

- 1/31/97 Reviewed 9/3/96 QR by Alisto. GW sampled on 7/10/96 flowed N-NE at 0.0.01 ft/ft. FP ranged fm 0.03 to 5.34 feet in MW1, MW3 and MW8. Also dissolved gw concs.
- 3/5/97 John Prall phoned: should he cc QR to Rich Hiett at thWQCB? NO
- 3/27/97 Reviewed 2/24/97 QRQR by Uribe. GW sampled 12/3/96 flowed N at 0.03 ft/ft. FP found in MW1, MW3, MW8, and MW6. Passive skimmers were installed in MW1 and MW8 on 11/15/96, while active skimmer inst in MW3 on 11/15/96. They are now pumping product into Baker tank (used drums prior). Dissolved concs are not that bad. Max benz i350 ppb. Good. They have a decent system to recover FP.

3/8/96 spoke w/Dan S. Item 1: Sect 3.0 discusses geo and hydrogeo. But no mention of "barrier." Their borings were on other side of barrier. Dongary thought barrier was bet Ports MW3 and their site. Port sent them a copy of this report. Item 2: no idea. Item 3: What is the minimum theyd want me to monitor? They have 8 wells now. **Delete MW6 (just measure FP), and delete MW5.** Item 5: maybe they were trying to save \$\$ by not submitting all the maps.

Theyre phasing out Alisto. Alisto will do 1st Q 96 QS. Then change consultants. Told him about the "wastewater impoundment" reports in the 1912-7th St. file (SP STID 3681). He thinks that the "Port Medical Services Bldg" is close to bldg C401. He will notify Tetra Tech (new consultant) about these reports. Doing an EIR for their proposed "Joint Intermodel Terminal" for this site area. Will probably need to do a history search for this anyway. . . . Wants to come up w/a long term remediation system in concert w/Dongary, if possible. But doesnt want to wait another year for their response, and pump weekly. He will update FP removal table w/next QR.

8/30/96 spoke w/Jeff Hess of ITSI (Jim Scalard phoned). 256-8898. Any permit requirements for storage of diesel fuel generated from FP removal fm gw. Their Port contact is John Prall, who is considering changing consultants. Told him it wd be considered HW, so if they store it >90 days, they need a permit. Also, City of Oakland OFD is now doing generator program. Referred him to Leroy Griffin. They wd remove it weekly or so. Port wants to change from manual bailing to skimmer system. Great!

9/12/96 spoke w/J. Prall: there will be a short hiatus in FP removal. No more than a month. Changing consultants. Alistos contract has run out, and Uribe will be taking over. Uribe should start next week. Wants an automatic skimmer in MW3; one that works continuously; 6,000 gal of fuel has been removed. Its not decreasing in thickness.

10/7/96 Reviewed 5/31/96 QR by Alisto. **Gw sampled on 4/4/96 flowed N at 0.007 ft/ft. MW1, MW3, and MW8 had FP ranging from 0.05 to 4.40 feet.** (Its interesting how MW4 has the highest benzene conc.) Table 2 shows FP removal (from MW1, MW3, and MW8). It goes up to 8/1/96.

11/22/96 spoke w/J. Prall The product removal system started up last Fri. Pumping into drum until they get their 1K AST. I will try to arrange a site visit when Im in the area. Maybe when they change to the 1K AST.

ppb (or 43 ppm) TPHd, but Table 3 says 210,000,000 ppb (or 210,000 ppm) TPHd and 4,200 ppb benzene. MW samples: 2,600 ppb TPHg, 8,400 ppb TPHd, 8,000 ppb TPH-mo, and 23 ppb benzene.

GW flowed more or less North on 9/6/95 at 0.02 to 0.03 ft/ft (with just Port wells) (see Fig 3), and gw flowed N-NE on 9/28/95 (w/Port and Dongary wells) (see Fig 4). . . They also sampled Dongary wells on 9/28/95 and found very low hits in MW2 and MW3. . . They made two cross sections (see Fig 2) thru the Mws and Sbs of both sites.

Item 1: But they do not discuss the findings of the cross sections. . .

