

7-14-2000

Tim Cook of W.A. Craig said drilling is tentatively scheduled for Aug. 16<sup>th</sup>

8-15-00

Tim Cook called and said drilling of the well will be on 8/16 or 8/17. He will forward the results to me in a final report.

5-25-99

Reed Reinhart of Rinehart Oil said there has been work that has been performed as outlined in the Workplan Addendum dated Aug. 27, 1978. He will contact the contractor who did the work, and send me documents pertaining to the work. (He said the City of Oakland was overseeing the investigation - at least that is what he thought.) Reinhart said Geopony Fiedler of W.H. Clegg left the company, and things fell through the cracks.

7-22-98

Spoke with Geogary Fiedler of W.A. Craig Inc. He said the faults are still in the ground, and that it is his understanding they will be upgraded to meet the 12/98 requirements for U.G.T. He does not think MW-3 is a good well to use to determine gradient direction since it is very slow to recover. He says additional wells are needed to determine gradient direction. Samples were not taken from RW-W and RW-E but ones for lab analysis because the wells were not screened, and surface water most probably got into the well. A sampling was done in 5/98, and he will be submitting the report in a week. Fiedler feels ~~that~~ the UGTs may be leaking. He also said the soil removal during installation of RW-W and RW-E was so hot, some had to be disposed of as haz waste.

7-21-99

Spoke to Reed Pinchault concerning his request for me to write a letter to the State Board on his behalf. I told him his consultant just needs to address my issues in my letter dated 6-25-99, that request a summary of the site activities. He said he will contact his consultant immediately.

1-5-98

Tim Gook of W.A. Craig will submit an excavation and sampling plan for the removal of the U.G.I.s at this site. I told him the goal should be to ~~be below~~ Tier I levels. A copy of the plan will be sent to Larry Cuzzari with the City of Oakland Fire Dept.

8/11/97

a mounding. Tight soils except in UST area. He'd like to draw down the water in the Rws, as an experiment. Would recover more FP; see if MWs respond; looking for hydraulic connection. Would be qualitative type of remediation. Told him that I heard that MTBE is not compatible w/glues in the piping. Does he have a contract to do the SWI? Not yet, but that's not Reed's fault. He's thinking of screening future Mws in the shallow area (first 5'), but it's difficult to do. Site is grossly contaminated. **There was a piping leak, but was there any soil sampling and/or cleanup? He will ask Reed.** Remember there was some SP soil. He owes me a letter re SP disposal. He is worried about drilling in an active pipe area. How about hand augering? He will speak w/Reed. He'd suggest some SBs between MW1 and the bldg. Was EB3 contam? Clean at 9' to 16'bgs.

BTEX (and TPHg?).

5/21/97

mess fm Jeff Fiedler: Reed wants to speak w/me directly. Reed asked Jeff to hold off sending anything to me until he has a chance to talk to me. He could find out what is in the product (fuel fingerprint). Or get a dissolved sample. Can do TPHg, BTEX, MTBE on a product sample. He is dubious about MW3, in terms of real # concs. Since it has such low recharge rate. He would also like to investigate behind bldg, bet MW1 and MW3. But that would be offsite. And I'm not asking for offsite SWI. Screen is below 5'bgs. Perched water above 5'bgs may be a conduit. Maybe they should do grab sampling fm perched zone. He was thinking of surveying the Rws, and tying them in to use for gradient. Seems like the water levels in the Rws is consistent. He would not need a surveyor; he could do it himself. Best # for Reed is 707-462-8811. Jeff still owes me a report on SP disposal.

