

December 5, 1996

7-309

Ms. Juliet Shin
Senior Hazardous Materials Specialist
Alameda County
Health Care Services Agency
Environmental Protection Division
1131 Harbor Bay Parkway, Room 250
Alameda, CA 94502-6577

Re: Workplan Addendum
2394 Mariner Square Drive, Alameda

Dear Ms. Shin:

As requested in your December 2, 1996 letter and our conversation of November 25, 1996, Hydro-Environmental Technologies, Inc. (HETI) is providing the following additional information about the above subject site.

- Item #1: "Information on the depth of the Posey Tube and surrounding fill, for the area where the geoprobe points are proposed".

Response: According to ^{to} the Mr. Ron Tsung of Caltrans, the Posey Tube is overlain by approximately 30 to 35 feet of ground cover at the site. The center line of the tube is approximately 25 feet from the nearest geoprobe location. Additional information will be available from Caltrans' seismic retrofit study, which includes cone penetrometer data from the west side of the Posey Tube backfill onsite.

The geoprobe points may encounter the top of the Posey Tube backfill, but will not encounter the Posey Tube. The upper fill placed after construction of the Posey Tube is approximately 8 to 14 feet thick, based upon reports from surrounding sites.

- Item #2: "Information on the depth of the storm drain trench, located adjacent to the former underground storage tank, to determine whether there is any potential preferential flow path being created by this trench".

Response: According to Mr. Barnhill, the depth of the storm drain trench is approximately two feet below grade, with a slope towards the estuary. Tidal water enters the drain only during high high tides. The depth of ground water reported in the excavation summary was approximately five feet. The storm drain does not appear to represent a preferential flow path to the estuary waters.

**HYDRO
ENVIRONMENTAL
TECHNOLOGIES, INC.**

- Item #3 "If unacceptable contaminant concentrations are identified in the samples collected from these temporary sample points, further characterization, involving the installation and quarterly sampling of permanent monitoring wells, will be required".

Response: The contingency for installation of a monitoring well has been made, if the unacceptable contaminant concentrations are encountered. The contaminant levels which are unacceptable may be evaluated using risk assessment calculations from sites with similar soil and hydrogeologic conditions.

An appropriate note cannot be conducted w/o at least two to four gws of g.w. monitoring at a site appropriate characterization

Please call me at (510) 521-2684, if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

HYDRO-ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC.



Gary Pischke, C.E.G.
Senior Geologist

cc: Mr. Barnhill

Additionally, due to the proximity of the passy tube to the site, g.w. gradient flow should be monitored at different times.

ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION

96 DEC -9 PM 1:38