Health Care Services

Alameda County Environmental Health
Meeting Sign-In Sheet

RO490
SAN FRANCISCO FRENCH BREAD
3924 MARKET ST., OAKLAND

Friday, October 20, 2017
10:00 AM

NAME	COMPANY	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE	SIGNATURE	E-MAIL
Dilan Roe	Alameda County	1131 Harbor Bay Pkwy, Suite 250 Alameda, CA 94502	(510) 567-6767		dilan.roe@acgov.org
Keith Nowell	Alameda County	1131 Harbor Bay Pkwy, Suite 250 Alameda, CA 94502	(510) 567-6764	Keith Nowell	keith.nowell@acgov.org
Scott Atthowe	Atthowe Transportation	3924 Market St. Oakland, Ca 94608	510-654-6866		scott@atthowe.com
Jim Gribi	Gribi Assoc	1090 Adams ST Ste K Benicia CA 945	707 748-7743		jgribi@gribiassociates.com
Mark Johnson	ACDEH		567-6876		

Meeting Notes of Friday, October 20, 2017

Case RO490 – SAN FRANCISCO FRENCH BREAD, 3942 MARKET ST., OAKLAND

Attendees: Property owner Scott Atthowe; Consultant Jim Gribi of Gribi Associates; and ACDEH representatives Keith Nowell (case worker) and Mark Detterman (Senior Hazardous Materials Specialist).

Background: Site is currently an art packaging, shipping and storage facility consisting of a single story building and having a narrow basement along the Market St. side of the original structure. Site structure(s) were added to in phases over the course of approximately 60 years. The site operated as a commercial bakery from the late 1920s until the mid-to-late- 1980s. In addition to a 500-gallon fuel UST, the former bakery facility operated a boiler and commercial-scale oven(s) and a 200-foot deep water supply well. There are no plans to redevelop the site. At the time the current owner purchased the property in the early 1990s, the building had been vacant for several years.

Topics of Discussion: Mr. Gribi presented a general history of the site, followed with the 1991 fuel tank removal through the 2017 investigation performed along 40th Street. The discussion included the appearance of free product 4 years after the well installations, site investigations conducted for plume delineation and soil vapor sampling, a geophysical survey, and reporting to document on-site water well destruction. Mr. Atthowe mentioned a UST removal during construction of offices adjacent to the existing structure(s). The UST removed in 1991 had been identified in the sidewalk. The tank Mr. Atthowe described was inside the property in the loading dock area of the site. It was unclear if this was a second tank or the one removed in 1991. The matter was not resolved.

History of activities: Following the 1991 UST removal, three groundwater monitoring well were installed in 1995. Free product consisting of a viscous oily, tar-like product appeared in August, 1999 in the 3 monitoring wells, 4 years after the well installations. Site investigations were conducted for plume delineation and soil vapor sampling. The case was idle for several years followed by investigations conducted in 2103, 2015, and 2017 which documented the presence of extractable range petroleum hydrocarbons (TEPH) in soil and groundwater. Little or no total volatile petroleum hydrocarbons (TVPH), with the exception of on-site bore locations B-4, B-10, and B-11, were rarely reported at concentrations above the laboratory reporting limit in groundwater. BTEX compounds were rarely reported at concentrations above the laboratory reporting limit in groundwater in any of the water samples. A well search did not reveal the presence of existing supply wells within 1,000 feet of the site.

Mr. Gribi concluded that, based on the investigations, the plume appears to be defined and the lack of volatiles indicate there is no significant vapor intrusion risk. Based on the reported concentration of chemicals of potential concern in the upper 10 feet of soil, there does not appear to be a direct contact-vapor intrusion to outdoor air risk.

ACDEH Discussion: ACDEH noted the source of TPH has not been identified. Additionally, PAHs which may be the result of the viscous free product, appear to have impacted soil in the smear zone and water samples. Based on the presentation, ACDEH indicated the site may be closable. However, if the source does not need to be identified for the site as currently developed, site closure may require a deed restriction or other means requiring further investigation should the site be redeveloped.