



ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICES
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
1131 Harbor Bay Parkway, Suite 250
Alameda, CA 94502-6577
(510) 567-6700
FAX (510) 337-9335

November 20, 2015

Mr. David E. Murray
PCC Flow Technologies Holdings, Inc.
4600 SE Harney Drive
Portland, OR 97206-0898
(sent via electronic mail to:
DMurray@pccstructurals.com)

Mr. Harold Mark Vignoles
9201 San Leandro LLC
9201 San Leandro Street
Oakland, CA 94603
(sent via electronic mail to: mark@servicewest.com)

Mr. Dallas Nelson
GP Holdings LLC
5977 Keith Avenue
Oakland, CA 94618-1545

Mr. David Murray
PCC Precision Castparts Corp.
4650 SW Macadam Avenue, #400
Portland, OR 97239
(sent via electronic mail to: DMurray@pccstructurals.com)

Subject: Request for Data Gap Investigation Work Plan, FS / CAP, and Focused SCM; Fuel Leak Case No. RO0000320 and Geotracker Global ID T0600101592, PACO Pumps Inc, 9201 San Leandro Street, Oakland, CA 94603

Dear Messrs. Murray, Vignoles, and Nelson:

Alameda County Environmental Health (ACEH) has reviewed the case file, including the *Data Gaps Investigation and Groundwater Monitoring Report*, dated January 6, 2015, and the *Second Quarter 2015 Groundwater Monitoring Report*, dated September 15, 2015. The reports were prepared and submitted on your behalf by The Source Group (SGI) of Signal Hill, California. Thank you for submitting the reports. The reports recommended site closure under the Low-Threat Closure Policy (LTCP).

ACEH has evaluated the additional data and recommendations presented in the above-mentioned reports, in conjunction with the case files, to determine if the site is eligible for closure as a low risk site under the State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCBs) Low Threat Underground Storage Tank Case Closure Policy (LTCP). Based on ACEH staff review of recent data and the case file, we have determined that the site continues to fail to meet the LTCP General Criteria b (consists only of petroleum), d (Free Product), f (Secondary Source Removal), the Media-Specific Criteria for Groundwater, the Media-Specific Criteria for Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air, and the Media-Specific Criteria for Direct Contact (see Geotracker for an updated copy of the LTCP checklist).

Despite not meeting the LTCP, a deed restriction has been proposed to manage the significant and substantial residual contamination at the site. This would require among other items, a finding by ACEH that residual contamination is not a health risk for workers at the site, downgradient properties, or for the environment. A land use restriction would also require notification of, and review by, ACEH of the affect of the modification or construction of any structure, or the repair of any underground utility at the site. In the view of ACEH this would be a very intrusive land use restriction; however, if you wish to explore this potential path, ACEH has tentatively identified potential actions for you and your consultant to explore further, in the discussions provided below.

The following discussions of site contamination are divided up into five Areas of Interest. Area of Interests 1, 2, and 3, appear to be surface releases located near the southern or western property boundaries. For the purpose of closure, if useful, Areas of Interest 1 through 3 can be separated from the separate underground storage tank (UST) investigations by the creation of a new case at the site. Area of Interest 4 and 5 are associated with UST locations. Portions of the discussions below were provided in the March 7, 2014

directive letter; however, to capture and support ACEHs current review of the case, these portions have been brought forward in order for review continuity and site understanding.

At this juncture ACEH requests that you prepare a Data Gap Investigation Work Plan, or a Feasibility Study / Corrective Action Plan (FS/CAP) that is supported by a focused Site Conceptual Model (SCM) to address the Technical Comments provided below. Prior to submitting the document(s), ACEH would like to invite you to a meeting to discuss the site and strategize about the most efficient path towards closure. ACEH requests notification of suitable dates and times for the meeting by the date identified further below.

TECHNICAL COMMENTS

- 1. LTCP General Criteria b (Unauthorized Release Consists Only of Petroleum)** – For purposes of this policy, petroleum is defined as crude oil, or any fraction thereof, which is liquid at standard conditions and temperature and pressure, which means 60 degrees Fahrenheit and 14.7 pounds per square inch absolute including the following substances: motor fuels, jet fuels, distillate fuel oils, residual fuel oils, lubricants, petroleum solvents and used oils, including any additives and blending agents such as oxygenates contained in the formulation of the substances.

