Groundwater Monitoring Results
Second Semi-Annual 2010 Monitoring Period
Cargill Salt – Alameda Facility
Alameda, California

CRAWFORD
CONSULTING
INC.

Cargill

November 11, 2010

Alameda County Environmental Health Services
Environmental Protection
1131 Harbor Bay Parkway, Suite 250
Alameda, California 94502-6577
Attn: Jerry Wickham

RE: Groundwater Monitoring Results, Second Semi-Annual 2010 Monitoring Period, Cargill Salt – Alameda Facility, Alameda, California, SLIC Case No. RO0002480

Dear Mr. Wickham,

The attached report presents the groundwater monitoring results for the second semi-annual 2010 monitoring period for the Cargill Salt Alameda facility. The report presents the results of groundwater monitoring data collected during the third quarter of 2010. Groundwater levels in the site monitoring wells were measured, groundwater samples were collected and analyzed, and the groundwater flow direction and gradient were determined.

I declare, under penalty of perjury, that the information and/or recommendations contained in the attached report are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Should you have any questions concerning the report, please don't hesitate to call me at (510) 790-8625.

Sincerely,

Sean Riley
Environmental Manager

Groundwater Monitoring Results
Second Semi-Annual 2010 Monitoring Period
Cargill Salt – Alameda Facility
Alameda, California

Prepared for:

Cargill Salt
7220 Central Avenue
Newark, California 94560

Prepared by:

Crawford Consulting, Inc.
4 North Second Street, Suite 650
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 287-9934

Project No. CS1605
November 12, 2010

Contents

Tables

Illustrations

Appendices

(presented in electronic format only)

Electronic File

Entire report presented in electronic file format (pdf) on CD-ROM inside back cover.

1 Introduction

Crawford Consulting, Inc. (Crawford) has prepared this report on behalf of Cargill Salt for the Cargill Salt Dispensing Systems Division facility (hereafter, the Site) in Alameda, California.

Results of groundwater transect sampling and the initial sampling of three groundwater monitoring wells installed in November 1999 were presented in the January 31, 2000 report, *Groundwater Characterization and Monitoring Well Installation, Cargill Salt – Alameda Facility, Alameda, California* (Crawford Consulting, Inc. and Conor Pacific/EFW). The purpose of the groundwater transect sampling and the monitoring well installation and sampling was to help characterize and monitor the occurrence of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), primarily tetrachloroethene (PCE) and its breakdown product, trichloroethene (TCE), previously detected in groundwater at the Site.

One of the recommendations in the report was to confirm the groundwater analytical results of the newly installed monitoring wells (wells MW-1, MW-2, and MW-3) and the groundwater flow direction and gradient via quarterly monitoring. Cargill Salt began groundwater monitoring on a quarterly basis after the initial groundwater monitoring well sampling event in November 1999. For 2000 through 2005, reporting was performed on an annual basis. Cargill began reporting on a semi-annual basis in 2006.

Cargill Salt conducted additional characterization activities in November and December 2001 to evaluate the off-site extent of VOCs in the soil and groundwater. Soil and groundwater samples were collected and analyzed from a neighboring residential property and along Clement Avenue, slug tests were performed in the three existing monitoring wells, and a groundwater monitoring well (MW-4) was installed in Clement Avenue.

A phytoremediation project was implemented at the Site in June 2005. Based on reductions in PCE concentrations in groundwater since 2006, Alameda County Environmental Health suggested in a September 30, 2009 letter that Cargill Salt reduce the groundwater monitoring frequency from quarterly to semi-annually. The second half of 2009 was the first semi-annual monitoring period under the reduced monitoring frequency. Groundwater sampling and analysis is now performed during the first and third quarters.

1.1 Reporting Period Activities

This report presents the results of groundwater monitoring data collected during the third quarter of 2010. Groundwater levels in the Site monitoring wells were measured, groundwater samples were collected and analyzed, and the groundwater flow direction and gradient were determined. The monitoring event for the second semi-annual 2010 monitoring period was conducted on September 3, 2010.

Supervision of the monitoring event was conducted for Cargill Salt by Crawford. Groundwater level measurements and collection of groundwater samples were conducted by Field Solutions, Inc. The

groundwater samples were analyzed by TestAmerica Laboratories, Inc., a state-certified laboratory in Pleasanton, California.

1.2 Background Information

A description of the Site and a summary of the development of characterization and monitoring programs for the Site are presented in this section.

1.2.1 Site Description

Alameda is an island on the east side of San Francisco Bay, separated from Oakland by a tidal canal (Figure 1). The Cargill Salt Dispensing Systems Division facility is located on a rectangular lot in an industrial and residential neighborhood. The facility building occupies approximately one-third of the Site and is separated from the vacant, unpaved side of the lot by an asphalt driveway (Figure 2). The Site is bordered by a sheet-metal shop and a residential lot to the northwest, an apartment complex to the southwest, and a residential lot to the southeast.

From 1951 to 1978, the Alameda facility produced salt-dispensing units, which required casting and milling aluminum parts.

Constituents of concern associated with site operations have included casting sands with elevated concentrations of metals, and solvents, machine oils, and grease used in casting and milling operations. As discussed below, previous investigations and remedial activities have investigated and remediated metals and solvents (VOCs) in vadose-zone soil.

1.2.2 Summary of Investigative and Remedial Activities

Cargill Salt initiated site investigative activities in 1993 to determine if facility operations had impacted site soils. Cargill Salt submitted the results of the soil sampling investigation to the Alameda County Environmental Health Services (ACEHS) in October 1993 along with a workplan for excavation and disposal of impacted soils and assessment of potential impact to groundwater (Groundworks Environmental, Inc. [Groundworks], 1993).

After approval of the workplan by ACEHS, Cargill Salt conducted several phases of soil remediation and groundwater characterization. Surficial soils impacted by metals were excavated for disposal off site. Vadose-zone soils with the highest degree of impact by VOCs were also excavated for off-site disposal (see "Soil excavation area" on Figure 2).

The results of these activities were submitted to the ACEHS in a report, *Soil and Groundwater Investigations and Remedial Activities, July 1993 – September 1994, Cargill Salt – Alameda Facility, Alameda, California* (Groundworks, 1995). Recommendations for additional work to further delineate the lateral and vertical extent of VOCs in groundwater beneath the Site were presented in the report.

A workplan for the additional delineation of VOCs in groundwater, *Workplan for Groundwater Characterization and Monitoring Well Installation, 2016 Clement Avenue, Alameda, California* (CCI), was submitted to the ACEHS in July 1999.

After approval of the workplan by the ACEHS, Cargill Salt conducted groundwater sampling and well installation activities during August and November of 1999. The results of these activities were

submitted to the ACEHS in a report, *Groundwater Characterization and Monitoring Well Installation, Cargill Salt – Alameda Facility, Alameda, California* (Crawford Consulting, Inc. and Conor Pacific/EFW, dated January 31, 2000). After the initial groundwater monitoring well sampling event in November 1999, Cargill Salt began groundwater monitoring on a quarterly basis.

A work plan for remedial investigation activities, *Workplan for Off-Site Characterization, Cargill Salt – Alameda Facility, Alameda, California* (Conor Pacific/EFW), was submitted to the ACEHS in June 2001. After approval of the workplan by the ACEHS, Cargill Salt conducted characterization activities in November and December 2001 to evaluate off-site extent of VOCs in the soil and groundwater. Soil and groundwater samples were collected and analyzed from a neighboring residential property and along Clement Avenue, slug tests were performed in the three existing monitoring wells, and a groundwater monitoring well (MW-4) was installed in Clement Avenue. The results of these activities were submitted to the ACEHS in the August 21, 2002 submittal *Off-Site Groundwater Characterization*, *Cargill Salt – Alameda Facility, Alameda, California*, prepared by Conor Pacific/EFW.

A phytoremediation project was implemented at the Site in June 2005. The project involved planting 96 bare-root hybrid poplar trees in a grid of 24 rows. The rows are generally 6 feet apart with trees on 7-foot centers on each row. Selection of the phytoremediation approach and implementation of the project were described in the October 20, 2006 report, *Groundwater Monitoring Results, First through Fourth Quarter 2005, Cargill Salt – Alameda Facility, Alameda, California* prepared by Crawford Consulting, Inc. In April 2008, seven additional saplings were planted in the rear of the property near monitoring well MW-2.

The Site groundwater monitoring wells were re-surveyed in September 2006 by CSS Environmental Services in order to provide Geotracker-compliant survey data. Results of the casing elevation survey indicate that each well is approximately 6.4 feet higher than the previous survey conducted in 1999. This difference is due to the use of different datum for the 2006 and 1999 surveys. The casing elevations from the September 2006 survey are shown on Table 1.