Item 2: It's strange how MW2 was ND for TPHg and BTEX and TPHd, while MW1 and MW3 had FP, and MW6 had a sheen (see Fig 6). . .

Item 3: We should keep an eye on DG well MW8, because it had a sheen on 9/6, then 0.12' FP on 9/28. . .

Item 4: Why doesn't Fig 7 include Dongary concs?. . See Fig 5 in Alisto's 1/31/96 QR.

Item 5: What are they trying to show with the aerial photos? They discussed the aerials a little bit on page 2, but they refer to a May 71 photo, of which there is none included here. Also, what is the address of "the site" w/the AST that they researched at RWQCB?

Item 6: check w/GTI Alisto's claim that there was an erroneous DTW measurement in MW1 as per GTI's 11/29/95 QR. This accounted for a reversal in gradient from S to N.

Item 7: did they send a copy to Dongary?

Reviewed 1/31/96 QR by Alisto. GW sampled on 9/6/95 was the third Q, while 9/28/95 was considered the fourth Q. They made an error in the scheduling.

Lm for Dan S.

7/20/95 mess to and from Dan S: he's still trying to get FP disposal doc. It was picked up by Waste Oil Recovery on a milkrun. His contractor trying to get the doc from WOR. He'll send a ltr w/results and proposed MW locations. Full report will be submitted after MW installation.

8/3/95 Reviewed 7/26/95 letter from Dan S. Includes results of soil and grab gw sampling, as well as proposed well locations. Looks ok. **Wrote acceptance letter**

8/21/95 Reviewed 8/9/95 letter fm Dan S: **invoices and manifests for the fuel recovered from Mws (to 7/26/95).** 400 or 900 gal (**manifest and invoice differ**) fuel/water on 4/28, 300 gal on 5/19 (**quantity and unit on manifest is illegible**), 50 gal on 5/31 (**for Port's "Western Aerospace Museum"**), 300 or 1,340 gal (**manifest and invoice differ**) on 7/26.

Phoned Dan S. And lm: Why all these discrepancies?

8/23/95 mess fm Dan S: waste oil does NOT get manifested from where it is picked up. They manifest the entire load on a milk run. That's why there are discrepancies.

It's ok (and makes sense) if the manifest shows the same quantity (or more) than the invoice does. But one manifest is illegible (5/22/95), and one invoice says Port of Oakland "Western Aerospace Museum" (5/31/95).

12/19/95 mess fm Dan S: their consultant erroneously sampled twice in Sept. Last sampling date was 9/28. Can they hold off on sampling for the fourth quarter, and resume early in first Q 1996 (Jan)? Lm for Dan: ok. If they do it in early Jan, I see no problem. Then it will only be 3 months and 1-2 weeks since last event.

12/26/95 lm for Dan: where is report for MW inst?

12/28/95 Dan's message: at Alisto for revision. To me in next couple of weeks.

3/1/96 Reviewed Jan 96 "Site Invest Report" by Alisto. **Report received 2/7/96!!!** They installed 11 more Sbs, SB7 to SB17, and ~~4~~ more Mws, MW4 to MW8. The new Sbs look like they're in approximately the same spots as proposed in the 3/30/95 wp. Max soil concs: 1,100 ppm TPHg, 14,000 ppm TPHd, 2,600 ppm TPH-mo. TPHk was ND. Only one hit of benzene: 2.9 ppm at 5.0' in MW1. They got 5.80' FP in MW3, 1.11' FP in MW1, and 0.12' FP in MW8. FP is removed weekly from MW1 and MW3. Grab gw samples: page 8 says up to 140,000 ppb (or 140 ppm) TPHg and 43,000