Area of Interest 1 and 3 – As previously discussed in the March 7, 2014 directive letter or the April 23, 2014 meeting, the potential for poly-chlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) contamination in Areas of Interest 1 and 3 appear to be adequately investigated.

Area of Interest 2 – Previous analytical sampling for PCBs in Area of Interest 2 was associated with deeper samples (3.5 feet below grade surface [bgs]) with non-detectable hydrocarbon concentrations. The detection of elevated diesel- and motor oil-range hydrocarbons in shallow soil (2.5 feet bgs) in recently installed wells MW-9, MW-10, and MW-11 in Area of Interest 2 at locations that have not previously documented elevated heavier hydrocarbon concentrations, indicated the appropriateness of a more recent additional sampling effort to determine the potential for hydrocarbon associated PCB contamination in this area of interest. Two bores (SB-MW-10 and SB-MW-11) were installed for this purpose.

The additional data indicates an increasing PCB concentration trend with depth at soil bore SB-MW-11, placed in close proximity to the soil bore for MW-11. The concentration of PCB increased from 0.14 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) at a depth of 1 foot below grade surface (bgs) to 2.5 mg/kg PCBs at a depth of 5 feet bgs. The analytical data submittals did not determine the total depth of PCB contamination, or if the soil contamination is also impacting groundwater beneath the down gradient edge of the site.

Two additional soil bores (SB-SGI-1 and SB-SGI-2) were installed to characterize oily soil stockpiles and surface dumping of waste oil at two locations on the western edge of the property in Area of Interest 2 noted during the April 2014 onsite meeting. Soil bores SB-SGI-1-1', SB-SGI-2-1' and SB-SGI-2-2.5 documented Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons as diesel (TPHd) and TPH as motor oil (TPHmo) up to 580 mg/kg and 1,800 mg/kg, respectively. These bores also documented elevated chromium, lead, and zinc at 1 or 2.5 feet bgs at concentrations up to 140, 310, and 1,700 mg/kg, respectively. While the concentration of chromium and lead are below the Environmental Screening Levels (ESLs) for commercial sites, as promulgated by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), the concentrations are not typical for the region. Additionally, one or more of the samples collected contain concentrations of zinc that are above commercial ESLs.

Please be aware that while the TPHmo is below the value on Table K-2 *Direct Exposure Soil Screening Levels, Commercial / Industrial Worker Exposure Scenario* (100,000 mg/kg), waste oil discharged to the surface of the land requires removal and a physical barrier to provide separation from surface contamination and worker exposure.

ACEH believes that once resolved, it may be possible to manage these concerns with a Site Management Plan and / or a deed restriction.

Please present a strategy in a Data Gap Work Plan and FS/CAP (described in Technical Comment 7 below) to address the comments and data gaps identified above. Please identify any additional data

gaps that are encountered. Alternatively, please provide justification of why the site satisfies this general criterion in the focused SCM described in Technical Comment 7 below.

As noted above, please also be aware, that because Area of Interest 2 does not appear to be associated with an UST, and as discussed before, the Area may be separated from the UST investigations and closed under another case number in the Voluntary Remedial Action Program (VRAP; a non-UST). In order to use this mechanism, ACEH will require sufficient funds to oversee the concurrent investigation. Once sufficiently characterized and if appropriate remediated, the use of a land use restriction may allow this area of interest to be managed with residual contamination in place.

- 2. LTCP General Criteria d (Free Product)** – The LTCP requires free product to be removed to the extent practicable at release sites where investigations indicate the presence of free product by removing in a manner that minimizes the spread of the unauthorized release into previously uncontaminated zones by using recovery and disposal techniques appropriate to the hydrogeologic conditions at the site, and that properly treats, discharges, or disposes of recovery byproducts in compliance with applicable laws. Additionally, the LTCP requires that abatement of free product migration be used as a minimum objective for the design of any free product removal system.