1.2.3 Source of VOC Impact

As discussed in the 1995 report, the occurrence of VOCs in soils and groundwater at the Site appears to be the result of a discharge or spill to surficial soils at a location near the rear property line at the southwestern corner of the property. The area with the highest degree of chemical impact was delineated prior to excavation and was then excavated using a backhoe and transported off-site for appropriate disposal. It is possible that the VOCs detected in soils and groundwater at this location were associated with waste products from facility operations. The VOCs may be associated with solvents previously used for degreasing operations at the facility, although there are no records indicating use of PCE. Site records indicate that the solvents used for degreasing operations were not PCE-based solvents.

It is also possible that the VOCs and oil and grease are associated with waste products discarded from neighboring properties. There is an apartment complex next to the rear property line of the facility, and the laundry room for this complex is in the utility shed immediately adjacent to the rear property line. This laundry room is only 4 feet away from the area of highest impact to soil. If PCE associated with laundry cleaning products were spilled in this laundry room, it is possible that it could have drained onto the Cargill Salt property.

2 Groundwater Flow Analysis

Groundwater levels were measured and a groundwater contour map was prepared for the second semi-annual 2010 monitoring event.

2.1 Water-Level Measurement

Water levels in groundwater monitoring wells (MW-1, MW-2, MW-3, and MW-4) were measured on September 3, 2010, before any of the groundwater monitoring wells were purged for sampling for the semi-annual monitoring event. The groundwater monitoring well locations are shown on Figure 2. The water levels were measured with an electric sounder. The depth to water at each well was recorded on a *Water Level Field Data* sheet (see Appendix A).

The water-level data through the third quarter of 2010 are shown on Table 1. The data in Table 1 include the date and time of measurement, the well casing elevation, the measured depth to groundwater, the groundwater elevation, and the change in elevation from the previous measurement. A plot of historical groundwater elevations is shown in Figure 3.

Groundwater levels in the on-site monitoring wells (MW-1, MW-2, and MW-3) showed a similar seasonal pattern in the second semi-annual period of 2010 as in the previous nine years (see Figure 3). Groundwater levels fell across the Site between the first and third quarter 2010 measurements, reflecting dissipation of winter-season discharge. Groundwater levels fell in off-site well MW-4 between the first and third quarter 2010 measurements, similar to the pattern exhibited by the on-site wells.

2.2 Groundwater Flow Direction and Gradient

A groundwater contour map based on the September 2010 water-level data is shown on Figure 4.

The groundwater flow direction determined for the third quarter of 2010 was to the northeast. The horizontal hydraulic gradient measured for the third quarter of 2010 was 0.013. The groundwater flow direction and horizontal hydraulic gradient were consistent with those previous determined for the Site.

2.3 Groundwater Velocity

Average linear groundwater flow velocities (V) were calculated using a form of Darcy's Law,

$$V = Ki/n,$$

where “K” is the hydraulic conductivity, “i” is the horizontal hydraulic gradient, and “n” is the effective porosity. The groundwater velocity calculations for the third quarter of 2010 groundwater data are presented in Appendix B.

Using hydraulic conductivity and porosity values determined for saturated native materials at the Site [based on slug tests and laboratory soil testing, respectively (Conor Pacific/EFW, 2002)], and the horizontal hydraulic gradients determined from the third quarter 2010 groundwater contour map, the groundwater flow velocity beneath the Site is calculated to be approximately 1 foot per year (ft/yr) for the third quarter 2010 measurements. This groundwater flow velocity is within the range of values previously determined for the Site.

3 Groundwater Sampling and Analysis

This section summarizes the sample collection and analytical methods, presents an evaluation of quality control data, and summarizes the results of the sampling events.

3.1 Sample Collection and Analysis

Groundwater samples were collected September 3, 2010 from groundwater monitoring wells MW-1, MW-2, MW-3, and MW-4. Dedicated tubing was installed in wells MW-1, MW-2, and MW-3 prior to the first quarter 2000 sampling event and on December 17, 2001 in well MW-4 to facilitate sampling with a peristaltic pump. Dedicated fluorinated ethylene propylene resin (FEP)-lined polyethylene tubing was installed in each monitoring well. The tubing intake was placed about one foot above the well bottom in each of the wells. Viton® dedicated check valves were installed on the tubing intakes to prevent back-flow of water into the well. A short length of dedicated Viton® tubing was installed at the well head for use in a peristaltic pump head. Prior to sample collection for each quarterly monitoring event, the wells were purged using a peristaltic pump. Field parameters (pH, electrical conductivity, temperature, and turbidity) were measured in purged groundwater from each well prior to sampling; these data are recorded on the Sample Collection Field Data sheets presented in Appendix A. After purging, groundwater samples were collected using the peristaltic pump and the dedicated Viton® pump head discharge tubing.

The groundwater samples were analyzed for VOCs using U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Method 8260. Results for all Method 8010 analytes were reported. The groundwater samples for the second semi-annual 2010 event were delivered with appropriate chain-of-custody documentation to TestAmerica Laboratories, Inc., a state-certified laboratory in Pleasanton, California, for chemical analysis.

3.2 Analytical Results

The results of field and laboratory quality control measures and the results of the groundwater monitoring well samples are reviewed in this section. The certified analytical reports and chain-of-custody documentation are presented in Appendix C.

3.2.1 Quality Control

Quality control (QC) samples were analyzed as part of the sampling and analysis program to evaluate the precision and accuracy of the reported groundwater chemistry data. QC samples included both field and laboratory samples. Descriptions of the purpose of specific field and laboratory QC samples used during the sampling and analysis program and an evaluation of field and laboratory QC results are presented below.

Field Quality Control Samples

A field duplicate was used during the second semi-annual 2010 sampling event for the Site. A field duplicate is used to assess sampling and analytical precision. The duplicate is collected at a selected well (MW-2) and then submitted "blind" to the laboratory for analysis with the same batch as the regular sample for the selected well. An estimate of precision is obtained by calculating the relative percent difference (RPD) between the regular sample and the duplicate sample using the following formula:

$$RPD = \frac{[\,x - y\,]\,100}{0.5\,(x + y)}$$

where: [x - y] = the absolute value of the difference in concentration between the regular sample (x) and the duplicate sample (y).

Laboratory Quality Control Samples

The following types of laboratory QC samples were used during the second semi-annual 2010 analytical program for the Site:

- surrogate spikes
- matrix spikes/duplicate matrix spikes

A surrogate spike is a check standard added to a sample in a known amount prior to analysis. Surrogate spikes consist of analytes not normally found in environmental samples and not targeted by the analytical procedure. Surrogate spikes provide information on recovery efficiency by comparing the percent recovery of specific surrogate analyses to statistically derived acceptance limits developed by the USEPA or the laboratory (provided such laboratory-specific limits are stricter than those developed by the USEPA). If the recoveries fall within the acceptance limits for the analytes, the analysis exhibits acceptable recovery efficiency. Recoveries that fall outside the acceptance limits indicate a potential problem with the recovery efficiency of analytes, which in turn indicates a potential bias with respect to the reported concentration of the environmental samples analyzed in the same batch.

Matrix spikes and duplicate matrix spikes are analyzed by the laboratory for the purpose of providing a quantitative measure of accuracy and precision, and to document the effect that the sample matrix has on the analysis. A selected sample is spiked in duplicate with known concentrations of analytes. The recoveries of the spiked analytes are compared to statistically derived acceptance limits developed by the USEPA or the laboratory (provided such laboratory-specific limits are stricter than those developed by the USEPA). If the recoveries fall within the acceptance limits for the analytes, the analysis has no statistically significant bias (i.e., the analysis is accurate). Recoveries that fall outside of the acceptance limits have a positive or negative bias, depending on whether the recovery is greater or less than the upper or lower acceptance limit, respectively. Analyses where analyte recoveries fall outside the acceptance limits should be regarded as estimates only.

Precision for matrix spikes is measured by calculating the relative percent differences (RPDs) between the measured concentration of analytes in the matrix and the duplicate matrix spike. The following equation is used for matrix spikes:

$$RPD = \frac{[\ MS - MSD\ ]\ 100}{0.5\ (MS + MSD)}$$

where: [MS - MSD] = the absolute value of the difference in concentration between the matrix spike (MS) and the matrix spike duplicate (MSD)

Third Quarter 2010 Field QC Results

One field duplicate (DUP-1) was analyzed as part of the third quarter 2010 sampling event at the Site. The duplicate sample was collected at groundwater monitoring well MW-2 and was analyzed for halogenated VOCs using USEPA Method 8260B (8010 list). Table 2 summarizes the calculated RPDs for MW-2 and MW-2 duplicate (DUP-1). The two parameters (cis-1,2-DCE and PCE) for which RPDs could be calculated (see Table 2) exhibit one low RPD value (i.e., less than 10%) indicative of good precision and one medium RPD value (i.e., 10 – 15%) indicative of fair precision.

