

## Rosenson, Valerie

---

**From:** Casolo, Louis  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 31, 2017 11:27 AM  
**To:** McMullen, J.R.; Nabel, Susan  
**Cc:** Rosenson, Valerie; Rosenberg, Burt  
**Subject:** FW: Czescik Homes Environmental Reports  
**Attachments:** 172 Greenwich - REV. Limited Phase II Results.pdf

JR:

Please refer to my responses to your 5/30 email below in GREEN. Let me know if you have any further questions.

Lou

**From:** J.R. McMullen [<mailto:jrmcmullen.stamford18@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 30, 2017 1:39 PM  
**To:** Casolo, Louis  
**Cc:** Nabel, Susan  
**Subject:** Re: Czescik Homes Environmental Reports

Hi Lou,

My questions are actually pretty straight forward. If we don't have answer before hand, I expect the questions will be raised at the L&R meeting being held at 6pm June 5

I am not sure this is really significant. First we were told that any contamination was below 10'. Since the samples only went down to 10' I was a bit skeptical. The report cites contamination in the 8-10 foot slice I would assume that means the contamination is at least a couple feet closer to the surface than we were led to believe.

As you may know, soil boring SB02 is the only boring where black staining and a strong petroleum odor was found from 6.25 feet-7.5 ftbg. The bottom of the borehole was at 10 ftbg. SB06 was a duplicate soil sample collected from 8 to 10 ftbg. The results for both SB02 and SB06 are found in the table associated with the Limited Phase II. Duplicate samples are collected by splitting the soils collected from the same interval evenly into two separate soil sampling sets. Both SB02 and SB06 were collected from the interval within the sampling tube that was representative of 8-10 ftbg.

During my review of the draft report I made a comment to TRC to correct the report as it stated "The laboratory analytical results indicate that ETPH is present in soil collected from the 8-10 ftbg interval at soil boring locations SB01 and SB02 at concentrations that exceed the RSR criteria, specifically the RDEC." Looking at the first table in the report the ETPH for SB01 was noted as 480 and the RDEC is noted as 500. As such, SBO1 was below the RSR criteria. TRC has since made changes to the report indicating that the ETPH concentration exhibited in SB01 did not exceed the RSR criteria. The paragraph now states that "Soils collected from boring SB01 exhibited an ETPH concentration that did not exceed applicable RSR criteria, however, soil collected from SB02 exhibited and ETPH concentration that exceeded the RDEC." A copy of the revised report is attached, refer to page of summary and conclusions.

Second I looked at the information for core samples SB01, SB02 and SB06. Samples 2 and 6 are reportedly from the same location but contaminants in sample 6 are higher. The other samples do not report contamination. My assumption would be that the contamination somehow runs between samples 1 and 2/6. That means it runs under the building slab. We don't know if the contamination runs down a gradient from sample 2/6 to sample 1 or if the contamination increases and peaks somewhere under the slab and then diminishes as it approaches sample sites. Once the slab is removed and before the City takes title (or passes title to Mill River) the soil under the slab should be tested. It might not be wise for Stamford to take title until any contamination has been resolved.

You are correct to assume that some level of contamination runs beneath the building slab between SB02/06 and SB01. As the soil results indicated, contamination levels decrease moving in a downgradient direction between the two samples. Although it is possible that concentrations may increase below the building, it has been determined that elevated ETPH levels are associated with a possible release from a former UST (soils were collected from the depth that was assumed to be the former UST bottom) and can be assumed, given the depth at which impacts were identified, that any further sampling would show some impacts from the same deep intervals. The depth at which impacts were identified are considered to be inaccessible and not a risk to human health.

I looked on their website to see if I could find any information on how to interpret the report. Finally I called the author of the report to ask if it is possible the contamination levels peaked under the slab and Stamford was assuming a much bigger problem than we were being led to believe.

I am copying Susan because she is on the committee and she shared her concerns about the contamination with the committee.

Thanks. J.R.

On Tue, May 30, 2017 at 1:00 PM, Casolo, Louis <[LCasolo@stamfordct.gov](mailto:LCasolo@stamfordct.gov)> wrote:

JR:

I understand that you may have a few questions in regards to the above. Are you available tomorrow to have a conference call with TRC? If so let me know what time works well for you and I can set it up.

Regards,

Lou Casolo

--

Trying to help other people at all times,

J.R. McMullen  
(203) 979-8360  
Representative District 18  
165 Slice Drive  
Stamford, CT 06907  
<https://www.linkedin.com/in/jrmcmullen>