Area of Interest 4 – As previously communicated, LTCP technical support documents consider Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH) as gasoline (TPHg) concentrations greater than 20,000 micrograms per liter [$\mu\text{g/l}$], or benzene concentrations greater than 3,000 $\mu\text{g/l}$, and TPHd concentrations greater than 5,000 $\mu\text{g/l}$, to be indirect evidence of LNAPL Light-Non-Aqueous Phase Liquid (LNAPL). Based on these technical documents, evidence of gasoline, diesel, or motor oil LNAPL in wells E3, E9, E10, and E11 is present beneath the site. Additionally, LNAPL may also be present at, or in the vicinity of, well E7. During the last two groundwater monitoring events (October 2014 and April / May 2015) concentrations of TPHg up to 25,700 $\mu\text{g/l}$, benzene up to 2,150 $\mu\text{g/l}$, TPHd up to 250,000 $\mu\text{g/l}$, and TPHmo up to 416,000 $\mu\text{g/l}$ were reported in groundwater, after cleanup by Silica Gel Cleanup (SGC) techniques. ACEH's review has determined that LNAPL has not been removed to the extent practicable.

Therefore, please present a strategy in the Data Gap Work Plan and FS/CAP (described in Technical Comment 7 below) to address the comments and data gaps identified above. Please identify any additional data gaps that are encountered. Alternatively, please provide justification of why the site satisfies this general criterion in the focused SCM described in Technical Comment 7 below.

- 3. General Criteria f – Secondary Source Has Been Removed to the Extent Practicable** – “Secondary source” is defined as petroleum-impacted soil or groundwater located at or immediately beneath the point of release from the primary source. Unless site attributes prevent secondary source removal (e.g. physical or infrastructural constraints exist whose removal or relocation would be technically or economically infeasible), petroleum-release sites are required to undergo secondary source removal to the extent practicable as described in the policy. “To the extent practicable” means implementing a cost-effective corrective action which removes or destroys-in-place the most readily recoverable fraction of source-area mass. It is expected that most secondary mass removal efforts will be completed in one year or less. Following removal or destruction of the secondary source, additional removal or active remedial actions shall not be required by regulatory agencies unless (1) necessary to abate a demonstrated threat to human health or (2) the groundwater plume does not meet the definition of low threat as described in this policy.

Area of Interest 4 – Based on ACEH's review of the case file, substantially elevated groundwater contamination in the vicinity of the former UST location, identified as a gasoline UST, suggests significant residual soil contamination has not been removed. Multiple groundwater samples in excess of 30,000 $\mu\text{g/l}$ TPHg have been documented in wells AS-1S, E-9, and E-10. Additionally, concentrations up to 106,000 $\mu\text{g/l}$ TPHd and 416,000 $\mu\text{g/l}$ TPHmo (using SGC) in groundwater samples are documented in down- or lateral gradient well E3. USTs associated with diesel or motor oil contamination have not been located or identified, the former gasoline tank pit has not been evaluated for diesel or waste oil (and associated standard contaminants), and the adequacy of the removal of secondary sources associated with the diesel or waste oil USTs has not been determined.

Additionally, the analytical results for soil vapor samples support the potential presence of unidentified source areas (for example analytical results for SV-1 of 340,000 µg/l TPHg, and 490 µg/l benzene at 80 feet distance from the presumed release area).

ACEH notes that residual concentrations in soil at or below 9.5 feet in depth are above concentrations the LTCP technical support documents indicate are indirect evidence of LNAPL (TPHg greater than 100 – 200 mg/kg, and TPHd greater than 10 to 50 mg/kg).

As noted above, the presence of substantial TPHmo concentrations in groundwater indicates the presence of a waste oil UST in close proximity to the former gasoline UST excavation at the site. Associated contaminants, including naphthalene, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), other Semi Volatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs), non-fuel related Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs), and wear metals have not been accessed in soil and/or groundwater at the site.

ACEH's review has determined that secondary sources have not been removed to the extent practicable.

Area of Interest 5 – The location of the (former?) UST associated with Area of Interest 5 has not been identified, and the status of tank backfill (secondary source) has not been determined. Consequently, the status of the removal of the secondary source in this area cannot be determined.

Previous soil analytical data for the area detected a maximum of 32 mg/kg TPHg and 0.700 mg/kg benzene at 10 and 5 feet bgs, respectively. Vapor probe SV-6 has detected in the highest soil analytical concentration (920 mg/kg TPHg, less than 4.0 mg/kg benzene, and 20 mg/kg ethylbenzene) to date for the area, but based on the depth of the contamination does not appear to have detected the source. The detection of significant soil vapor at VP-6 (1,000,000 µg/l TPHg, 23,000 µg/l benzene, and 45,000 µg/l ethylbenzene) further indicates a residual source and is in conflict with previous low soil analytical data.