Second Semi-Annual 2010 Laboratory QC Results

A review of the second semi-annual 2010 field data sheets and laboratory reports (presented in Appendices A and C, respectively) indicates that all analyses were performed within USEPA or California Department of Health Services (DHS) recommended maximum sample holding times.

QC data on surrogate spike recoveries and matrix spike recoveries are presented in the laboratory reports. These data indicate: (1) no surrogate spike recoveries were outside of the laboratory's acceptance limits; (2) RPD values for the matrix spikes and duplicate matrix spikes indicate a high overall degree of analytical precision.

No matrix spike or duplicate matrix spike recoveries were outside of the laboratory's control limits.

The laboratory QC data indicate that the results reported herein are of adequate quality for evaluation of site groundwater conditions.

3.2.2 Groundwater Results

The results for the second semi-annual 2010 monitoring event are shown on Table 3a and Figure 5. The results of historical VOC analyses for each quarter for 2000 through first quarter 2010 are summarized in Table 3b, which also shows the VOC results for the initial sampling event for monitoring wells MW-1, MW-2, and MW-3 in November 1999. Historical VOC results for all the wells are plotted on Figure 6.

Consistent with previous monitoring events, PCE and its breakdown product TCE were detected in Site groundwater samples from the third quarter 2010 monitoring event. Cis-1,2-DCE was also detected in MW-2 during the third quarter 2010 monitoring event.

For the third semi-annual 2010 event, the concentrations of PCE detected were:

- 420 micrograms per liter (μg/L) in monitoring well MW-1
- 180 μg/L in MW-2

- not detected in MW-3
- 0.64 μg/L in MW-4.

TCE was detected at 57 μg/L in monitoring well MW-1, but was not detected in MW-2, MW-3 or MW-4.

Cis-1,2-DCE was detected at 6.2 μg/L in monitoring well MW-2, but was not detected in monitoring wells MW-1, MW-3, or MW-4.

DCE was detected at 0.64 μg/L in monitoring well MW-3, but was not detected in monitoring wells MW-1, MW-3, or MW-4.

3.3 Discussion

Variations in VOC concentrations at monitoring well MW-2, the well with historically the highest reported PCE concentrations at the site, generally correlate with variations in groundwater elevations at the Site. An increase in VOC concentrations generally follows a rise in groundwater elevations, and a decrease in VOC concentration generally follows a fall in groundwater levels (see Figure 7). The variations in VOC concentrations sometimes lag one quarter behind the variations in groundwater elevation.

The average seasonal concentration of PCE reported for groundwater monitoring well MW-2 has been lower since the second quarter of 2006 (June 2006 event) compared to results reported since monitoring began in 1999 (see Figure 6). The PCE concentrations reported for MW-2 since June 2006 are an indication that the phytoremediation project implemented in June 2005 has reduced the average seasonal concentration of PCE at the site.

The results for VOC concentrations reported for the second semi-annual 2010 quarterly monitoring event are generally similar to the results reported since the second quarter of 2006 (see Figure 6), with the following notable exceptions:

- The concentration of PCE reported for groundwater monitoring well MW-2 for September 2010 is the lowest concentration ever reported for MW-2 during the Site's monitoring history.
- The concentrations of PCE reported for well MW-2 during the last three events are the three lowest consecutive values ever reported for MW-2.

Continued monitoring will be required to assess the effectiveness of the phytoremediation project in further reducing the PCE concentrations in groundwater.

4 Phytoremediation Project Status Update

A phytoremediation project was implemented at the Site in June 2005. The project involved planting 96 bare-root hybrid poplar trees in a grid on the unpaved portion of the site. Selection of the phytoremediation approach and implementation of the project were described in the report, *Groundwater Monitoring Results, First through Fourth Quarter 2005, Cargill Salt – Alameda Facility, Alameda, California* (Crawford Consulting, Inc., October 20, 2006).

A tree monitoring and maintenance program is being conducted by a landscaping contractor. This program involves monthly inspection of the trees during the growing season, inspection and maintenance of the drip irrigation system, and weed control.

The trees were 4-ft-tall, bare-root poles with no foliage when planted in June 2005. During the first two years of growth, the trees developed foliage and most grew 3 to 10 additional feet in height. Photos comparing the appearance of the trees just after planting in 2005, in June 2007, and in September 2009 are show below and on the following pages. After three years, most of the trees had grown to heights of 10 to 25 feet. After five years, most of the trees have grown to heights of 25 to 35 feet. In April 2008, seven additional saplings were planted in the rear of the property near monitoring well MW-2.

As discussed in Section 3.3, the PCE concentrations reported for monitoring well MW-2 since June 2006 are an indication that the phytoremediation project has been effective at reducing the average seasonal VOC concentration in groundwater at the site. Tree growth and VOC concentrations will be monitored and evaluated to determine the effectiveness of the phytoremediation project in further reducing VOC concentrations.

Bare-root trees planted in June 2005 - View towards rear of property

June 2007 - View from driveway towards rear of property

September 2009 - View from street towards driveway and rear of property

November 2010 – View from street towards driveway and rear of property
(compare tree height to photo on previous page)

June 2007 - View of front planting strip at Clement Avenue

September 2009 - View of front planting strip at Clement Avenue.
Note relative height of gate vs. trees in the pictures on previous page and below.

November 2010 – Trees dropping foliage. Also, branches on
bottom 6 feet of trunks have been cleared for site visibility.

Professional Certification

Groundwater Monitoring Results
Second Semi-Annual 2010 Monitoring Period
Cargill Salt – Alameda Facility
Alameda, California

This report has been prepared by CRAWFORD CONSULTING, INC. with the professional certification of the California professional geologist whose signature appears below.

Dana C. Johnston
Project Manager



Mark C. Wheeler
Principal Geologist
P.G. 4563

References

Alameda County Environmental Health Services, 1999. Letter to Cargill Salt: Groundwater Monitoring Well Installation at 2016 Clement Avenue, Alameda, CA, May 7, 1999.

Conor Pacific/EFW, 2001. Workplan for Off-Site Characterization, Cargill Salt Alameda Facility, June 18, 2001.

_____, 2002. Off-Site Groundwater Characterization, Cargill Salt – Alameda Facility, Alameda, California, August 21, 2002.

Crawford Consulting, Inc., 1999. Workplan for Groundwater Characterization and Monitoring Well Installation, 2016 Clement Avenue, Alameda, California, July 7, 1999.

_____, 2001. Groundwater Monitoring Results, First through Fourth Quarter 2000, Cargill Salt – Alameda Facility, Alameda, California, April 11, 2001.

_____, 2002. Groundwater Monitoring Results, First through Fourth Quarter 2001, Cargill Salt – Alameda Facility, Alameda, California, August 14, 2002.

_____, 2003. Groundwater Monitoring Results, First through Fourth Quarter 2002, Cargill Salt – Alameda Facility, Alameda, California, August 13, 2003.

_____, 2004. Groundwater Monitoring Results, First through Fourth Quarter 2003, Cargill Salt – Alameda Facility, Alameda, California, February 27, 2004.

_____, 2005. Groundwater Monitoring Results, First through Fourth Quarter 2004, Cargill Salt – Alameda Facility, Alameda, California, November 7, 2005.

_____, 2006. Groundwater Monitoring Results, First through Fourth Quarter 2005, Cargill Salt – Alameda Facility, Alameda, California, October 20, 2006.

_____, 2006. Groundwater Monitoring Results, First Semi-Annual 2006 Monitoring Results, Cargill Salt – Alameda Facility, Alameda, California, November 8, 2006.

_____, 2007. Groundwater Monitoring Results, Second Semi-Annual 2006 Monitoring Results, Cargill Salt – Alameda Facility, Alameda, California, February 28, 2007

_____, 2007. Groundwater Monitoring Results, First Semi-Annual 2007 Monitoring Results, Cargill Salt – Alameda Facility, Alameda, California, September 28, 2007.

_____, 2007. Groundwater Monitoring Results, Second Semi-Annual 2007 Monitoring Results, Cargill Salt – Alameda Facility, Alameda, California, February 28, 2008

_____, 2008. Groundwater Monitoring Results, First Semi-Annual 2008 Monitoring Results, Cargill Salt – Alameda Facility, Alameda, California, December 22, 2008.

_____, 2008. Groundwater Monitoring Results, Second Semi-Annual 2008 Monitoring Results, Cargill Salt – Alameda Facility, Alameda, California, March 2, 2009

Crawford Consulting, Inc. and Conor Pacific/EFW, 2000. Groundwater Characterization and Monitoring Well Installation, Cargill Salt – Alameda Facility, Alameda, California, January 31, 2000.

Groundworks Environmental, Inc. (Groundworks), 1993. Results of Soil Sampling and Workplan for Remedial Activities, Alameda facility, October 19, 1993.

_____, 1995. Soil and Groundwater Investigations and Remedial Activities, July 1993 – September 1994, Cargill Salt – Alameda Facility, Alameda, California, July 31, 1995.