Spoke w/Reed: it's motor oil and diesel, and a lot more fuel than they ever lost, and it doesn't match what they have in the RWs (gasoline). **He thinks there has been some midnight dumping.** He disconnected the quick coupling attached to Baker tank approx late April so nobody can hook up to it. Someone put a quick coupling system in (so he could pump in). They lost about 2200 gal of product, and there is about 4200 gal of product in the Baker tank (Jeff determined the volume). He looked for Douglas Scott (see 3/16/97 ltr fm B&B), thinking he was in Benicia, but found an apt complex, with answering machine. Then he went over to where the business was supposed to be in Benicia and found an auto repair shop. He did this bec **tenant at site saw a beige waste oil truck hanging around by 6 pm a few days.** Brinker supposedly had Pacific Petro Chem offhaul some product out of drums, when they first started pumping product. He never heard of Enviropur. He is not contracting B&B to do any more work. He said it's thick like motor oil. Told him I was writing a letter to him requesting additional SWI. *He said he believes the lines were leaking.*

→ from pipe leak

Phoned Pam Evans: told her what Reed just said. (Left a long message)

8/11/97

Jeff Fiedler phoned: Water in Rws (representing tank area) is higher than gw in Mws. Tire Shop has moved out; bldg is vacant. Trucking containers made it difficult to drill S of USTs. Surveyed the wells. **Strange how MTBE concs are higher than TPHg concs.** Maybe TPHg has volatilized, and MTBE is slower to dissipate. **Outrageous MTBE concs.** QR is on its way, straight to me. RW w/product has MTBE concs lower than TPHg. Last time he was there (about 3 weeks ago) the baker tank was still there. Skimmer fills up every 3 days or so. Thinks Reed will replace USTs in total. Will continue to do QS. What about the additional SWI? Can't explain why MW3 is so slow to recharge. He didn't use GWEs from Rws in gradient, since gw is about 3' higher there; it would just show

4/24/97

Jeff Fiedler phoned: SP came back 220 ppm TPHd, 2.8 TPHg, 0.028 ppm benzene, ND MTBE, 86 total lead, 5.1 ppm soluble lead. It was a composite sample, so he ran each one: got 2 over 5.0 and 2 under 5.0, avg was 5.1 ppm. Going to cost \$7,000 to dispose SP. Told him Caltrans may be willing to take that SP for use in building freeway. I think Barney had a site who got rid of SP to Caltrans in this way. He ran TCLP (to profile it for disposal) and got non-haz level. He has a new QR. High MTBE in UG well. DG well GWE much lower than other 2. Brinker is trying to figure out what to do w/that Baker tank. He says it's got more liquid in it than he thought. Jeff tried to find the bottom of AST. Ran a fuel fingerprint: diesel fuel oil. Black, oily substance that is really diesel. Is that what's in the RWs? He doesn't know. They only recovered one full skimmer. They haven't been very good about checking it. He will include this info in the next QR. Should be to me next week. Jeff was helping Rino w/that, but he said he had a vendor who could do it for cheaper. Scheduled to haul SP on 4/29. Let me know what happens w/the SP.

Phoned Pam Evans: I have not heard from her. Did she get my inquiry from 3/21?

Mess fm Pam: does not see a copy of my report. Has my 9/20/96 ltr. Here til 5 today, then out Fri but back in late pm. GAVE HER THE INFO AGAIN.

4/29/97

mess fm Jeff Fiedler: will be onsite 4/30 using Allied to offhaul the SP. 86 ppm lead (?); will use dust control. He spoke w/DTSC, who said Caltrans cannot take any fm offsite sources. . . . Well, that's their (hasty) decision to offhaul the SP. They could have resampled it. . .

5/20/97

SP is gone. Reviewed 5/15/97 QR by WA Craig. **GW sampled on 3/5/97 flowed SE at 0.09 ft/ft.** That makes MW3 the DG well. But there is no well DG of the dispensers. The passive skimmer was installed in RW-W on 3/7/97. They have removed 211 pints (says the text) or ounces (says Table 3) of product. RW-E has no product. **THERE IS 760,000 PPB MTBE IN UG MW2!!! Where is this MTBE coming from? It is ND in MW1, and only 13 ppb in MW3.** Also 1500 ppb benzene in MW2. They recommend further invest to the SE portion of the site and S of the site. I say the source of MTBE should be investigated.

