



127 E. Commerce Street, Ste. 201
Milford, MI 48381
248-676-9594 Phone
248-676-9545 Fax

May 21, 2007

Mr. Derek Delacourt
Deputy Director, Planning Department
City of Rochester Hills
1000 Rochester Hills Drive
Rochester Hills, MI 48309

Re: Adams/Hamlin Field Observation Methodology

Dear Mr. Delacourt:

Last week, at your request, I put together a basic cost estimate for STS' services to observe, document, and split selected samples from AKT Peerless for the Adams Hamlin site. All costs are based on the timeline that was provided on May 10, 2007 and contained in the recent communication from both AKT and Strobl & Sharp, the developer's environmental attorney. Please note that we received the last piece of the information (sample numbers) on May 17.

You will recall that the Consent Judgment that settled the lawsuit between the City and the developer allowed the City and its environmental representative (STS) to observe, document and split samples with the developer's consultant, at its discretion. You will likely recall that observation of the developer's consultant was discussed many times in study sessions with the City Council and likely in the public forum as well. Most recently, we discussed the observation process with the City's Environmental Affairs Committee, prior to meeting with the representatives of the Rochester Hills Fire Department.

The schedules of all field events are somewhat fluid, based on how things actually develop and whether problems are encountered, thus, my time projections are estimates as well but are linked to AKT's estimates based on what they indicate that they need to accomplish. Due to the level of activity that they propose, I have two of my staff allocated to cover their operations because they are doing different things in different parts of the site, at the same time. My staff are there to observe their actions and methods, document what they see in writing and photographs and split 20% of the samples with them. STS staff will number the samples identically and submit them to a different laboratory to promote an unbiased quality check. The amount of split sampling (20%) was chosen because if AKT is using an accredited lab, it is costly and redundant to collect 100% of the samples. Typically for in-field quality control, 10% QC are collected. I chose 20% as a quality and data reliability check with the possibility of going to 25% if conditions or methods seem to be out of compliance with industry standard.

If the City decides that costs need to be conserved, I can reduce my staff to one, though we risk missing critical events and sampling opportunities. Additionally, I believe that the Consent Judgment did not obligate the City to collect the split samples; it would be done at the City's discretion. If we did not collect and analyze the samples, a savings of approximately \$9,000 may be realized. In this case, we would be forced to accept AKT Peerless' laboratory data.

I plan to update you via email on Fridays so you will be aware of what has transpired on the site during the prior week and what is projected for the coming week. Please contact me with additional questions about the field operation. I can be reached at 248-676-9594.

Sincerely,

STS

Jim Anderson
Associate Scientist