References
(continued)

Hickenbottom, K. S., and Muir, K.S., 1988. Geohydrology and Groundwater-Quality Overview of the East Bay Plain Area, Alameda County, California, 205 (j) Report, prepared for the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region, by the Alameda County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, June 1988.

Limitations

This report and the evaluations presented herein have been prepared in accordance with generally accepted professional standards and is based solely on the scope of work and services described herein. This report has been prepared solely for the use of Cargill Salt for the purposes noted herein. Any use of this report, in whole or in part, by a third party for other than the purposes noted herein is at such party's sole risk.

Table 1. Groundwater Level Data

Well/ Piezometer	Date	Time	Casing Elevation (feet, MSL)	Depth to Water (feet)	Water Elevation (feet, MSL)	Elev. Change from Last Measurement (feet)
MW-1	11/16/1999	09:56	13.16	3.75	9.41	NA
MW-1	3/30/2000	10:09	13.16	2.81	10.35	0.94
MW-1	5/16/2000	09:43	13.16	3.32	9.84	-0.51
MW-1	7/28/2000	09:11	13.16	3.58	9.58	-0.26
MW-1	11/30/2000	08:36	13.16	3.52	9.64	0.06
MW-1	3/26/2001	08:47	13.16	3.15	10.01	0.37
MW-1	6/25/2001	10:19	13.16	3.53	9.63	-0.38
MW-1	9/28/2001	09:32	13.16	3.96	9.20	-0.43
MW-1	12/17/2001	10:47	13.16	3.23	9.93	0.73
MW-1	3/21/2002	07:28	13.16	2.89	10.27	0.34
MW-1	6/6/2002	08:03	13.16	3.50	9.66	-0.61
MW-1	9/20/2002	08:30	13.16	3.86	9.30	-0.36
MW-1	12/19/2002	08:38	13.16	3.13	10.03	0.73
MW-1	3/4/2003	10:31	13.16	3.08	10.08	0.05
MW-1	6/9/2003	08:32	13.16	3.29	9.87	-0.21
MW-1	9/8/2003	10:02	13.16	3.79	9.37	-0.50
MW-1	12/1/2003	10:16	13.16	3.78	9.38	0.01
MW-1	3/4/2004	09:31	13.16	2.88	10.28	0.90
MW-1	6/2/2004	08:42	13.16	3.45	9.71	-0.57
MW-1	9/14/2004	08:01	13.16	3.87	9.29	-0.42
MW-1	12/8/2004	07:44	13.16	3.23	9.93	0.64
MW-1	3/3/2005	08:07	13.16	2.01	11.15	1.22
MW-1	6/10/2005	07:05	13.16	2.90	10.26	-0.89
MW-1	9/16/2005	08:00	13.16	3.62	9.54	-0.72
MW-1	12/6/2005	08:00	13.16	3.28	9.88	0.34
MW-1	3/10/2006	07:40	13.16	2.28	10.88	1.00
MW-1	6/9/2006	09:45	13.16	3.09	10.07	-0.81
MW-1	9/11/2006	10:24	13.16	3.70	9.46	-0.61
MW-1	12/15/2006	07:34	13.16	2.94	10.22	0.76
MW-1	3/6/2007	09:18	13.16	2.87	10.29	0.07
MW-1	6/15/2007	07:29	13.16	3.30	9.86	-0.43
MW-1	9/11/2007	08:05	13.16	3.85	9.31	-0.55
MW-1	12/4/2007	08:53	13.16	3.58	9.58	0.27
MW-1	3/20/2008	08:13	13.16	3.00	10.16	0.58
MW-1	6/18/2008	08:22	13.16	3.73	9.43	-0.73
MW-1	9/3/2008	08:06	13.16	3.93	9.23	-0.20
MW-1	12/4/2008	08:12	13.16	3.71	9.45	0.22
MW-1	3/5/2009	09:18	13.16	1.83	11.33	1.88
MW-1	6/11/2009	08:40	13.16	3.52	9.64	-1.69
MW-1	9/3/2009	07:57	13.16	3.98	9.18	-0.46
MW-1	3/2/2010	08:10	13.16	2.37	10.79	1.61
MW-1	9/3/2010	07:01	13.16	3.80	9.36	-1.43
MW-2	11/16/1999	11:15	16.22	5.22	11.00	NA
MW-2	3/30/2000	10:05	16.22	2.80	13.42	2.42
MW-2	5/16/2000	09:35	16.22	4.13	12.09	-1.33
MW-2	7/28/2000	09:17	16.22	4.85	11.37	-0.72
MW-2	11/30/2000	08:32	16.22	4.75	11.47	0.10
MW-2	3/26/2001	08:40	16.22	3.28	12.94	1.47
MW-2	6/25/2001	12:12	16.22	4.75	11.47	-1.47
MW-2	9/28/2001	12:20	16.22	5.41	10.81	-0.66

Table 1. Groundwater Level Data

Well/ Piezometer	Date	Time	Casing Elevation (feet, MSL)	Depth to Water (feet)	Water Elevation (feet, MSL)	Elev. Change from Last Measurement (feet)
MW-2	12/17/2001	10:44	16.22	4.07	12.15	1.34
MW-2	3/28/2002	09:37	16.22	3.40	12.82	0.67
MW-2	6/6/2002	08:11	16.22	4.70	11.52	-1.30
MW-2	9/20/2002	08:34	16.22	5.28	10.94	-0.58
MW-2	12/19/2002	08:45	16.22	3.37	12.85	1.91
MW-2	3/4/2003	10:26	16.22	3.11	13.11	0.26
MW-2	6/9/2003	08:31	16.22	4.16	12.06	-1.05
MW-2	9/8/2003	10:08	16.22	5.26	10.96	-1.10
MW-2	12/1/2003	10:20	16.22	5.05	11.17	0.21
MW-2	3/4/2004	09:34	16.22	2.86	13.36	2.19
MW-2	6/2/2004	08:53	16.22	4.47	11.75	-1.61
MW-2	9/14/2004	07:59	16.22	5.26	10.96	-0.79
MW-2	12/8/2004	08:00	16.22	4.20	12.02	1.06
MW-2	3/3/2005	08:04	16.22	1.90	14.32	2.30
MW-2	6/10/2005	07:09	16.22	3.74	12.48	-1.84
MW-2	9/16/2005	08:08	16.22	4.92	11.30	-1.18
MW-2	12/6/2005	10:58	16.22	4.39	11.83	0.53
MW-2	3/10/2006	07:47	16.22	2.13	14.09	2.26
MW-2	6/9/2006	10:03	16.22	3.75	12.47	-1.62
MW-2	9/11/2006	10:22	16.22	4.94	11.28	-1.19
MW-2	12/15/2006	07:32	16.22	4.08	12.14	0.86
MW-2	3/6/2007	09:13	16.22	3.27	12.95	0.81
MW-2	6/15/2007	07:31	16.22	4.57	11.65	-1.30
MW-2	9/11/2007	08:07	16.22	5.60	10.62	-1.03
MW-2	12/4/2007	08:47	16.22	4.99	11.23	0.61
MW-2	3/20/2008	08:17	16.22	3.48	12.74	1.51
MW-2	6/18/2008	08:27	16.22	4.93	11.29	-1.45
MW-2	9/3/2008	08:08	16.22	5.58	10.64	-0.65
MW-2	12/4/2008	08:14	16.22	5.07	11.15	0.51
MW-2	3/5/2009	11:10	16.22	2.30	13.92	2.77
MW-2	6/11/2009	08:41	16.22	4.44	11.78	-2.14
MW-2	9/3/2009	08:01	16.22	5.55	10.67	-1.11
MW-2	3/2/2010	08:12	16.22	2.88	13.34	2.67
MW-2	9/3/2010	07:04	16.22	5.18	11.04	-2.30
MW-3	11/16/1999	15:43	13.34	4.34	9.00	NA
MW-3	3/30/2000	10:01	13.34	2.77	10.57	1.57
MW-3	5/16/2000	09:46	13.34	3.44	9.90	-0.67
MW-3	7/28/2000	09:05	13.34	3.72	9.62	-0.28
MW-3	11/30/2000	08:34	13.34	3.73	9.61	-0.01
MW-3	3/26/2001	08:54	13.34	3.51	9.83	0.22
MW-3	6/25/2001	10:21	13.34	3.65	9.69	-0.14
MW-3	9/28/2001	09:30	13.34	3.96	9.38	-0.31
MW-3	12/17/2001	10:38	13.34	3.28	10.06	0.68
MW-3	3/21/2002	07:28	13.34	3.10	10.24	0.18
MW-3	6/6/2002	08:07	13.34	3.63	9.71	-0.53
MW-3	9/20/2002	08:25	13.34	3.82	9.52	-0.19
MW-3	12/19/2002	08:42	13.34	3.10	10.24	0.72
MW-3	3/4/2003	10:36	13.34	3.29	10.05	-0.19
MW-3	6/9/2003	08:28	13.34	3.41	9.93	-0.12
MW-3	9/8/2003	10:00	13.34	3.85	9.49	-0.44