ACEH's review has determined that secondary sources have not been removed to the extent practicable.

Area of Interest 5 Path Forward – In ACEH's review, although it does not appear that Area of Interest 5 meets the Secondary Source Removal General Criteria, it may be possible to manage the Area of Interest with a land use restriction or deed restriction, provide other aspects of the LTCP are satisfied for the Area of Interest.

Please present a strategy in the Data Gap Work Plan (described in Technical Comment 7 below) to address the items discussed above. Alternatively, please provide justification of why the site satisfies this general criterion in the focused SCM described in Technical Comment 7 below.

- 4. LTCP Media Specific Criteria for Groundwater** – To satisfy the media-specific criteria for groundwater, the contaminant plume that exceeds water quality objectives must be stable or decreasing in areal extent, and meet all of the additional characteristics of one of the five classes of sites listed in the policy.

Our review of the case files indicates that insufficient data collection and analysis has been presented to support the requisite characteristics of plume length, plume stability (LTCP plume classification), distance to a surface water body, or that the property owner may be willing to accept a land use restriction as follows:

Area of Interest 4 -

- a. Plume Length** – Depending on the date of the groundwater monitoring event and the number of wells available for use in determining the groundwater flow direction, the flow direction appears to rotate between a westerly and a southwesterly flow direction. In general, wells MW-9 to MW-11, installed in March 2013, appear to currently define the groundwater dissolved-phased plume to the southwest of the known release area, and well MW-12 appears to define the plume adequately to the south of the release. However, wells with increasing concentration trends, as identified in several paragraphs below, appear to occupy an apparent 80 foot gap in the downgradient perimeter well network that does not appear sufficient to monitor the downgradient extent of this portion of the groundwater plume.

As briefly discussed above, SGC was utilized in the analysis for the extractable ranged hydrocarbons (TPHd and TPHmo) that yielded these elevated groundwater concentrations. ACEH is in agreement that the use of SGC is appropriate at the site; however, to remain consistent with the recommendations of the RWQCB, ACEH requests that all extractable ranged hydrocarbon analysis use both SGC and standard EPA methods to allow a judgment of the magnitude of contamination at the site in the extractable range. The RWQCB states that some hydrocarbon degradation compounds may be more toxic than the associated petroleum hydrocarbons.

- b. Plume Stability** – The requisite characteristics of plume stability have not been demonstrated at the site. Groundwater concentration trends in wells E2, E3, E5, E6, E7, E8, and E9 are increasing. The majority of these wells are plume perimeter wells (E2, E3, E5, E6, E7, and E8) and therefore these data do not indicate the lateral or downgradient extent of the hydrocarbon contamination is stable in this plume direction.

ACEH also notes that multiple wells at the site have not demonstrated plume concentration stability (MW-3, MW-6, AS-1S, ASMW-2S, E1, and E7). Wells MW-7, E2, E3, E6, E7, and E8 do not exhibit stability of extractable range hydrocarbons. As an example, dissolved-phase concentrations in downgradient well E-8 have fluctuated between 1,380 and 4,750 µg/l TPHg, 2.0 and 707 µg/l benzene, less than 5.0 and 180 µg/l ethylbenzene, 64 and 1,420 µg/l TPHd, and less than 190 and 1,030 µg/l TPHmo in an approximately 30 month period. (March 2012 and October 2014).

ACEH additionally notes that groundwater benzene concentrations were above 3,000 µg/l during the last sampling event at well E10, located approximately 25 feet downgradient of the source excavation area, and are currently 2,150 µg/l in well E9.

Area of Interest 5 –

- a. Plume Length** – Although the monitoring well network for Area of Interest 4 might be capable of defining the downgradient extent of a plume associated with Area of Interest 5, elevated concentrations in wells associated with Area 4 eliminate the ability of the wells to do so. Two grab groundwater samples (GP-3 and GP-7) have been collected in the area at widely spaced locations and partially assist in plume delineation; however, do not sufficiently define the plume at an appropriate level of confidence for an unlocated source area. Elevated vapor concentrations at VP-6 indicate substantial residual soil contamination is present in the vicinity of the unknown location of the (former?) UST.
- b. Plume Stability** – Because the source area remains essentially unlocated, and may be further east than suggested by the location of well MW-4, it cannot be determined if well MW-4 can effectively determine plume stability for this area of interest.
- c. Area of Interest 5 Path Forward** – In ACEH's review, although it does not appear that Area of Interest 5 meets the Groundwater Media-Specific Criteria, it may be possible to manage the Area of Interest with a land use restriction or deed restriction, provide other aspects of the LTCP are satisfied for the Area of Interest.