- 2/3/95 Reviewed 1/30/95 ltr fm Port w/documentation of disposal of 1,550 gal of "non-RCRA haz waste liquid." This was part of a milk run. So how much waste diesel was actually disposed from our site? left mess Dan S. mess fm Dan: **385 gal. was disposed.**
- 2/23/95 How is the FP recovery going? I'd like bimonthly status reports (every other month). Last one was 12/27/94. So it's almost been 2 months. left mess: **asked him to submit FP recovery update.**
- 3/6/95 left mess Dan S. re FP status reports. He's out sick today.
- 3/8/95 Reviewed fax fm Port: FP status report. Most recent event was 3/3/95, when there was 4.85' FP in MW3. Looks like bailing has been weekly continuously since 1/20/95.
- 3/14/95 mess to J. Borrego of Uribe: what kind of material did they encounter in MW3 starting at 9'bgs?
- 3/20/95 mess fm J. Borrego: he recalls that the soil was sand to silty sand. Too much liquid in sample to be retained. (Hmm, sounds like the same stuff on the Dongary site)
- 5/5/95 **Reviewed 3/30/95 Workplan for Supplemental Site Investigation, by Alisto (rcvd 4/19/95).** This includes 10 borings with temporary wells. They want to install "up to 6 Mws" at a later date, but will provide a separate wp for that. **This should be clarified.** The locations and # of Mws depend on the results of this investigation. Soil and gw samples will be analyzed for TPHg, TPHd, and BTEX. QS will ensue following MW installation. I wonder if Jaff of GSI is aware of this wp. Left mess for Dan
- 5/10/95 spoke w/Dan S: field work on 5/11
- Wrote letter to RP**
- 6/28/95 Reviewed 6/2/95 QR by Alisto. **GW sampled on 3/29/95 flowed N at 0.08 ft/ft (but Fig 2 says 0.008 ft/ft), and had FP in 2 wells (up to 2.9ft).** GWEs were higher this Q by approx 1ft. Since they couldnt use GWE from MW3 due to 2.9ft FP, they used GWE measurements from Dongarys wells (See Fig 2). **They did not include doc of FP disposal, which reportedly occurred on 1/19/95 (see my ltr dated 5/10/95).**
- left mess Dan S: 1) gradient discrepancy 2) FP removal doc 3) Report of Findings for most recent invest.--date of submittal?

12/20/94 lm Dan S.

12/22/94 spoke w/Dan S. They've extracted 1200 gal diesel already. They resurveyed all the wells in early Dec, and measured GWES; got another potentiometric map. Discrepancy in one well was cleared up; this changed the gradient to be towards Bldg 401. They're still fighting. They have to clean up the FP before they can do the bioremediation. Consultants both want to gather more data bf they design a system to remove FP. They want to stop FP removal until they come up w/a proposal for FP removal. When did they last remove FP? a few wks ago. Met w/Dongary 12/8; that was the last time they bailed FP. I pointed out that they already "stopped" doing it, so they're not requesting AlCo approval; they're just telling us what they did in retrospect. **I said they must continue bailing as an interim measure, even tho it's not cost effective, until they can implement another system.** He wants this in writing. But he's writing me a ltr first, stating their desire to stop FP removal. He'll try to fax the letter to me on Tues 12/27.

SHOULD WE DO A PERP ON THIS CASE?

12/27/94 Reviewed 12/27 fax from Port: **they have stopped manual FP pumping bec it is impractical; they want County concurrence on this.** They resurveyed AND recalculated gw gradient using the 3 MWS at bldg C-401 AND the 3 MWS at Dongary: they say that Port well MW3 is UG of their own USTs; however, the figure is unclear as to dates-- where is the 12/94 date and arrow? It's 11/30/94. Updated FP recovery tables were also included, with the last date as 12/8/94. On that date, FP thickness in MW1 was .77' and in MW3 was 5.63'.

12/28/94 Discussed w/SOS. Wrote ltr to RP (Port) saying **they must continue FP removal as interim measure.**

1/9/95 Dan S. phoned. Will continue hand pumping on a weekly basis **starting next week.** They may change consultants. They've been discussing more SBs along perceived lithology change, and on/far side of bldg. I reminded him to send me disposal doc. for the removed product already disposed. He'll fax.

1/11/95 met w/KG

1/17/95 Wrote letter to Dongary requesting gw investigation.

1/27/95 Tom Barnes of Uribe phoned: will resume weekly bailing of FP today.