Table 1. Groundwater Level Data

Well/ Piezometer	Date	Time	Casing Elevation (feet, MSL)	Depth to Water (feet)	Water Elevation (feet, MSL)	Elev. Change from Last Measurement (feet)
MW-3	12/1/2003	10:30	13.34	3.90	9.44	-0.05
MW-3	3/4/2004	09:22	13.34	3.11	10.23	0.79
MW-3	6/2/2004	08:46	13.34	3.53	9.81	-0.42
MW-3	9/14/2004	08:05	13.34	4.07	9.27	-0.54
MW-3	12/8/2004	07:40	13.34	3.73	9.61	0.34
MW-3	3/3/2005	07:53	13.34	2.36	10.98	1.37
MW-3	6/10/2005	07:14	13.34	3.15	10.19	-0.79
MW-3	9/16/2005	08:04	13.34	3.90	9.44	-0.75
MW-3	12/6/2005	08:04	13.34	3.35	9.99	0.55
MW-3	3/10/2006	07:43	13.34	2.89	10.45	0.46
MW-3	6/9/2006	09:33	13.34	3.26	10.08	-0.37
MW-3	9/11/2006	10:19	13.34	3.70	9.64	-0.44
MW-3	12/15/2006	07:37	13.34	3.10	10.24	0.60
MW-3	3/6/2007	09:16	13.34	3.04	10.30	0.06
MW-3	6/15/2007	07:27	13.34	3.60	9.74	-0.56
MW-3	9/11/2007	08:03	13.34	3.87	9.47	-0.27
MW-3	12/4/2007	08:50	13.34	3.62	9.72	0.25
MW-3	3/20/2008	08:15	13.34	3.13	10.21	0.49
MW-3	6/18/2008	08:24	13.34	3.90	9.44	-0.77
MW-3	9/3/2008	08:02	13.34	3.92	9.42	-0.02
MW-3	12/4/2008	08:10	13.34	3.59	9.75	0.33
MW-3	3/5/2009	09:23	13.34	2.79	10.55	0.80
MW-3	6/11/2009	08:38	13.34	3.14	10.20	-0.35
MW-3	9/3/2009	07:55	13.34	4.31	9.03	-1.17
MW-3	3/2/2010	08:09	13.34	2.94	10.40	1.37
MW-3	9/3/2010	07:07	13.34	3.75	9.59	-0.81
MW-4	12/17/2001	10:40	12.43	2.55	9.88	NA
MW-4	3/28/2002	08:05	12.43	3.06	9.37	-0.51
MW-4	6/6/2002	07:57	12.43	2.85	9.58	0.21
MW-4	9/20/2002	08:28	12.43	3.21	9.22	-0.36
MW-4	12/19/2002	08:53	12.43	3.70	8.73	-0.49
MW-4	3/4/2003	10:34	12.43	3.14	9.29	0.56
MW-4	6/9/2003	08:29	12.43	2.82	9.61	0.32
MW-4	9/8/2003	10:04	12.43	3.43	9.00	-0.61
MW-4	12/1/2003	10:14	12.43	3.12	9.31	0.31
MW-4	3/4/2004	09:27	12.43	2.81	9.62	0.31
MW-4	6/2/2004	08:44	12.43	3.34	9.09	-0.53
MW-4	9/14/2004	08:03	12.43	3.51	8.92	-0.17
MW-4	12/8/2004	07:36	12.43	3.10	9.33	0.41
MW-4	3/3/2005	07:44	12.43	2.48	9.95	0.62
MW-4	6/10/2005	07:02	12.43	2.47	9.96	0.01
MW-4	9/16/2005	08:12	12.43	3.23	9.20	-0.76
MW-4	12/6/2005	07:50	12.43	3.17	9.26	0.06
MW-4	3/10/2006	07:37	12.43	3.77	8.66	-0.60
MW-4	6/9/2006	07:30	12.43	2.49	9.94	1.28
MW-4	9/11/2006	10:17	12.43	3.19	9.24	-0.70
MW-4	12/21/2006	NR	12.43	2.90	9.53	0.29
MW-4	3/6/2007	09:20	12.43	2.54	9.89	0.36
MW-4	6/15/2007	07:33	12.43	3.03	9.40	-0.49
MW-4	9/11/2007	08:11	12.43	3.27	9.16	-0.24

Table 1. Groundwater Level Data

Well/ Piezometer	Date	Time	Casing Elevation (feet, MSL)	Depth to Water (feet)	Water Elevation (feet, MSL)	Elev. Change from Last Measurement (feet)
MW-4	12/4/2007	08:55	12.43	3.25	9.18	0.02
MW-4	3/20/2008	08:20	12.43	2.65	9.78	0.60
MW-4	6/18/2008	08:31	12.43	3.35	9.08	-0.70
MW-4	9/3/2008	07:58	12.43	3.28	9.15	0.07
MW-4	12/4/2008	08:17	12.43	3.12	9.31	0.16
MW-4	3/5/2009	09:27	12.43	2.16	10.27	0.96
MW-4	6/11/2009	08:43	12.43	2.84	9.59	-0.68
MW-4	9/3/2009	08:04	12.43	3.49	8.94	-0.65
MW-4	3/2/2010	08:14	12.43	2.32	10.11	1.17
MW-4	9/3/2010	07:10	12.43	3.10	9.33	-0.78

Key:

NA = Not available

feet, MSL = feet, relative to Mean Sea Level

Casing elevations for all wells were resurveyed on September 6, 2006 by CSS Environmental Services for Geotracker compliance.

Table 2.
Relative Percent Difference Based on Duplicate Samples

Third Quarter 2010

Analysis	Well MW-2 Results	Duplicate (DUP-1) Results	RPD[1] (%)
Volatile Organic Compounds (µg/L)			
cis-1,2-dichloroethene	6.2	6.5	4.7
Tetrachloroethene (PCE)	180	200	10.5

[1] RPD = relative percent difference

All other 8010 list analytes not detected (by 8260).

Table 3a. Summary of Groundwater Monitoring Well Data - Third Quarter 2010

Well No. Field Date	**MW-1** 9/3/10	**MW-2** 9/3/10	**MW-3** 9/3/10	**MW-4** 9/3/10	MCL[1]
DCE[3]	<5.0	<5.0	**0.64**	<0.5	6
cis-1,2-DCE	<5.0	**6.2**	<0.5	<0.5	ne[2]
TCE[4]	**57**	<5.0	<0.5	<0.5	5
PCE[5]	**420**	**180**	<0.5	**0.64**	5
Other analytes[6]	nd[7]	nd	nd	nd	nd

Notes:
Results measured in micrograms per liter (μg/L)

[1] MCL = California Primary Drinking Water Standard - Maximum Contaminant Level

[2] ne = not established or none applicable

[3] DCE = 1,1-Dichloroethene

[4] TCE = Trichloroethene

[5] PCE = Tetrachloroethene

[6] All other 8010 list analytes

[7] nd = not detected above laboratory reporting limit

Table 3b. Historical Summary of Groundwater Monitoring Well Data

Results measured in micrograms per liter (μg/L)

Well No.	MW-1																							
Field Date	11/16/99	3/30/00	5/16/00	7/28/00	11/30/00	3/26/01	6/25/01	9/28/01	12/17/01	3/21/02	6/6/02	9/20/02	12/19/02	3/4/03	6/9/03	9/8/03	12/1/03	3/4/04	6/2/04	9/14/04	12/8/04	3/3/05	6/10/05	9/16/05	MCL[1]
DCE[2]	<50.0	**13**	<10	**15**	**14**	<13	**14**	**15**	<13	<13	<13	<13	<13	<10	**12**	**5.2**	**8.4**	<5.0	**5.8**	**6.6**	<5.0	<5.0	<2.0	<5.0	6
CFC 113[3]	na[4]	**1.4**	<10	<10	<8.3	<50	<50	<50	<50	<13	<13	<13	<13	<10	<10	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<2.0	<5.0	ne[5]
DCA[6]	<50.0	**0.8**	<10	<10	<4.2	<13	<13	<13	<13	<13	<13	<13	<13	<10	<10	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<2.0	<5.0	5
Chloroform	<50.0	**0.6***	<10	<10	<8.3	<13	<13	<13	<13	<13	<13	<13	<13	<10	<10	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<2.0	<10	ne
cis-1,2-DCE	<10	<10	<10	<10	<4.2	<13	<13	<13	<13	<13	<13	<13	<13	<10	<10	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<2.0	<5.0	ne
TCA[7]	<50.0	**1.6**	<10	<10	<4.2	<13	<13	<13	<13	<13	<13	<13	<13	<10	<10	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<2.0	<5.0	200
TCE[8]	**178**	**150**	**190**	**170**	**130**	**180**	**250**	**210**	**190**	**160**	**140**	**190**	**68**	**97**	**90**	**110**	**130**	**53**	**72**	**81**	**39**	**15**	**23**	**34**	5
PCE[9]	**906**	**1,400**	**1,900**	**1,200**	**880**	**1,000**	**1,400**	**1,000**	**1,400**	**1,100**	**980**	**1,100**	**600**	**730**	**770**	**780**	**850**	**370**	**490**	**620**	**380**	**160**	**180**	**240**	5
Other analytes[10]	nd[11]	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	--