Spoke w/Geof: he said they only did a fuel fingerprint; it was diesel fuel oil. Did not analyze dissolved concs. They also found 12 inches FP in Baker Tank.

**WROTE LETTER requesting more SWI.**

Instead of doing DG SWI, maybe they should sample the Rws for MTBE, since they are closer to the USTs than MW1 and MW3. And since DG MW3 is ND for BTEX (and TPHg?).

3/4/97 mess fm Jeff: he is onsite; the Baker tank is still onsite.

3/6/97 mess fm Jeff F: Reed wants to Craig to get rid of soil SP. He will sample it on 3/7 for TPHg, TPHd, BTEX, MTBE, and 5 metals. He will also install passive skimmer in the trench on 3/7. Spoke w/JF: he just spoke w/OFD re the storage of gasoline. They told him there is a 90-day limit on storage. Will put skimmer in RW w/FP (the other RW doesn't have any FP, maybe just a sheen, but no noticeable odor): The FP appears to be diesel. Where will they pump it into? Product collects in the container in the skimmer, then gets drained into 55-gal drum as needed. Will install it, check it the next day, then take it from there. He just sampled MWs on 3/5/97. He is giving RP a wp for additional work: a few more Mws (one offsite to the S, one in corner of site near EB7). EB7 had a high benzene in ratio to TPH. He noted the high MTBE in gw in MW2&3. He said the SP is sandy clay w/mixed rubble. He is just characterizing it for disposal. Baker tank is closed on top, but vented. It has a permanent ladder on one end of it. He noted a lot of staining and cat litter on ground by dispensers. Is the ground paved over there? Yes, but it is in poor condition. Can his tech meet me onsite at 10:30 on 3/7?

3/7/97 ONSITE FOR SP SAMPLG AND SKIMMER INSTALL. See field report.

3/21/97 Reviewed 3/14 fax fm JF. **SP results**: 2.8 TPHg, ND MTBE, 0.028 benzene, some TEX, 220 TPHd, ND Cd, 32 Cr, **86 Pb**, 31 Ni, 71 Zn. **MW results**: up to 2300 TPHd, 4400 TPHg, 760,000 MTBE, 1500 benzene (all in MW2).

3/21/97 Received and reviewed 3/16 ltr fm B&B. He tries to account for the amounts of waste listed on the 3 invoices, but the dates and amounts do not add up.

1st invoice) #2305 The Enviropur West invoice (#87859) is for 400 gal of "HW oil" and is dated 2/22/95. This is *close* to the 440 gal mentioned on B&B invoice 2305, but the **Enviropur invoice does not state the address of the job site. It just says "Pacific Pride" under "customer."** B&B invoice date 3/3/95 is **after** the Enviropur invoice date of 2/22/95.

2nd invoice) #2307 This has the same manifest #. **WHY?** Also, the dates are wrong. B&B invoice date 3/3/95 is **after** ~~to~~ the Enviropur invoice date of 2/22/95. Also, the amounts do not add up. B&B's invoices #2307 says 110 gal, while Enviropur invoice says 300 gal. Also, **the Enviropur invoice does not state the address of the job site. It just says "Pacific Pride" under "customer."**

3rd invoice: #2304 Who is Doug Scott? What does he have to do with this?

→ maybe bec the dates are same (waste picked up on same date)

SENT COPY OF B&B LTR TO PAM FOR HER INPUT.



1/24/97 Spoke w/Jeff Fiedler: RP wants him to do FP recovery. Great news! RP didn't have anything to say about the report. No cover letter. Thinks RP got ltr of commitment. He suspects the FP release is so fresh that it may have separated into its components (ie MTBE). He's getting resistance fm Fund about not getting ahead of the Agency in doing more work. Jeff will go ahead and sample the Mws for first quarter. He'd like to write a wp for FP recovery separately from a wp for more SI. He will attach a site map for soil concs. He will decide on how to present the data. — no!

