MCL for lead is 50 ppb (both state and federal MCL). They previously got hits of lead in soil ( 71 and 84 ppm total lead), while grab gw was ND. What were the gw concs? Were they <the MCL? Spoke w/Paul King: Just found out they got 16 ppm TPHd in one soil sample (B6-4.5'). Late fax. Only organic contam hit. Pb hits in gw are $0.049,1.7,0.068,0.49 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ or ppm . Those are really TTLCs. So $49,1,700,68$ and 490 ppb Pb in gw. 3 of $4>\mathrm{MCL}$. The Webster St. tube that goes to Alameda runs below Harrison St. . . . . . He did the tank pull for Peerless Coffee. PNAs there seem to be related to a SP spill. They found a lot of garbage and fill during TR. He spoke w/John Kaiser at RWQCB at great length, who said there's not much they can do about it. He was at Middlehauser at the time. He suggested they do TDS. RWQCB didn't seem to prioritize this site.

He will recommend case closure.
5/16/96 Reviewed 5/10/96 cover letter, and 4/5/96 report by AllPro. Four borings were installed in March 1996; hand augered. GW encountered at 5.5', 5.0 ${ }^{\prime}$, 5.9', and 7.0 bgs in B3 to B7, respectively. Soil samples collected and analyzed at $4.5^{\circ} \mathrm{bgs}$.

Phoned Paul King: Since the lead in gw is >MCL, can they do a TDS analysis? (Just $\operatorname{lm}$ to call me.) It wd show the gw is not beneficial.

5/17/96 spoke w/Paul King: no, they didn't do TDS, and he suspects the gw samples are long gone from the lab.

REVISED CLOSURE SUMMARY

1/6/96 Wrote letter
1/16/96 Don Andersen phoned: we played phone tag.
1/18/96 spoke w/Don Andersen: can he get an extension? He is just getting bids now. I told him he is on track if he is getting bids now. I gave him 60 days for wp , not the usual 45.

2/5/96

2/26/96

3/6/96
3/11/96 Reviewed 2/29/96 wp by All Pro Corp. Proposes 4 Sbs: 2 in the sidewalk, and 2 near the property line and RR tracks. Use Geoprobe. The $15,000 \mathrm{ppm}$ TPHd hit
was at 7 ' with slant boring, so the actual depth bgs was less than that, maybe even near the property line and $R R$ tracks. Use Geoprobe. The $15,000 \mathrm{ppm}$ TPHd hit
was at 7 ' with slant boring, so the actual depth bgs was less than that, maybe even $5-6^{\prime} \mathrm{bgs}$. So their proposal to sample soils at $5^{\prime} \mathrm{bgs}$ is good. Their CEG (Don Braun) forgot to sign it. No, continue on after the tables, and find the sign.

## Wrote wp acceptance letter.

3/28/96
spoke w/L. Buckman: She's trying to apply RBCA. She has E1739-95 from ASTM's Standard Guide for RBCA Applied at Petroleum Release Sites. This sounds more recent (95). She uses a computer program to get Tier 1 RBSLs. Plugs in site specific parameters. DTW, thickness of vadose zone, thickness of contam, etc. Suggested we call Ravi. She will call him. Which model should we use?

Reviewed 2/14/96 letter from Don Andersen, and 1/23/96 SWI Proposal by All Pro. This is a proposal, not a wp. Phoned Paul King of All Pro: Will use Geoprobe. DTW was only 6 'bgs. We're shooting for the cap fringe for soil samples. He's a RG w/P\&D, who's under contract to All Pro when they need a RG. He'll send wp tomorrow; wants quick approval. Gulp.

Workplan received
mess fm Paul King: got ND Hcs in soil and gw, but 58 and 310 ppm total lead in soil (and also in gw). The Pb contam is not related to HC contam. Does not want to evaluate what is probably a widespread lead problem, due to contaminated fill. Must they do WET for those 2 soil samples, as per my $1 / 6 / 96$ letter to RP? 6586916. He doesn't think the Pb is related to UST, due to the locations away from the UST. Fill material used for Webster St. tube, and also the entire shoreline area in this part of Oakland. Rationale: we have gw results, which show how much lead is leaching from the soil into gw. OK, so hold off on the soil WET analyses.
(Lawyer for RP) phoned. 746-6666 Wants status of Amtrak station investigation. Tc w/Don Anderson: RP basically wants more guidance from the County. They are thinking of selling the property. OK .
evaluate for closure:
UST not used since at least 1976.
hits in slant bowings:
soil - ND Benz

$$
\begin{aligned}
15,000 \mathrm{ppm} \text { diesel } \times .0013= & 19.5 \text { ppm } \\
& \text { napthalen }
\end{aligned}
$$

naphthalene

$$
19.5<22.9 \text { soil to protect gulinges st. (res) }
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& <22.7 \text { sol to pete } \\
& <40.7 \text { soil to bldg } \text { (res) } \\
& <\text { RES soil to air }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
<\text { RES soil to air }
$$

ghee 2.7 ppb ben $2<11,000 \mathrm{gw}$ to air (res)
$<2.94$ gu ingest (res)
$<81$ gu to bldg (res)
5,500 pp diesel $\times .0013=7.15$ pp nap thole
$7.15 \mathrm{ppb}<\mathrm{S}$ ga to air
$<146$ gi ingest (res)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& <146 \\
& <10,600 \mathrm{gw} \text { to bldg (res) }
\end{aligned}
$$

But for benzo(a) pyrene::

$$
15,000 \mathrm{ppm} \text { diesel } \times .0007=10.5 \mathrm{ppm}
$$

which is $>1.85 \mathrm{~g} 9 \mathrm{~m}$ for Soil bach ate to protect GW weston Target level-RBCA Tier 1

4616
5-5-94 mess' to + frm D. Anderson re his concern re digiging up dity soil at adj. Future Amtak site (stid 4581).
8-3 Reald 8- 1 ltr fom D. Anderson. $\operatorname{lm}$ DA.
8-9 $\operatorname{lm} D A$
8-10 APW/DA. Said the rains in Gan. brought oily runelt. Welll wait far Port to do heir invest.
an'-9lol fout $D$. Anderson:
5-15-95 0.A. phoned for update:
Faxed him mio dated 3-31-95 re amtrak wo (Stid 4581).