- 11/3/94 Spoke w/Dan S. Waiting for final report. He provided Ringsby w/boring logs; they met approx 2 weeks ago. They agreed to do DTW together, so both parties can verify it was done properly. We discussed SPacific's former wastewater impoundments on an adjacent site. As per the Jan 92 "GW Mon. Report" by Geomatrix (see STID 3781A file), there was approx 2' FP (4 MWs w/FP) in 12/92. But the RWQCB closed this site under the Toxic Pits Cleanup Act by letter dated 6/17/92, signed by Richard McMurtry. **How could they close a site w/2' FP? Was there any gw treatment?**
- 11/16/94 phoned Dan S. Where's MW inst. report? He got report on 11/14. Will send within a wk. I asked for FP removal update (last one 8/94) and disposal doc. for the removed FP.
- 11/22/94 Received 11/10/94 "Report of Additional Invest. and GW MW Inst and Sampling," by Uribe.
- 12/14/94 Reviewed the report. This documents the installation on 9 SBs back in May 1994. Three were converted to MWs. They got grab samples from the 6 SBs. **There was FP in MW1 (0.18') and MW3 (6.88')**, (which we already know). FP bailing occurred between 6/30 and 8/18; during this time, FP decreased in MW3 by 1.24' and FP increased in MW1 by 0.58'. **How could they analyze water/liquid from MW3 and SB1 and get dissolved concs of 1,000,000 mg/L and 210,000 mg/L, respectively?** (Table 3) **Why doesn't the TPH-d distribution map (Fig 3) make sense? I'd expect high concs in MW2 and SB2 if they think the TPH-d plume is coming from ANR. . . .** They claim that all the ANR USTs were diesel (w/one waste oil) (p.1). They do not identify which Southern Pacific site they got gw info from (p.2). They said "the highest concs of TPHd in gw were in SB1 and SB2." This is not true; SB2 had relatively low concs (p.7, Fig 3, Table 3). They claim that the W and S-SW flow directions reported by Ramcon (93) and GTI (94) cannot be relied upon without additional data on tidal fluctuations (p.9). They recommend: QM of MW2, additional FP recovery, and additional evaluation of tidal effects and gw gradients (p.9). **They say that a detailed recommendation for additional FP recovery has been submitted under separate cover (p.9).**
- Phoned Dan S. re FP recovery status.
- 12/19/94 mess fm Dan: FP removal not working; the thickness is not decreasing; not cost effective. He met w/Dongary on 12/15. Jon Amdur leaving the Port; going to EPA.

Site Summary STID 3899
Port of Oakland
aka Shipper's Imperial
Bldg C-401
2277-7th St.
Oakland CA 94607

continued fm handwritten notes:

- 8/30/94 Reviewed 8/24/94 letter fm the Port. Approx. total of diesel removed from MW3 is 303 gal over the past 8 wks. Port proposes an air-powered pump to recover FP from MW3 and MW1. Wrote acceptance letter.
- 9/16/94 Dan S. phoned. Uribe wants to use a different pump that will be above ground. They plan to begin 9/22 9am. He has to get a tanker to pump out the diesel from the drums, so they don't have to bring in more drums.
- 9/21/94 mess. fm Gary Goodemote of Uribe (pager 382-4249). Probably can't pump on 9/22. spoke w/him. Pump isn't working.
- 9/22/94 spoke w/GG. Getting new pump; will be here tomorrow; wants to pump then; OK? OK. After that, they plan to pump every Thursday. He'll measure thickness of FP. He'll leave me a message tomorrow (it's my flex day) re progress. The diesel in the drums has already been removed, tho not by Uribe.
- 10/20/94 Mtg w/Jaff Auchterlonie for STID 940: the diesel soil plume appears to be erratic (see tank removal doc). This does not support the theory that Dongary's diesel migrated to C-401. Reviewed UST compliance file: no tank test results, no inspections, one interim permit issued 1/91, and four B forms signed by Neil Werner in 90 that say the USTs were empty! **We're missing the MW installation report (and boring logs).** Left mess. Dan S. re report. The geometry of the plume doesn't fit w/a typical plume (coming fm Dongary). The N-NW "inferred gradient" comes fm SP Waste Impoundment site fm 90-91. Dongary's onsite gradient is SW to W-SW (away fm C401).
- 10/26/94 mess. fm Dan S: He's been on vacation again. He has the report in draft form; final ready by end of next week (Nov. 4). Should be to me by ____ ?

