

5552 Ron Simpson, 489 - 43rd Street, Oakland 94609

12/4/95 New case from SH. Review file and prepare site summary. Review September 25, 1995 - Accutite "Report on the Removal of One Underground Storage Tank".

Site Summary:

On September 18, 1995, Accutite removed the 1000-gallon UST which formally contained regular (leaded) gasoline. After the UST removal, a total of four soil samples were collected. Soil sample GAW-1-10.5' was collected from the west end, approximately 10.5' below surface grade (approximately one foot below the bottom of the UST). Soil sample GAE-1-11' was collected from the east end, approximately 11' bgs. Soil sample GAM-1-13' was collected from the middle, approximately 13' bgs. Soil sample STOK-1 was collected from the soil stockpile generated from the UST removal. Laboratory analysis of soil samples collected from beneath the UST detected maximum concentrations of TPHg-1900 ppm*, TPHd-1300 ppm*, benzene-0.2 ppm, toluene-0.46 ppm, ethyl benzene- 17 ppm*, total xylenes-48 ppm* and MTBE-1300 ppm*. Note: The asterisk* denotes concentrations detected in the sample collected from beneath the middle of the UST (sample GAM-1-13'). No groundwater was encountered in the UST pit.

Recommendations/comments: Need to over-excavate the pit. Placed call to consultant (Accutite) and to Ron Simpson. Left messages for both parties. Call back from Accutite, no over-excavation performed. Pit is backfilled and resurfaced. There are reportedly 3 wells across the street-case file of EC or SH. Will talk to them concerning location of these wells.

12/12/95 Review file. Call to Ron Simpson concerning next step for remediation of the site. I informed him that over-excavation is usually the next step in this case, since confirmatory samples collected at depths ranging from 10.5' to 13' bgs detected significant concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons. Mr. Simpson informed me that the tank was in close proximity to underground utilities, and that they had severed a water line while removing the tank. Talked to SH and EC concerning whether over-excavation was feasible. EC said that borings would probably be the way to approach this site, and that over-excavation may not be feasible, since contamination would be hard to chase due to utilities and the close proximity to the street.

1/9/96 Call from Ron Simpson concerning direction of remediation. He is concerned with the costs associated with the remediation, and that his consultant ACCUTITE wants an additional 1000.00 to do a work plan for overexcavation. I told him that a work plan would not be required for just an overexcavation, since the original health and safety plan for the UST removal would be sufficient, however, he would have to get three bids to fulfill UST Fund requirements.

1/10/96 Placed call to Ron Simpson after reviewing notes on borings instead of additional

excavation. Left message that I would like to come down and visit the site, in order to become more familiar with it before additional investigation is requested. Draft of PSA letter for peer review. On site at 1:00 pm to talk to Mr. Simpson. He showed me the property and I found where the UST pit was located. Utilities are in the street in close proximity to former UST pit. Excavation has been resurfaced with concrete. Number of soil borings or hydropunch locations should be approximately three or four to determine where monitoring well (1) would be best located. Gave him Jennifer's list of contractors so he can solicit bids for the Fund reimbursement. Final draft of letter sent.

- 6/10/96 Call to Ronn Simpson concerning PSA request. Informed him that one well or three hydropunch borings within 10 feet of the former UST location. Faxed him copy of consultant list.
- 6/13/96 Call from Tom Fogut of Weiss Associates. He stated that the Water Code section I cited (13267) was not applicable to Mr. Simpson's case. I left message informing him that that section was requiring the site assessment and request for reports, and that the current owner and operators, at the time of release discovery, would be named as RP(s). He also stated that the tank was installed on city property and that Mr. Simpson was not responsible for the UST. Confer with SH about these developments. She stated that she had no knowledge that the former UST was on city property, and in fact, that Mr. Simpson would need to prove that. We discussed the PSA requirements and we agreed that one hydropunch boring down-gradient (within 10 feet) of the former Simpson UST would be sufficient. Reviewed county assessors files again to determine whether any information documenting the ownership of a Paul Metz Bakery which was inscribed in a portion of the oven area with the date 5-1942. The information in the County Assessors files only go back to 1960 for this property, which at that time was owned by an Weber, Aloysius C Etal, up to 1972, when a Gregory and Joan Grossman bought the property. This UST could have been abandoned in the 1940-1950's. According to Britt Johnson of the Fire Departments Hazardous Materials Division, the City of Oakland Fire Department now destroys records over 3 years old (they stopped after the Loma-Prieta earthquake which damaged the building which was archiving the records). Visited site to determine whether former UST could be considered on City property. UST was approximately 3 feet from the building and five feet from the curb. No visible means of determining possible locations for any UST piping was evident upon inspection of the building's exterior structure.
- 6/17/96 Calls from/to Ronn Simpson and Tom Fogut of Weiss Associates. Conferred with Ronn Simpson on the requirement that only one Boring/hydropunch would be needed within 10 feet in the down-gradient location from the former UST. Requested that samples be tested for the presence of TPHpt (paint thinner). Left message for Tom Fogut.

- 8/20/96 Draft NOV letter sent after BC review.
- 9/24/96 Review Weiss Associates "Investigative Workplan"-dated 9/18/96.
- 9/25/96 Call to Tom Fogut of WA. He is on vacation this week, left message to call me about possibly putting in a well instead of just a boring and a "grab" groundwater sample.
- 10/7/96 Call from Tom Fogut of WA. Draft approval letter sent after BC review.

Normally, 1 boring is not enough for RBCA determination but it was allowed in this case because alot info is available from Walter Blumert Co. PE