Please present a strategy in the Revised Data Gap Work Plan (described in Technical Comment 7 below) to address the items discussed above. Alternatively, please provide justification of why the site satisfies the Media-Specific Criteria for Groundwater in the focused SCM described in Technical Comment 7 below.

- 5. LTCP Media Specific Criteria for Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air** – The LTCP describes conditions, including bioattenuation zones, which if met will assure that exposure to petroleum vapors in indoor air will not pose unacceptable health risks to human occupants of existing or future site buildings, and adjacent parcels. Appendices 1 through 4 of the LTCP criteria illustrate four potential exposure scenarios and describe characteristics and criteria associated with each scenario.

Area of Interest 4 – ACEHs review of the case files indicates that the site data collection and analysis fail to support the requisite characteristics of one of the four scenarios in Area of Interest 4 as follows:

- **TPH Concentrations in Bioattenuation Zone** - Very limited soil analytical data has been collected within the 0 to 5 foot depth interval outside the presumed source area; however, available data from a number of recently installed vapor points at locations up to approximately 80 feet down- or lateral-gradient to the known release indicate concentrations of TPH over 100 mg/kg in this depth interval (SV-1). Limited data also indicates TPH greater than 100 mg/kg in the 5 to 10 foot depth interval in the vicinity of the presumed release area (SV-1).
- **Benzene Concentrations in Groundwater** – The LTCP requires benzene concentrations to be less than 100 or less than 1,000 µg/l depending on the thickness of the bioattenuation zone, and the percentage of oxygen. During a recent groundwater sampling event, benzene concentrations at the site were up to 2,150 µg/l in the source area.
- **Vapor Samples** - The percentage of oxygen in the vapor analytical data ranged between 2.8 and 12 percent. Vapor point SV-1, located furthest (80 feet) from the source area, contained the lowest percentage of oxygen, and may suggest an additional undocumented and unevaluated source area. Elevated TPHg and benzene vapor concentrations at SV-1, and a slight groundwater mounding at wells E-2 and E-5 further support this potential. Closer to the presumed source area, benzene concentrations range up to 560,000 µg/m³ at a depth of 5.5 feet bgs. All vapor benzene concentrations do not meet the LTCP in this Area of Interest.

A site-specific human health risk-assessment was conducted for Area of Interest 4 using available data from the site. The human health risk assessment states that no significant human health risk is posed at the site. ACEH is concerned that model assumptions and calculations do not accurately represent risk at the site. As discussed above ACEH does not agree that the site has been adequately characterized and that all sources documented. Additionally, multiple lines of evidence based on existing data indicate that the potential for vapor intrusion is significant and cannot be risked away until sufficient data is collected. Included in this concern is the use of parameters derived from bulk soil sample B1 that is classified as clay. Because the nature of the excavation fill is not sufficiently characterized, and reported to be gravel (see bore E1), the use of a different bulk density appears appropriate. Additionally, review of the vapor bore logs VP-1 to VP-5 also indicates that shallow soil was classified as poorly graded sand with gravel (1.5 to 3 feet of the material).

- **Potential Path Forward** – At present, this Area of Interest does not meet this media-specific criteria of the LTCP. Although the potential for substantial vapor contamination is present beneath this area, the potential for vapor intrusion in this Area of Interest may be limited due to the nature of the building present in the vicinity of the release. This has not been validated with the collection of appropriate analytical data.

Area of Interest 5 - Based on a one-time vapor sampling event, soil vapor may meet Scenario 4, Part 2 for this source area; however, due to the unknown location and removal status of the former (?) UST, and the unknown status of tank backfill characterization, it is difficult to evaluate the appropriateness of the vapor sampling locations.

- **Potential Path Forward** - As discussed previously, it appears appropriate to request at a minimum an additional soil vapor sampling event. Alternative methods for determining the potential for vapor intrusion in this Area of Interest may include indoor air sampling in order to determine the level of protection afforded by the concrete slab in this Area of Interest.