7-15-94 rec'd fax fm Uribe .

7-22 rec'd fax " " . Thickness of FP has decreased slightly. Mess fm Dan S. looking at other remediation methods. Will bail in the meanwhile.

8-1 Im Dan S. Rec'd fax fm Uribe. FP bailed 7-29.

8-5 Reur 8-3 fax fm Uribe. FP ↑ d.

8-25 Sp w/ Dan S. They'll submit a wp for FP removal via pump. It's been 8 wks of FP " .

They'll bring a pump out weekly to remove FP. " work w/ Fire Dept to get OK on good place to store drums. Any ↓ in FP thickness? Nothing significant; maybe 1 ft. less. Can't use their MWs to determine gw flow dir; due to the FP. Maybe we need a tidal study. 24hr period? Every 3 mos? Dongary should put a MW inside their plume to see how much FP they get. The Port could do it.

6-17-94 ltr Dan S

6-20 mess fm Dan S. Requests ~10 day
ext. Has been out past 2 wks.
Family emergency.

6-30 site visit for removal of FP.

Dongary's pits (w.o. + fuel) have been
backfilled. ~100 yd³ soil still sits
next to fuel pit.

Saw the 3 MWs.

Andy Meyer of Uribe said that they
got results back for the FP: it's diesel

Mess. fm Jerry Slattery: they got 40-45 gal
diesel fm MW-3. Diesel is recharging quickly.
How much FP did the other MWs have?

7-6 Received fax fm Uribe: they got no FP
in MW-2, and 0.55' FP in MW-1.

7-13 Rcv'd fax fm Uribe: FP thickness ↑ d
bet .2 + .4 ft. ltr Andy pls fax wklly.

3899

on 5-26-94

5-31-94 Dan S. phoned. Their consultant installed 3 MWs + sampled them. They did not notify me! There was ~ 7' of FP in MW-3. ANR backfilled ^{the} pit w/ clean fill (recently) + supposedly offhauled dirty soil. MW-1 had ~ 2" FP. Port thinks it's ANR's responsibility. Dan is writing me a letter. Thinks MW-3 is UG, & can't accurately measure gradient (gwe).

6-1 Reviewed 5-31 ltr fm Port.

6-2 Discussed w/ Kevin Graves of RWQCB

Urbe/Port says their 2 10K USTs were gasoline, not diesel. The clos. plan indicated same.

What type of FP is in the wells? Im for Dan, saying they must sample it to determine gas or diesel, as a basis for refusal to vaccuum.

3-1-94 ^{mess-} fm + to M. James. Tank Removal report is ready. ULR-submitted on 11-1-93 had wrong address (2777-7th St). Asked him to submit a corrected version.

Results fm Port's extra sample at ANR site? I never got results. sp w/Micheaux. These results will be in the report.

No agreement w/ANR Freight yet as to cleanup/rem. system.

3-17 Reviewed 2-23 "Rep of UST Removals" by Uribe, and Appendix G (2-23 wp) for 3 MUs + 6 SBs.

Wrote acceptance letter

4-1 Reviewed 3-29 ltr fm Uribe - Mess. fm + to M. James. Did I recv his revised ULR?

4-4 sp w/M. James. He's working on a letter to me. ~~I rec'd~~

4-14 sp w/J. Borrego. Any outstanding issues? Revu 4-4-94 ltr fm N. Werner (Port), which addresses items 1 + 2 in my 3-17 letter.

27xIII = 135	25xIII = 75	24x0 = 48	23x III = 138	19xII = 38	20xI = 20	13xI = 13
28xII = 56	26xII = 52	= 575 yd ³ actually disposed.				

Site Summary STID 3781
SeaLand Services Inc.
1425 Maritime St.
Oakland CA 94607

12/27/93 Reviewed Sept. 93 QR by ESE. GW flowed S (consistent) on 9/9/93. All 4 MWS had decreasing conc's. All were ND except 6,000 ppb TPHd in MW3 (cross or UG well). GWES decreased by about .3 ft.