I MUST WRITE LTR TO RP, BUT WD LIKE PAM'S INPUT FIRST.

Spoke w/Pam: we should write the ltr to B&B, not RP.

2/4/97 lm for Leroy Griffin and Steve Craford. Any inspection done at B&B? Can I see the file? Any problems? I suspect they may be disposing of wastes illegally. They are a general contractor, nothing more.

2/26/97 **MTG W/LEROY GRIFFIN. We added up the amounts on the 3 invoices fm B&B, and got 1815 gallons, which is the amount of "free product. . .placed into drums" specified on Rino's 6/10/96 letter to County. However, Rino also specified there were "550 gal of gasoline in the Baker tank." What happened to this?**

3/3/97 **WROTE LETTER TO B&B**, requesting manifests referred on their 3 invoices.

3/4/97 mess fm Jeff Fiedler RP Rino has authorized him to do QM and product skimming. Will analyze TPHg, TPHd, BTEX and MTBE. OK? He understands that Rino removed the Baker tank and the stockpiled soil. . . . OK analytes.

Phoned Reed Rinehart at 707-462-8811. He asked B&B to remove the soil. Was that SP ever sampled? He authorized Jeff to sample it. Was there anything in the Baker tank? Was he skimming product into the tank? Doesn't know. Tony Muir is po and tank owner. **I asked him to notify me when the Baker will be removed**, assuming he gets informed by Brinker. They are in C category, but has not yet received a LOC. When did he apply? A year ago. He has 8 locations, applied to Fund 4-5 yrs ago, and has received \$\$ on 3 of them. He got one site closed in Sacto.

The SP is approx 37 yd3, as per Craig's 1/17/97 report. **Sample results? Origin?** Reed said it was mostly pea gravel from the trenching. Huh? It should have been soil they dug to install the trench (w/pea gravel). Lm for Jeff: did he sample the SP?

10/10/96 SITE VISIT for subsurface investigation.

12/16/96 Im for Jeff Fiedler: status? Where is the report? Rpt ready at end of week. Will send to Rino first. Slow recharge. TPHd is main problem. He never responded to my 9/20 letter.

### SUMP?

1/9/97 mess fm Reed: he hasn't received rpt yet. Phoned Jeff Fiedler: that's right, he hasn't gotten rpt to RP yet. SOON.

1/23/97 Received report.

1/24/97 Reviewed 1/17/97 "Subsurface Invest Rpt" by WA Craig. DTW was 3 to 8'bgs, but DTW during drilling was 8 to 12'bgs. MW1 and MW3 have slow gw recovery rates. Unusually high MTBE concs, in some locations where gasoline was ND (like MW3). They drilled 7 borings and installed 3 Mws. They found perched water with a moderate to strong HC odor at approx 5' in EB1, EB3, EB4, and EB6. These 4 borings were closest to the USTs. **GW flowed SE on 10/21/96 at 0.03 ft/ft and S on 11/4/96 at 0.01 ft/ft.**

Groundwater results: it seems like MTBE is the biggest problem. TPHd, TPHg and benzene appear in moderate concs. Maximums are 120 ppb benzene, 910 ppb Tphg, 2700 ppb TPHd, and 470,000 ppb MTBE. **(Isn't this FP MTBE?)** Soil results: maximums are 12 mg/kg benzene, 1,400 mg/kg TPHg, 28,000 mg/kg TPHd all in EB5 at 4.5', and 83 mg/kg MTBE in EB4 at 5'. NO

**They recommend 1) recovering FP via the recovery wells (located on the SE and SW edges of UST area), 2) additional SWI south and east of site, 3) QM of wells, 4) close the sump near MW3 (containerize, characterize and dispose the contents), 5) characterize and dispose soil SP and gw in Baker tank.**

COMMENTS: 1) it would be nice to have the product lines drawn on the site map. 2) it wd also be nice to have a site map with soil concs, like the one they presented for gw concs. 3) isn't 470,000 ppb MTBE FP? NO

Phoned Jeff Fiedler: Im: rcvd rpt, wd like site map showing soil concs. Should I request this via RP?