Please note, that if direct measurement of soil gas is proposed, ensure that your strategy is consistent with the field sampling protocols described in the Department of Toxic Substances Control's Final Vapor Intrusion Guidance (April 2012). Consistent with the guidance, ACEH requires installation of permanent vapor wells to assess temporal and seasonal variations in soil gas concentrations.

- 6. LTCP Media Specific Criteria for Direct Contact and Outdoor Air Criteria** – The LTCP describes conditions where direct contact with contaminated soil or inhalation of contaminants volatilized to outdoor air poses a low threat to human health. According to the policy, release sites where human exposure may occur satisfy the media-specific criteria for direct contact and outdoor air exposure and shall be considered low-threat if the maximum concentrations of petroleum constituents in soil are less than or equal to those listed in Table 1 for the specified depth bgs. Alternatively, the policy allows for a site specific risk assessment that demonstrates that maximum concentrations of petroleum constituents in soil will have no significant risk of adversely affecting human health, or controlling exposure through the use of mitigation measures, or institutional or engineering controls.

Area of Interest 4 - ACEHs review of the case files indicates that insufficient data collection and analysis has been presented to satisfy the media-specific criteria for direct contact and outdoor air exposure. Specifically, the source of extractable ranged hydrocarbons (TPHd and TPHmo) has not been disclosed or located, nor have soil and/or groundwater been characterized for required contaminants (wear metals, SVOCs, chlorinated VOCs, and other waste oil related compounds including naphthalene and PAHs). Additionally, shallow near source soil samples have not been collected near the presumed gasoline source, including tank backfill characterization samples, to sufficiently address this criterion.

Area of Interest 5 – ACEHs review of the case files indicates that insufficient data collection and analysis has been presented to satisfy the media-specific criteria for direct contact and outdoor air exposure. Specifically, due to the unknown source location, the unknown removal status of the former (?) UST, and the unknown status of tank backfill characterization, it is difficult to evaluate if sufficient characterization for this criterion has occurred in this area of interest.

Therefore, please present a strategy in the Data Gap Work Plan described in Technical Comment 7 below to collect sufficient data to satisfy the direct contact and outdoor air exposure criteria in known and presumed source areas. Sample and analyze soil at the five and ten foot intervals, at the groundwater interface, lithologic changes, and at areas of obvious impact. Also, collect a groundwater sample from each boring and propose the requisite analysis including naphthalene and PAH polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) analysis.

Alternatively, please provide justification of why the site satisfies the Media-Specific Criteria for Direct Contact and Outdoor Air Exposure in the focused SCM described in Technical Comment 7 below that assures that exposure to petroleum constituents in soil will have no significant risk of adversely affecting human health.

- 7. Data Gap Investigation Work Plan and Focused Site Conceptual Model** – Please prepare a Data Gap Investigation Work Plan to address the technical comments listed above. Please support the scope of work in the Data Gap Investigation Work Plan with a focused SCM and Data Quality Objectives (DQOs) that relate the data collection to each LTCP criteria. For example please clarify which scenario within each Media-Specific Criteria a sampling strategy is intended to apply to.

In order to expedite review, ACEH requests the focused SCM be presented in a tabular format that highlights the major SCM elements and associated data gaps, which need to be addressed to progress the site to case closure under the LTCP. Please tabulate all soil, groundwater, and soil vapor analytical data, and group by Area of Interest. Additionally, provide a figure by area with all historic sample locations. Please see Attachment A “Site Conceptual Model Requisite Elements”. Please sequence activities in the proposed revised data gap investigation scope of work to enable efficient data collection in the fewest mobilizations possible.

- 8. Groundwater Monitoring** – Please continue semi-annual groundwater monitoring at the site. Please sample all wells during the next monitoring event, use SGC for extractable range hydrocarbon analysis, and submit a sampling plan for future monitoring events. Please submit groundwater monitoring reports by the dates identified below.

