

Site Summary SLIC STID
CalTrans
SF Bay Bridge/Toll Plaza
Oakland CA 94607

3/31/95 Wrote ltr to RP re SLIC case.

4/7/95 spoke w/Alan Baradar: re SLIC site: They haven't yet signed the contract for 2nd Phase of construction and retrofitting of columns. So deposit may be delayed. Probably can't make the 5/1 deadline. He's writing a memo to construction officer. How are these 2 related? \$\$ comes out of construction, not env. dept. . . . re my ? re existing MWs: No, they plan to destroy those wells. Their purpose was solely to get gw discharge permit from RWQCB. He's afraid they may be destroyed during construction. I told him that my concern is that we may require wells in the future, and then get a lot of difficulty from CalTrans. He'll talk w/RWQCB about it. And then talk w/me. He spells his name "Allen."

5/11/95 mess to and fm Allen Baradar: the \$\$ should be here by July or August.

wrote this summary

6-28 *mess fo + fm AB: project h still n b awarded (to contractor).*

11/28/95 *calls to Robert of SENCOR and Alan Baradar OF CALTRANS.*

11/29/95 *calls to Alan Baradar & ~~Alan~~ Panda? Jit*

11/30/95 *Alan Baradar*

12/4/95 *call from Jit Panda - call to Alan Baradar, call to Jit Panda*

12/13/94

STID 4901

Talked to Steve Russell re:

- 1) ULR - need to submit
- 2) UGT closure reports
- 3) Groundwater investigation plan

8/18/94

STID 4901

SFO Bridge Toll Plaza

meeting with Steve Russell & Alan Bonata

- re: report on monitoring wells
- limited overexcavation to groundwater
- call Jim Arizala to confirm NPDES
storm water run off management plan

3/30/95 Wrote ltr to RP re UST

3/31/95 Wrote ltr to RP re SLIC case.

4/7/95 spoke w/Alan Baradar: re SLIC site: They haven't yet signed the contract for 2nd Phase of construction and retrofitting of columns. So deposit may be delayed. Probably can't make the 5/1 deadline. He's writing a memo to construction officer. How are these 2 related? \$\$ comes out of construction, not env. dept. . . . re my ? re existing MWS: No, they plan to destroy those wells. Their purpose was solely to get gw discharge permit from RWQCB. He's afraid they may be destroyed during construction. I told him that my concern is that we may require wells in the future, and then get a lot of difficulty from CalTrans. He'll talk w/RWQCB about it. And then talk w/me. He spells his name "Allen." .3 hr

5-10 phoned A. Baradar: ltr re #

be attributable to the UST.

- 3) I'm concerned about the use of 418.1 in gw; it's cumulative for petro and non-petro HCs. They used this method, and got up to 2,000 ppb O&G in gw.
- 4) Note they didn't analyze TPHg, TPHd, or TPHk, which were detected at the tank removal (or BTEX).
- 5) How far away is the closest well to the UST? Approx 140 ft. Tri-Reg Guidelines specify the well must be within 10' DG of the UST. These wells were apparently installed without any prior workplan submittal to, or approval by the County.
- 6) We could really use tabulated data.
- 7) Alan Baradar told me that his consultant (APEX) has information at nearby sites showing contam fill. If they want to conclude that the gw contam is from contam fill, their consultant must present supporting technical data.
- 8) Why do you need case closure before proceeding with further work? Wells are installed and sampled over a period of time (often years) while many sites operate.

3/30

mtg w/Alan Baradar (Tom Peacock also attended). Alan said they found soil and gw contam while sampling under bents (supports). Wells were installed to monitor contam assoc. w/bents. UST was not yet discovered. They have to offhaul water fm dewatering for construction activities. Bec RWQCB won't allow them to discharge water to bay. They have a nearby treatment facility, but it would cause problems to treat this water. Purpose is NOT cleanup, but rather construction. We all discussed if this is really a SLIC site, and who is the lead agency? He wants to wait until construction is complete bf installing MW(s). Work scheduled to start in next couple months. We agreed to at least 1 MW after construction is complete (1.5 to 2yrs from now). He had an orange copy of the ULR, dated 8/18/94, and signed by CalTrans, but not by us. They probably filled it out, and sent it to Sacto. In any case, we never got it, bec. we didn't sign it in upper Right corner. Made copy, signed it, and gave copy to him. . . . Drafted ltr to RP. . . discussed w/TP: he said we should begin a SLIC site, write them a letter requesting \$\$, and also run the LOP site separately. Two separate sites. He talked to Sum Arigala about it; he'd like to see us oversee it as a SLIC site.

3/13/95 Alan Baradar phoned: he wants to know what information I need at this point. He spoke w/Jerry last Friday. He has information at nearby sites showing contam fill, and will give this to APEX. OK, but I told him that **the conclusion re contam fill must come from their consultant.** UST is at "Bent 31." They do not have any tabulated results. I had to do it myself. They didn't encounter any water in tank pit, even during overexcavation. They encountered water at about 12'bgs when they dug one of the MWs. Steve Rosso worked on TR. They did not get permission from RWQCB to discharge water back into the Bay. **Was there any TDS analysis? NO** He's with the Env. Branch, not Construction. He wants to have a meeting.

spoke w/Sum Arigala of RWQCB: Does he want to attend mtg? No. Ask KG. RB has been cutting them a lot of slack already.