Phoned Pam Evans: what was the outcome of the 11/6/96 PERP for Reed Rinehart? She is out until 1/28. Left message.

8/30/96  
con't

procedure. What does he have? Two trenches going side by side around tank complex, 10' deep, 6" slotted PVC pipe going horizontal, and 18" vertical slotted PVC. Just one vertical pipe in each trench, goes to 10'bgs; gw is at 4'bgs. Brinker installed those 2 yrs ago(?). **Free product on gw.** They've removed a lot. **Brinker hauled away the Baker tank water.** To where? He doesn't know. Why didn't he get a qualified consultant to work on this site? Bec their wp was verbally approved by Roel, and bec their consultant on another site didn't want to mess around w/this site bec he knew. Asked him to get disposal doc for gw already offhauled. Lm Pam re this update: also, what's the deal w/their UST permit? Why didn't they ever get one? He needs one to apply for State Fund. Was it our oversight? Or his? Phoned Cheryl Gordon: left message.

9/20/96

Received and reviewed 9/16 wp by WA Craig. **(It's overdue.)** Includes 7 Sbs and conversion of 3 into Mws. GW probably flows South, based on proximity to Inner Harbor, and consistent S to SE flow direction at 330 Chestnut St. (Aramark). Phoned Jeff Fiedler: Is it possible to place a MW South of the USTs, like in that "accessible lane?" He was told that "it's smelly near the scale." He doesn't know how thick the FP in Rws is. It was really shallow, like 3'bgs. I asked him about the sump (see site map). He was told they shut off all their storm drains, like grouted them up. Why? They got in trouble w/Fish and Game. He said the sump is a mess, lots of black oil inside it, and is covered w/wood. He thinks the USTs are coming out; not sure. What does he think about taking grab water samples from the other borings? How long wd he leave the hole open? Take it immediately. It wd cost about \$100 per hole for analysis. RWs do not appear to be hooked up. It's a fairly crude setup. He's not getting a straight answer about what happened w/gw/FP recovery. Baker Tank is closed on top, so he doesn't know what's inside. But he thinks something is inside. It's a \$16,000 job, he thinks.

### WROTE CONDITIONAL APPROVAL LETTER

10/1/96

mess fm JF: tentative start date for drilling is 10/9. Bordering po may be the Hofbrau.

10/2/96

mess fm JF: wants to change location of MW3 to the south margin of property, not offsite. RP doesn't want to go offsite.

10/3/96

spoke w/JF: new drill date is 10/10. New location for MW3 will also be DG of the sump. He doesn't think we will miss the plume with citing MW3 South of the sump. This is just a first cut. Do we have any better site plans? Esp an as-built?

Spoke w/Pam: no plans showing utilities or lines; sorry.

