signature only at 40'-45' interval. Nothing anywhere else. Stopped at 89' bgs at hard layer.
- 2p Hill field observer, Jeff Ockerman on-site.
- Talked with Marlon (cell 707-225-5827). He said that the comparison of the second co-located pair is very good too, with pronounced signature at 40-45' bgs. Sees that the UVOST picked up more than the ROST, so we have more confidence in the UVOST. Good. No further co-locations needed for this Source Area.
- Talked with Ted. He reviewed other co-located boring and said they correlate very well. Satisfied with correlation. OK. Will be out at job site on Monday. I gave him Jeff Ockerman’s cell number. He has Dave Myers number already.
- CPL0093, data file got corrupted somehow, couldn’t retrieve graph. Operator will send file back to developer to see if graph can be retrieved. We observed the graph visually, as noted above. Looked same as CPL0092.