Well No.	MW-2																							
Field Date	11/16/99	3/30/00	5/16/00	7/28/00	11/30/00	3/26/01	6/25/01	9/28/01	12/17/01	3/28/02	6/6/02	9/20/02	12/30/02	3/4/03	6/9/03	9/8/03	12/1/03	3/4/04	6/2/04	9/14/04	12/8/04	3/3/05	6/10/05	9/16/05	MCL[1]
DCE[2]	<50.0	<0.5	<25	<25	<8.3	<25	<25	<25	<25	<25	<25	<25	<25	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<25	<25	<20	<50	<25	<20	6
CFC 113[3]	na	<0.5	<25	<25	<17	<100	<100	<100	<100	<25	<25	<25	<25	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<25	<25	<20	<50	<25	<20	ne[5]
DCA[6]	<50.0	<0.5	<25	<25	<8.3	<25	<25	<25	<25	<25	<25	<25	<25	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<25	<25	<20	<50	<25	<20	5
Chloroform	<50.0	<0.5	<25	<25	<17	<25	<25	<25	<25	<25	<25	<25	<25	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<25	<25	<20	<50	<25	<40	ne
cis-1,2-DCE	<50.0	<0.5	<25	<25	<8.3	<25	<25	<25	<25	<25	<25	<25	<25	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<25	<25	<20	<50	<25	<20	ne
TCA[7]	<50.0	**5.0**	<25	<25	<8.3	<25	<25	<25	<25	<25	<25	<25	<25	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<25	<25	<20	<50	<25	<20	200
TCE[8]	<50	**29**	**53**	<25	**20**	**40**	**78**	<25	<25	**49**	**52**	**32**	<25	**58**	**41**	**28**	**25**	**39**	**49**	**37**	**30**	**78**	**43**	**29**	5
PCE[9]	**840**	**3,600**	**3,200**	**3,300**	**1,700**	**2,200**	**4,400**	**1,700**	**1,700**	**3,500**	**3,800**	**2,100**	**1,800**	**3,900**	**3,800**	**2,500**	**2,500**	**3,000**	**4,100**	**3,800**	**2,800**	**7,300**	**3,600**	**2,500**	5
Other analytes[10]	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	--

Notes:

[1] MCL = California Primary Drinking Water Standard - Maximum Contaminant Level (in micrograms per liter [μg/L])

[2] DCE = 1,1-Dichloroethene

[3] CFC 113 = Trichlorotrifluoroethane (1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane)

[4] na = not analyzed

[5] ne = not established or none applicable

[6] DCA = 1,1-Dichloroethane

[7] TCA = 1,1,1-Trichloroethane

[8] TCE = Trichloroethene

[9] PCE = Tetrachloroethene

[10] All other 8010 list analytes

[11] nd = not detected above laboratory reporting limit

* Chloroform detected in equipment blank at 1.6 μg/L for 3/30/00 event.

Table 3b. Historical Summary of Groundwater Monitoring Well Data

Well No.	MW-1																	
Field Date	12/6/05	3/10/06	6/9/06	9/11/06	12/15/06	3/6/07	6/15/07	9/11/07	12/4/07	3/20/08	6/18/08	9/3/08	12/4/08	3/5/09	6/11/09	9/3/09	3/2/10	9/3/10	MCL[1]
DCE[2]	<2.0	<0.5	<2.0	**3.3**	<2.0	<2.0	**3.0**	<5.0	<5.0	<2.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<0.5	<2.5	<10	<5.0	<5.0	6
CFC 113[3]	<2.0	<0.5	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<5.0	<5.0	<2.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<0.5	<2.5	<10	<5.0	<5.0	ne[5]
DCA[6]	<2.0	<0.5	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<5.0	<5.0	<2.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<0.5	<2.5	<10	<5.0	<5.0	5
Chloroform	<4.0	**1.4**	<4.0	<4.0	<4.0	<4.0	<4.0	<10	<10	<4.0	<10	<10	<10	**1.9**	<5.0	<20	<10	<10	ne
cis-1,2-DCE	<2.0	<0.5	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<5.0	<5.0	<2.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	**0.62**	<2.5	<10	<5.0	<5.0	ne
TCA[7]	<2.0	<0.5	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<5.0	<5.0	<2.0	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	<0.5	<2.5	<10	<5.0	<5.0	200
TCE[8]	**16**	**3.4**	**22**	**47**	**20**	**17**	**38**	**51**	**29**	**18**	**42**	**65**	**42**	**6.5**	**40**	**68**	**27**	**57**	5
PCE[9]	**140**	**39**	**140**	**400**	**210**	**170**	**310**	**430**	**330**	**170**	**390**	**620**	**320**	**68**	**300**	**640**	**170**	**420**	5
Other analytes[10]	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	--

Well No.	MW-2																	
Field Date	12/6/05	3/10/06	6/9/06	9/11/06	12/15/06	3/6/07	6/15/07	9/11/07	12/4/07	3/20/08	6/18/08	9/3/08	12/4/08	3/5/09	6/11/09	9/3/09	3/2/10	9/3/10	MCL[1]
DCE[2]	<25	<25	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<25	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	6
CFC 113[3]	<25	<25	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<25	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	ne[5]
DCA[6]	<25	<25	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<25	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	5
Chloroform	<50	<50	<40	<20	<40	<40	<40	<40	<40	<40	<40	<40	<40	<40	<50	<10	<10	<10	ne
cis-1,2-DCE	<25	<25	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<25	<5.0	**8.0**	**6.2**	ne
TCA[7]	<25	<25	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<20	<25	<5.0	<5.0	<5.0	200
TCE[8]	**45**	**59**	<20	<20	<20	<20	**22**	**31**	<20	<20	**21**	<20	<20	<20	<25	<5.0	**9.5**	<5.0	5
PCE[9]	**3,300**	**5,200**	**1,600**	**990**	**1,000**	**1,600**	**2,400**	**1,700**	**1,100**	**2,900**	**1,700**	**1,600**	**2,000**	**2,300**	**1,500**	**410**	**860**	**180**	5
Other analytes[10]	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	--

Notes:

[1] MCL = California Primary Drinking Water Standard - Maximum Contaminant Level

[2] DCE = 1,1-Dichloroethene

[3] CFC 113 = Trichlorotrifluoroethane (1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane)

[4] na = not analyzed

[5] ne = not established or none applicable

[6] DCA = 1,1-Dichloroethane

[7] TCA = 1,1,1-Trichloroethane

[8] TCE = Trichloroethene

[9] PCE = Tetrachloroethene

[10] All other 8010 list analytes

[11] nd = not detected above laboratory reporting limit

Table 3b. Historical Summary of Groundwater Monitoring Well Data

Results measured in micrograms per liter (μg/L)

Well No.	MW-3																										
Field Date	11/16/99	3/30/00	5/16/00	7/28/00	11/30/00	3/26/01	6/25/01	9/28/01	12/17/01	3/21/02	6/6/02	9/20/02	12/19/02	3/4/03	6/9/03	9/8/03	12/1/03	3/4/04	6/2/04	9/14/04	12/8/04	3/3/05	6/10/05	9/16/05	12/6/05	3/10/06	6/9/06	MCL[1]
DCE[2]	<0.500	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	**0.51**	<0.5	**0.81**	<0.5	<0.5	**0.68**	**2.4**	**1.5**	**1.1**	**0.86**	**4.3**	6
CFC 113[3]	na	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<1.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	ne[5]
DCA[6]	<0.500	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	**0.50**	5
Chloroform	<0.500	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<1.0	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	ne
cis-1,2-DCE	<0.500	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	ne
TCA[7]	<0.500	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	**1.0**	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	200
TCE[8]	<0.500	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	5
PCE[9]	<0.500	<0.5	<0.5	**0.8**	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	**0.81**	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	**0.90**	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	5
Other analytes[10]	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	--