1/5/94 spoke w/J. Lynch. He'll submit tank closure plan for two more USTs: 1,000-gal waste oil and 2,000-gal lube oil. What analyses to run for lube oil? TPHd and TPH-mo (or TOG), since lube oil is a heavy HC. As for w.o. UST, if they get ND on the HCs and on CL HCs, then they do not have to analyze 8270. Metals can be present, since they may be background anyway.

We also spoke about the newly (extraction) well installed (EW-5). Lynch said that he needs to make an addendum to this report (Dec 93) because the distinction was not made between TPHd and TOG detected. This issue had been raised and explained in the first QR. We also discussed the need for FP removal in EW-5.

Reviewed Dec 93 "GW Extraction Well Installation" report by ESE. There was .25" of FP in both the old and new wells. TPHd has migrated to the four MWS from the area of the non-permitted former well (MW-5). Recommends remedial action at EW-5 to avoid further plume migration. Recommends tidal influence study (requested by AlCo) as part of aquifer pump test. EW-5 was sampled on 11/1/93 and had 18,000,000 ppb TPHd, 17,000 ppb TPHg, and 8,900,000 ppb O&G.

1/6/94 WRote letter to RP re FP removal. Spoke w/J. Lynch. Mtg w/engineer set for 1/12. Thinking of pump and treat. Will depress gw surface to maximize effectiveness of skimmer system, and to prevent migration of FP, and pump out FP.

1/26/94 reviewed 1/20 letter fm Wright.

2/22/94 received fax fm Wright. It's a FP removal report starting 1/25/94. Shows weekly replacement of 3-quart capacity absorbent sock in floating passive skimmer. No FP visible during last check (2/17).

2-25 sp w/lester Messina. Don't know how to explain it. Very ltl FP. ($< 1/16$ " in jar)

2-28 mess. fm J. Lynch: They are not yet working on remed. w/p, bec RP has not yet authz work. RP is evaluating their ~~draft w/p~~ proposal. (Contradictory)

The lateral extent of soil contamination (metals and HCs like TPH-mo) has not yet been totally defined. (see Fig.4 and p.33). "The distribution of contaminants in soils indicates that the UST system is not likely the sole source." p.33

They recommend continue the QM thru 1993; begin extracting FP from RW and OKUS-W5 into existing oil/water separator; do aquifer test. (p.36)

↓

might not be big enuf to store oil
how? pump fm well + pipe into sep? pump into sump
how often monitor + clean/remove oil?

sep. not used to store haz. mat.

it's regulated by NPDES or EBMUD.

The plume is spreading bec FP isn't being remediated.

12-30 No FP in W5 in Nov.

RW has 24" FP in July.

~~the~~ last time looked at RW.

Haven't hooked it up to oil/water sep. (above-ground tank)

They h a tank to store oil fm sep.

Same kind of system as nr diesel refueling area. Uses a total fluids pump → sep.

Can help control plume fm spreading

1717 Mid Harb. Rd. Denton Mauldin USPCA

going to turn over 1750 Ferry to DM also

Will ✓ w/DM. his contact?

storm-water high level switch set in sump?
will ✓ Setup of seps.

Dan

12-30

3899

- 1) backfill pit? my ^{approval} letter? Look at "CON" samples. yes & repaved.
- 2) 10-22 ltr fm Michael
- 3) Why didnt you sample contents of both ~~the~~ fuel USTs? If you could show they were both gas, you'd have a stronger case that diesel found in pit is not from you. ~~Where are~~ Did I get results of Tank B contents sample?

1-7 sp w/Dan. Uribe did draft report. Final pending. Port I do further delineation on their site. ANR I hold off on remed. system. Press. is off me to write ANR ltr, is? Wait for Uribe report, then I may still say that "the plume" is not defined.

2-15-94 mtg w/Jon Amdur. Tank report not yet ready. Port is finalizing it.

HUD Rental Rehabilitation Tracking/Reporting System
 Disbursement Information Options
 1) Add New Disbursement Data
 2) Modify/Delete Existing Disbursement Data
 Enter Search Criteria:
 Grant: _____
 Project No: _____