TECHNICAL REPORT REQUEST

Please upload technical reports to the ACEH ftp site (Attention: Barbara Jakub), and to the State Water Resources Control Board's Geotracker website, in accordance with the following specified file naming convention and schedule:

- **January 8, 2016** – Notification of Acceptable Meeting Dates
(Email notification preferred)
- **January 15, 2016** – Second 2015 Semi-Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report
(File to be named: RO320_GWM_R_yyyy-mm-dd)
- **60 Days After Meeting** – Data Gap Investigation Plan and / or FS/CAP and Focused Site Conceptual Model; (File to be named: RO320_WP_SCM_R_yyyy-mm-dd and / or RO320_CAP_R_yyyy-mm-dd)
- **October 21, 2016** – Semi-Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report
(File to be named: RO320_GWM_R_yyyy-mm-dd)

These reports are being requested pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 25296.10. 23 CCR Sections 2652 through 2654, and 2721 through 2728 outline the responsibilities of a responsible party in response to an unauthorized release from a petroleum UST system, and require your compliance with this request.

Online case files are available for review at the following website: <http://www.acgov.org/aceh/index.htm>.

If you have any questions, please call me at (510) 567-6876 or send me an electronic mail message at mark.detterman@acgov.org.

Sincerely,

Mark E. Detterman, PG, CEG
Senior Hazardous Materials Specialist

Enclosures: Attachment 1 – Responsible Party (ies) Legal Requirements / Obligations
Electronic Report Upload (ftp) Instructions

cc: Paul Parmentier, The Source Group, 1962 Freeman Avenue, Signal Hill, CA 90755
(sent via electronic mail to pparmentier@thesourcegroup.net)

Rob Bilotti, Service West, Inc; 9201 San Leandro Street, Oakland, CA 94603
(sent via electronic mail to: Rob@servicewest.com)

Marc Zeppetello, Barg Coffin Lewis & Trapp, LLP, 350 California Street, 22nd Floor, San Francisco, CA 94104-1435; (sent via electronic mail to MAZ@bcltlaw.com)

Scott Kaplan, Stoel Rives, LLP, 900 S.W. Fifth Avenue, Suite 2600, Portland, OR, 97204
(sent via electronic mail to SJKaplan@stoel.com)

Dilan Roe, ACEH (sent via electronic to: dilan.roe@acgov.org)
Mark Detterman, ACEH (sent via electronic mail to mark.detterman@acgov.org)
Electronic File, GeoTracker

Attachment 1

Responsible Party(ies) Legal Requirements / Obligations

REPORT REQUESTS

These reports are being requested pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 25296.10. 23 CCR Sections 2652 through 2654, and 2721 through 2728 outline the responsibilities of a responsible party in response to an unauthorized release from a petroleum UST system, and require your compliance with this request.

ELECTRONIC SUBMITTAL OF REPORTS

ACEH's Environmental Cleanup Oversight Programs (LOP and SLIC) require submission of reports in electronic form. The electronic copy replaces paper copies and is expected to be used for all public information requests, regulatory review, and compliance/enforcement activities. Instructions for submission of electronic documents to the Alameda County Environmental Cleanup Oversight Program FTP site are provided on the attached "Electronic Report Upload Instructions." Submission of reports to the Alameda County FTP site is an addition to existing requirements for electronic submittal of information to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) GeoTracker website. In September 2004, the SWRCB adopted regulations that require electronic submittal of information for all groundwater cleanup programs. For several years, responsible parties for cleanup of leaks from underground storage tanks (USTs) have been required to submit groundwater analytical data, surveyed locations of monitoring wells, and other data to the GeoTracker database over the Internet. Beginning July 1, 2005, these same reporting requirements were added to Spills, Leaks, Investigations, and Cleanup (SLIC) sites. Beginning July 1, 2005, electronic submittal of a complete copy of all reports for all sites is required in GeoTracker (in PDF format). Please visit the SWRCB website for more information on these requirements (http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/ust/electronic_submittal/).

PERJURY STATEMENT

All work plans, technical reports, or technical documents submitted to ACEH must be accompanied by a cover letter from the responsible party that states, at a minimum, the following: "I declare, under penalty of perjury, that the information and/or recommendations contained in the attached document or report is true and correct to the best of my knowledge." This letter must be signed by an officer or legally authorized representative of your company. Please include a cover letter satisfying these requirements with all future reports and technical documents submitted for this fuel leak case.

PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATION & CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

The California Business and Professions Code (Sections 6735, 6835, and 7835.1) requires that work plans and technical or implementation reports containing geologic or engineering evaluations and/or judgments be performed under the direction of an appropriately registered or certified professional. For your submittal to be considered a valid technical report, you are to present site specific data, data interpretations, and recommendations prepared by an appropriately licensed professional and include the professional registration stamp, signature, and statement of professional certification. Please ensure all that all technical reports submitted for this fuel leak case meet this requirement.

UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK CLEANUP FUND

Please note that delays in investigation, later reports, or enforcement actions may result in your becoming ineligible to receive grant money from the state's Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Fund (Senate Bill 2004) to reimburse you for the cost of cleanup.

AGENCY OVERSIGHT

If it appears as though significant delays are occurring or reports are not submitted as requested, we will consider referring your case to the Regional Board or other appropriate agency, including the County District Attorney, for possible enforcement actions. California Health and Safety Code, Section 25299.76 authorizes enforcement including administrative action or monetary penalties of up to \$10,000 per day for each day of violation.

Alameda County Environmental Cleanup Oversight Programs (LOP and SLIC)	REVISION DATE: May 15, 2014
	ISSUE DATE: July 5, 2005
	PREVIOUS REVISIONS: October 31, 2005; December 16, 2005; March 27, 2009; July 8, 2010, July 25, 2010
SECTION: Miscellaneous Administrative Topics & Procedures	SUBJECT: Electronic Report Upload (ftp) Instructions

The Alameda County Environmental Cleanup Oversight Programs (LOP and SLIC) require submission of all reports in electronic form to the county's ftp site. Paper copies of reports will no longer be accepted. The electronic copy replaces the paper copy and will be used for all public information requests, regulatory review, and compliance/enforcement activities.

REQUIREMENTS

- **Please do not submit reports as attachments to electronic mail.**
- Entire report including cover letter must be submitted to the ftp site as **a single portable document format (PDF) with no password protection.**
- It is **preferable** that reports be converted to PDF format from their original format, (e.g., Microsoft Word) rather than scanned.
- **Signature pages and perjury statements must be included and have either original or electronic signature.**
- **Do not password protect the document.** Once indexed and inserted into the correct electronic case file, the document will be secured in compliance with the County's current security standards and a password. **Documents with password protection will not be accepted.**
- Each page in the PDF document should be rotated in the direction that will make it easiest to read on a computer monitor.
- Reports must be named and saved using the following naming convention:

RO#_Report Name_Year-Month-Date (e.g., RO#5555_WorkPlan_2005-06-14)

Submission Instructions

- 1) Obtain User Name and Password
 - a) Contact the Alameda County Environmental Health Department to obtain a User Name and Password to upload files to the ftp site.
 - i) Send an e-mail to deh.loptoxic@acgov.org
 - b) In the subject line of your request, be sure to include "**ftp PASSWORD REQUEST**" and in the body of your request, include the **Contact Information, Site Addresses**, and the **Case Numbers (RO# available in Geotracker) you will be posting for.**
- 2) Upload Files to the ftp Site
 - a) Using Internet Explorer (IE4+), go to <ftp://alcoftp1.acgov.org>
 - (i) Note: Netscape, Safari, and Firefox browsers will not open the FTP site as they are NOT being supported at this time.
 - b) Click on Page located on the Command bar on upper right side of window, and then scroll down to Open FTP Site in Windows Explorer.
 - c) Enter your User Name and Password. (Note: Both are Case Sensitive.)
 - d) Open "My Computer" on your computer and navigate to the file(s) you wish to upload to the ftp site.
 - e) With both "My Computer" and the ftp site open in separate windows, drag and drop the file(s) from "My Computer" to the ftp window.
- 3) Send E-mail Notifications to the Environmental Cleanup Oversight Programs
 - a) Send email to deh.loptoxic@acgov.org notify us that you have placed a report on our ftp site.
 - b) Copy your Caseworker on the e-mail. Your Caseworker's e-mail address is the entire first name then a period and entire last name @acgov.org. (e.g., firstname.lastname@acgov.org)
 - c) The subject line of the e-mail must start with the RO# followed by **Report Upload**. (e.g., Subject: RO1234 Report Upload) If site is a new case without an RO#, use the street address instead.
 - d) If your document meets the above requirements and you follow the submission instructions, you will receive a notification by email indicating that your document was successfully uploaded to the ftp site.