Well No.	MW-4																										
Field Date	12/17/01	3/28/02	6/6/02	9/20/02	12/19/02	3/4/03	6/9/03	9/8/03	12/1/03	3/4/04	6/2/04	9/14/04	12/8/04	3/3/05	6/10/05	9/16/05	12/6/05	3/10/06	6/9/06	9/11/06	12/21/06	3/6/07	6/15/07	9/11/07	12/4/07	3/20/08	6/18/08	MCL[1]
DCE[2]	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	6
CFC 113[3]	<2.0	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	ne[5]
DCA[6]	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	5
Chloroform	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	ne
cis-1,2-DCE	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	ne
TCA[7]	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	200
TCE[8]	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	5
PCE[9]	**2.6**	**2.8**	**2.0**	**2.5**	**1.1**	**2.1**	**2.1**	**1.6**	**1.6**	**1.7**	**1.4**	**1.3**	**1.2**	**0.93**	**0.98**	**0.8**	**1.1**	**0.79**	**0.64**	**0.70**	**0.63**	**0.70**	**0.75**	**0.86**	**0.92**	**0.91**	**0.86**	5
Other analytes[10]	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	--

Notes:

[1] MCL = California Primary Drinking Water Standard - Maximum Contaminant Level (in micrograms per liter [μg/L])

[2] DCE = 1,1-Dichloroethene

[3] CFC 113 = Trichlorotrifluoroethane (1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane)

[4] na = not analyzed

[5] ne = not established or none applicable

[6] DCA = 1,1-Dichloroethane

[7] TCA = 1,1,1-Trichloroethane

[8] TCE = Trichloroethene

[9] PCE = Tetrachloroethene

[10] All other 8010 list analytes

[11] nd = not detected above laboratory reporting limit

Table 3b. Historical Summary of Groundwater Monitoring Well Data

Well No.	MW-3															
Field Date	9/11/06	12/15/06	3/6/07	6/15/07	9/11/07	12/4/07	3/20/08	6/18/08	9/3/08	12/4/08	3/5/09	6/11/09	9/3/09	3/2/10	9/3/10	MCL[1]
DCE[2]	**2.8**	**1.6**	**1.5**	**2.4**	**1.4**	**1.1**	**1.0**	**1.4**	**0.79**	**0.59**	<0.5	**0.95**	**0.51**	<0.5	**0.64**	6
CFC 113[3]	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	ne[5]
DCA[6]	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	5
Chloroform	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	ne
cis-1,2-DCE	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	ne
TCA[7]	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	200
TCE[8]	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	5
PCE[9]	<0.5	**0.56**	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	**1.2**	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	5
Other analytes[10]	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	--

Well No.	MW-4							
Field Date	9/3/08	12/4/08	3/5/09	6/11/09	9/3/09	3/2/10	9/3/10	MCL[1]
DCE[2]	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	6
CFC 113[3]	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	ne[5]
DCA[6]	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	5
Chloroform	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	ne
cis-1,2-DCE	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	ne
TCA[7]	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	200
TCE[8]	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	5
PCE[9]	**0.84**	**0.65**	**0.62**	**0.70**	**0.79**	**0.78**	**0.64**	5
Other analytes[10]	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	--

Notes:

[1] MCL = California Primary Drinking Water Standard - Maximum Contaminant Level

[2] DCE = 1,1-Dichloroethene

[3] CFC 113 = Trichlorotrifluoroethane (1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane)

[4] na = not analyzed

[5] ne = not established or none applicable

[6] DCA = 1,1-Dichloroethane

[7] TCA = 1,1,1-Trichloroethane

[8] TCE = Trichloroethene

[9] PCE = Tetrachloroethene

[10] All other 8010 list analytes

[11] nd = not detected above laboratory reporting limit

CRAWFORD CONSULTING INC.

Project No. CS1605
Cargill Salt Dispensing Systems Division
2016 Clement Avenue, Alameda, California
Figure 1. Site Location

1605fig104.dsf 12/8/04



1605fig207Q4.dsf 2/22/08

Base map from Conor Pacific/EFW, Off-Site Groundwater Characterization, August 21, 2002.

CRAWFORD CONSULTING INC.

Project No. CS1605
Cargill Salt Dispensing Systems Division
2016 Clement Avenue, Alameda, California
Figure 2. Groundwater Monitoring Well Locations

Figure 3. Graphical Summary of Groundwater Elevations





EXPLANATION

- Monitoring well
- (9.4) Groundwater elevation (Ft.-MSL); measured 9/3/10
- Groundwater elevation contour (Ft.-MSL)

0 40 Feet
Approximate Scale

1605fig410Q3.dsf 10/27/10

Base map from Conor Pacific/EFW, Off-Site Groundwater Characterization, August 21, 2002.

CRAWFORD CONSULTING INC.

Project No. CS1605
Cargill Salt Dispensing Systems Division
2016 Clement Avenue, Alameda, California
Figure 4. Groundwater Elevation Contours - September 2010



EXPLANATION

Groundwater monitoring well location

DCE <5.0
cis-1,2-DCE 6.2
TCE <5.0
PCE 180

Analyte concentration

Analytical parameter

All concentrations reported in micrograms per liter (µg/L), in groundwater.
All other 8010 list analytes were below detection limits.

DCE = 1,1-Dichloroethene
PCE = Tetrachloroethene
TCE = Trichloroethene
VOCs = Volatile organic compounds

0 40 Feet
Approximate Scale

1605fig510Q3.dsf 10/27/10

Base map from Conor Pacific/EFW, Off-Site Groundwater Characterization, August 21, 2002.

CRAWFORD CONSULTING INC.

Project No. CS1605
Cargill Salt Dispensing Systems Division
2016 Clement Avenue, Alameda, California

Figure 5. VOC Concentrations in Groundwater – September 2010

Figure 6. Graphical Summary of PCE Concentrations



Figure 7. PCE Concentrations vs. Groundwater Elevation



Appendix A

Field Data Sheets

Third Quarter 2010

WATER LEVEL FIELD DATA

Cargill Salt
Alameda Facility
Alameda, California
Project No. CS1605

Well ID	Date	Time	Depth to Water (1st Msmt.) (feet)	Depth to Water (2nd Msmt.) (feet)	Comments
MW-1	9/3/10	0701	3.80	3.80	Needs bolts
MW-2	9/3/10	0704	5.18	5.18	Needs bolts
MW-3	9/3/10	0707	3.75	3.75	Needs bolts
MW-4	9/3/10	0710	3.10	3.10	Needs bolts

Data Collection

Field measurements by:
Print: Manuel A Gallegos
Signature:
Date: 9-3-10

Reviewed by:
Print: J Butera
Signature: J Butera
Date: 9/7/10

SAMPLE COLLECTION FIELD DATA

Project No.: CS1605
Project Name: Alameda Facility
Location: Alameda, CA
Client: Cargill Salt

Well ID: MW-1
Sample ID: MW-1
Start Date: 9-3-10
Finish Date: 9-3-10

WELL INFORMATION

Casing diameter (in.): 1.0 Depth to water (ft): 3.81 Well depth (ft): 18.3
One casing volume (gal.): 0.59 Calculated purge volume (gal.) *(3 x casing volume)*: 1.78
One casing volume = π x [casing radius (in.) x 1 ft/12 in.]^2 x [well depth (ft) - depth to water (ft)] x 7.48 gal/ft^3
Gallons per linear ft for casing diameter of: 1" = 0.041 2" = 0.16 4." = 0.65 5" = 1.0 6" = 1.5 8" = 2.6
Floating product thickness (ft): ND Method for checking: Interface probe X Clear bailer

WELL PURGING

Date purged: 9-3-10 Start time: 0804 End time: 0826
Purging equipment: Submersible pump ___ Bladder pump ___ Peristaltic pump X
PVC bailer ___ Teflon bailer ___ Other ___
Purge rate: 0.3 gal/pm) Well yield (H/L): High
Purge water disposal: Drummed on site

Time (2400 hr)	Cumulative Vol. Purged (~~gal.~~ mls)	pH (units)	EC (µS/cm)	T (° C)	Color (Visual)	Turbidity (Visual or NTU)
0812	2.2	7.01	489	17.9	Clear	2.12
0819	4.4	6.74	472	18.3	Clear	2.27
0826	6.7	6.69	467	18.2	Clear	0.39

Total Purged (~~gal.~~ mls): 6.7

WELL SAMPLING

Date sampled: 9-3-10 Start time: 0827 End time: 0828
Depth to water (ft) before sampling: 5.82
Sampling equipment: Peristaltic pump X Bladder pump ___ Teflon bailer ___
PVC bailer ___ Other ___

Weather conditions: Ok Ambient temperature (° F): 65
Well condition/Remarks: All Samples taken
well lid needs bolts

Meter calibration: EC ___ pH ___
Temperature ___ Turbidity ___

Purged and sampled by (print): Manuel L. Gallegos
Signature: [signature] Reviewed by: [signature]

SAMPLE COLLECTION FIELD DATA

Project No.: CS1605
Project Name: Alameda Facility
Location: Alameda, CA
Client: Cargill Salt