*fold JF*

- 8/1/96 Im for Bill Craig
- 8/12/96 phone tag w/Bill Craig. Mess from Pam: re status?
- 8/13/96 spoke w/Bill Craig: Reed is in the process of taking over from his dad, Bob. Reed has appt on 8/20 in Ukiah. Craig is not the lowest bidder. Craig is recommending 7 Sbs as a minimum, and converting 3 to Mws. That was back in May. He's looking into Geoprobe work and piezometers. No new contracts have been signed since we last spoke (7/18). Left mess for Pam: no, I have not received any SI report yet, bec they have not done a SI. I don't know anything more about the temporary UST closure. How about us doing a joint inspection this wk?
- 8/15/96 SITE VISIT. Met Edward Talbot, the UST operator. He said that they just installed piping in the recovery trench yesterday. He said the trench had already been dug several months ago, but the piping was just installed yesterday. I noted a large Baker tank onsite. He said it was empty, and pounded on it so I could hear the hollow sound. He leases the site for a tire business, but plans to move the business to 24th and Union Sts.
- Discussed situation w/Pam. She thinks we should get him in for a PERP (Panel Review). Maybe attach a letter to the PERP notice that outlines the reasons why. Spoke w/Tom: he suggested we write a NOV, and both Pam and I sign it. Give him a short TAT, like 2 wks, then if no response, write the PERP Notice. He DOES have a UST permit for 2 USTs, but the other two are supposed to be under temp. closure. I will start on the NOV; let's try to get it out by Monday.
- Phoned Reed Rinehart: left message on his voice mail at mobile phone #.
- DRAFTED THE NOV.
- 8/19/96 Revised the NOV.
- 8/28/96 Jeff Fiedler phoned from WA Craig: he has signed contract w/Rino. Wil do wp and SBs.
- 8/30/96 spoke w/Reed Rinehart: they were pumping it through hoses and bailing; contractor just decided to put self-pumping system in so they wouldn't have to bail it by hand. He went ahead and contracted with WA Craig. They found some gasoline in the USTs, bec the Re vapor pressure was over 8 (it was 10). So they cannot get rid of it in-state. He's talking about the USTs he wants to do temp closure on. Brinker is closing the USTs; has all instructions. State is asking him for a definition of RP, and a permit to operate. His contact is Cheryl Gordon. Told him I'll talk to her. His "workplan" was only intended as an emergency

Site Summary STID 922  
Rino Pacific/Oakland Truck Stop/J&O Truckstop  
1107-5th St.  
Oakland CA 94607

7/18/96

*Confidential*

Phoned WA Craig and spoke w/Bill Craig: 525-2780. Prop owner is negotiating new lease. City may want to take over some of the land. Reed is son, and is in the process of taking over the business. Reed recognizes the need for consultant to handle the sites, but owner Bob doesn't agree. Reed has handled problem sites for his dad. They own 10 or 12 gas stations, and sell to about 60 stations as a bulk distributor. Reed is finally turning over some of the problems to WA Craig. Told him that the Phase II wp should be submitted to this office for my review and approval. He will speak w/Rino tomorrow. He does not have a contract to do Phase II. He reported a release to us. Any samples? **He has been pumping water (or gasoline?) into a Baker tank. Bill assumed we knew about this. It gets offhauled periodically. JE: Where is it coming from? Rino started digging, found shallow gw and/or gasoline, and started pumping it out. If we go out to the site, we will see a Baker tank, and then can question Rino about it.** He gave Rino a proposal for Phase II, but haven't received it signed back yet. They also have a **SIGNED** contract for piping replacement (this one was signed in April or May): Then Rino decided that they needed to do more work, specifically Phase I and Phase II. They met in May in Ukiah at Rino's office. Rino is just a tenant, but may own the USTs. He's not selling gas, since the piping break/leak (just selling diesel). He thinks the County is holding off approval of the piping replacement plans until we get a Phase I and/or II. Rino is getting their own permits. Lm for Pam: is this last part true? Or did we already approve a piping replacement? Mess fm Pam: we are not holding up anything. We issued them a permit to operate the two operable USTs, and told Rino that the other two USTs should be closed. Lm for Pam: told her about the Baker tank and Rino doing their own remediation. Maybe we should do a joint site visit? Spoke w/Pam: she said they submitted a ULR, and we did not route it correctly. Spoke w/Tom: he said that we can transfer to LOP based on presence of a ULR. The ULR was dated 2/17/95, submitted by Reed Rinehart. It only says that the "delivery driver discovered gasoline odor while delivering fuel." Roel received it, kept the white copy, and gave the other copies back to RP for distribution. (That's not our standard way of doing things. He should have given the copies to Elaine Olson for distribution, and then notified LOP.) Phoned RP for correct mailing address: a woman told me that they are a Texaco distributorship, and the company name is Rinehart Oil Inc., not Rino Pacific. PO Box 725, Ukiah CA 95482

**TRANSFERRED TO LOP. WROTE NOR.**