3/27/95 mess fm Alan Baradar: wants to meet on 3/27 at HIS office.

3/28/95 left mess Alan Baradar: mtgs are scheduled in our offices; please send copies of doc. before the mtg so I can have a chance to peruse.

3/29/95 spoke w/Alan Baradar. He'll fax over the map showing UST and MW locations.

3/30/95 Reviewed 3/29 fax from Alan Baradar. The map is actually in 3 separate legal-sized pages. Prep for mtg:

- 1) They only sampled the wells during the 3rd quarter 1994. We normally require four Qs sampling over a yr.

- 2) **LEAD:** I'm concerned about the 470 ppb lead detected in gw (at low tide). The MCL (both fed and state) is 50 ppb. Note they got 1200 ppb lead in pit water. They also got up to 67 ppm lead in tank pit, and 558 ppm lead in stockpile; these samples were later analyzed via WET, and the pit samples were below HW limits (<5ppm), but the stockpile had 52ppm soluble lead (=HW).

Site Summary STID 4901
Oakland Bay Bridge
East Bay Span
Oakland CA 94607

- 2/17/95 Reviewed 1/17/95 ltr fm DOT to Susan Hugo, and the 11/14/94 Letter Report by APEX. I'd like one map with all 3 wells, in relation to the Bay waters. They sampled the wells at high tide (7/21/94), low tide (7/28/94), and mid-tide (8/5/94), as well as Bay waters. **Up to 2,000 ppb TRPH by 418.1, up to .47 mg/L or 470 ppb lead. Note they didn't analyze TPHg, TPHd, or TPHk, which were detected at the tank removal (or BTEX).** "They want approval of the tank removal asap." What exactly does this mean? They will be submitting a tank closure report. Have they already? **YES**; it's dated 12/29/94, by Ben's Trucking. **Still need ULR and completed well construction diagrams, and boring logs** (should have been included in this report). left mess Allen Baradar of CalTrans at 286-5636.
- 2/22/95 left mess A. Baradar
- 2/23/95 spoke w/A. Baradar of CalTrans: It means they want case closure. He'll check into the TR Report. He'll ask tank contractor. APEX is their consultant (Gerald Kirkpatrick). They backfilled pit. Just wonder about TPHg and TPHk analyses. He says there's a lot of background contam, bec. land was made from fill which may have been contaminated to begin with. UST installed unknown date; last used unknown date. AlCo did not request MWS; they just did it. He'll have APEX contact me.
- 3/1/95 Jerry Kirkpatrick of APEX phoned (669-1843).
- 3/2/95 Phoned JK: He's a manager, rather than a field person. **I need 1) one map showing location of former UST and locations of all 3 MWS. 2) ULR, 3) completed MW construction diagrams, 4) soil boring logs, 5) They did 418.1 on MWS, but this doesn't help us, bec. it's cumulative for petroleum and non-petro organics. . . . They were instructed NOT to log the soils; it's all sand, w/some garbage at the top. See original bound report; same material. No contract to continue QS. Send ULR. Their lab may have used a sceen to filter out organics. He thinks they ran 418.1 for borings (original bound report). Asked him to see if they could conclude that the area is all contaminated w/the fill. He'll check into it.**

farthest R lane on bridge
pay toll
make R turn

Kerosene UST.

expecting doc./rep from CT. (S. Russell).
retrofitting bridge

ULR?

bring logs / MW constantly?

- 1) They only sampled the wells during the 3rd quarter 1994. We normally require four Qs sampling over a yr.
- 2) **LEAD:** I'm concerned about the 470 ppb lead detected in gw (at low tide). The MCL (both fed and state) is 50 ppb. Note they got 1,200 ppb lead in pit water. They also got up to 67 ppm lead in tank pit, and 558 ppm lead in stockpile; these samples were later analyzed via WET, and the pit samples were below HW limits (<5ppm), but the stockpile had 52ppm soluble lead (=HW). The STLC lead concs decreased from 8' to 10'bgs, during overexcavation. It could be concluded that higher concs of lead was present in the soils above and around the UST, and therefore, the lead may be attributable to the UST.
- 3) I'm concerned about the use of 418.1 in gw; it's cumulative for petro and non-petro HCs. They used this method, and got up to 2,000 ppb O&G in gw.
- 4) Note they didn't analyze TPHg, TPHd, or TPHk, which were detected at the tank removal (or BTEX).
- 5) How far away is the closest well to the UST? Approx 140 ft. Tri-Reg Guidelines specify the well must be within 10' DG of the UST. These wells were apparently installed without any prior workplan submittal to, or approval by the County.
- 6) We could really use tabulated data.
- 7) Alan Baradar told me that his consultant (APEX) has information at nearby sites showing contam fill. If they want to conclude that the gw contam is from contam fill, their consultant must present supporting technical data.
- 8) Why do you need case closure before proceeding with further work? Wells are installed and sampled over a period of time (often years) while many sites operate.