Well ID: MW-2
Sample ID: MW-2
Start Date: 9-3-10
Finish Date: 9-3-10

WELL INFORMATION

Casing diameter (in.): 1.0 Depth to water (ft): 5.23 Well depth (ft): 17.5
One casing volume (gal.): 0.50 Calculated purge volume (gal.) *(3 x casing volume)*: 1.50
One casing volume = π x [casing radius (in.) x 1 ft/12 in.]^2 x [well depth (ft) - depth to water (ft)] x 7.48 gal/ft^3
Gallons per linear ft for casing diameter of: 1" = 0.041 2" = 0.16 4." = 0.65 5" = 1.0 6" = 1.5 8" = 2.6
Floating product thickness (ft): ND Method for checking: Interface probe X Clear bailer

WELL PURGING

Date purged: 9-3-10 Start time: 0938 End time: 0959
Purging equipment: Submersible pump Bladder pump Peristaltic pump X
PVC bailer Teflon bailer Other
Purge rate: 0.27 (lpm) Well yield (H/L): High
Purge water disposal: Drummed onsite

Time (2400 hr)	Cumulative Vol. Purged ~~(gal.)~~ (ml)	pH (units)	EC (µS/cm)	T (° C)	Color (Visual)	Turbidity (Visual or NTU)
0945	1.9	6.71	521	17.5	Clear	58
0952	3.8	6.65	515	17.5	Clear	23.44
0959	5.7	6.63	5.19	17.5	Clear	9.60

Total Purged ~~(gal.)~~ (ml): 5.7

WELL SAMPLING

Date sampled: 9-3-10 Start time: 1000 End time: 1002
Depth to water (ft) before sampling: 5.90
Sampling equipment: Peristaltic pump X Bladder pump Teflon bailer
PVC bailer Other

Weather conditions: Clear Ambient temperature (° F): 73
Well condition/Remarks: well lid needs bolts

All Samples Collected

Meter calibration: EC pH
Temperature Turbidity

Purged and sampled by (print): Manuel L. Gallegos
Signature:
Reviewed by:

SAMPLE COLLECTION FIELD DATA

Project No.: CS1605
Project Name: Alameda Facility
Location: Alameda, CA
Client: Cargill Salt

Well ID: MW-3
Sample ID: MW-3
Start Date: 9-3-10
Finish Date: 9-3-10

WELL INFORMATION

Casing diameter (in.): 1.0 Depth to water (ft): 3.72 Well depth (ft): 17.6
One casing volume (gal.): 0.56 Calculated purge volume (gal.) *(3 x casing volume)*: 1.70
One casing volume = π x [casing radius (in.) x 1 ft/12 in.]^2 x [well depth (ft) - depth to water (ft)] x 7.48 gal/ft^3
Gallons per linear ft for casing diameter of: 1" = 0.041 2" = 0.16 4." = 0.65 5" = 1.0 6" = 1.5 8" = 2.6
Floating product thickness (ft): ND Method for checking: Interface probe X Clear bailer

WELL PURGING

Date purged: 9-3-10 Start time: 0839 End time: 0920
Purging equipment: Submersible pump Bladder pump Peristaltic pump X
PVC bailer Teflon bailer Other
Purge rate: 0.15 (l/m) Well yield (H/L): Low
Purge water disposal: Drummed onsite

Time (2400 hr)	Cumulative Vol. Purged (gal.) (ML)	pH (units)	EC (µS/cm)	T (° C)	Color (Visual)	Turbidity (Visual or NTU)
0849	2.3	7.22	537	18.6	Clear	4.27
0902	4.2	7.28	576	18.2	Clear	2.50
0920	6.4	7.34	580	18.2	Clear	5.35

Total Purged (gal.) (ML): 6.4

WELL SAMPLING

Date sampled: 9-3-10 Start time: 0920 End time: 0923
Depth to water (ft) before sampling: 16.42
Sampling equipment: Peristaltic pump X Bladder pump Teflon bailer
PVC bailer Other

Weather conditions: Clear Ambient temperature (° F): 69
Well condition/Remarks: All samples collected
No bolts on well l.d.

Meter calibration: EC pH
Temperature Turbidity

Purged and sampled by (print): Manuel L. Gallegos
Signature: [signature] Reviewed by: [signature]

SAMPLE COLLECTION FIELD DATA

Project No.: CS1605
Project Name: Alameda Facility
Location: Alameda, CA
Client: Cargill Salt

Well ID: MW-4
Sample ID: MW-4
Start Date: 9-3-10
Finish Date: 9-3-10

WELL INFORMATION

Casing diameter (in.): 1.0 ~~2.5~~ Depth to water (ft): 3.10 Well depth (ft): 19.0
One casing volume (gal.): 0.65 Calculated purge volume (gal.) *(3 x casing volume)*: 1.95
One casing volume = π x [casing radius (in.) x 1 ft/12 in.]^2 x [well depth (ft) - depth to water (ft)] x 7.48 gal/ft^3
Gallons per linear ft for casing diameter of: 1" = 0.041 2" = 0.16 4." = 0.65 5" = 1.0 6" = 1.5 8" = 2.6
Floating product thickness (ft): ND Method for checking: Interface probe X Clear bailer

WELL PURGING

Date purged: 9-3-10 Start time: 0723 End time: 0747
Purging equipment: Submersible pump Bladder pump Peristaltic pump X
PVC bailer Teflon bailer Other
Purge rate: 0.3 (lpm) Well yield (H/L): High
Purge water disposal: Drum on site

Time (2400 hr)	Cumulative Vol. Purged (~~gal.~~/mL)	pH (units)	EC (µS/cm)	T (° C)	Color (Visual)	Turbidity (Visual or NTU)
0731	2.4	7.10	600	20.9	Clear	2.22
0739	4.8	7.27	605	20.4	Clear	1.02
0747	7.2	7.24	604	20.3	Clear	1.50

Total Purged (~~gal.~~/mL) 7.2

WELL SAMPLING

Date sampled: 9-3-10 Start time: 0748 End time: 0750
Depth to water (ft) before sampling: 13.15
Sampling equipment: Peristaltic pump X Bladder pump Teflon bailer
PVC bailer Other

Weather conditions: OK Ambient temperature (° F): 63
Well condition/Remarks: All samples taken
well lid needs bolts

Meter calibration: EC 14,852-15,000 pH 7.02-7.00/10.01-1000/3,524.00
Temperature 22.2 Turbidity

Purged and sampled by (print): Manuel L. Gallegos
Signature:
Reviewed by:

Appendix B

Groundwater Velocity Calculations

APPENDIX B
GROUNDWATER VELOCITY CALCULATIONS

FOR CARGILL ALAMEDA SITE

GROUNDWATER VELOCITY FORMULA

$V = Ki/n$ where:

V = average linear groundwater velocity — i = hydraulic gradient
K = hydraulic conductivity — n = effective porosity

PARAMETERS

Range of hydraulic conductivity values (K) from slug tests:

Material	Well	K (cm/sec)
Silty sand (SM) and Clayey sand (SC)	MW-1	0.00002
Silty sand (SM) and Clayey sand (SC)	MW-2	0.00002
Silty sand (SM) and Clayey sand (SC)	MW-3	0.000003
	Highest measured K =	0.00002

Porosity (n) = 33% (from laboratory analysis of boring B21 soil sample)

Hydraulic gradient (i) calculated from groundwater contours:

September 2010 0.013

UNIT CONVERSIONS

1 day = 86,400 sec
1 foot = 30.48 cm
1 cm/sec = 2,834.65 ft/day
1 cm/sec = 1,034,645.67 ft/yr

CALCULATED VELOCITIES

Measurement Event	Flow Direction	K (cm/sec)	i (ft/ft)	n	V (ft/yr)
September 2010	NE	0.00002	0.013	0.33	1

Calculations and assumptions prepared by: Mark C. Wheeler

Date: 11/9/10

Appendix C

Certified Analytical Reports and Chain-of-Custody Documentation

Third Quarter 2010

TestAmerica
THE LEADER IN ENVIRONMENTAL TESTING

ANALYTICAL REPORT

Job Number: 720-30292-1

Job Description: Alameda Facility CS 1605

For:
Crawford Consulting Inc
4 North First Street Suite 650
San Jose, CA 95113-1326

Attention: Ms. Dana Johnston

Approved for release.
Dimple Sharma
Project Manager I
9/8/2010 10:45 AM

Dimple Sharma
Project Manager I
dimple.sharma@testamericainc.com
09/08/2010

CA ELAP Certification # 2496
The Chain(s) of Custody are included and are an integral part of this report.
The report shall not be reproduced except in full, without the written approval of the laboratory. The client, by accepting this report, also agrees not to alter any reports whether in the hard copy or electronic format and to use reasonable efforts to preserve the reports in the form and substance originally provided by TestAmerica.
A trip blank is required to be provided for volatile analyses. If trip blank results are not included in the report, either the trip blank was not submitted or requested to be analyzed.

TestAmerica Laboratories, Inc.
TestAmerica San Francisco 1220 Quarry Lane, Pleasanton, CA 94566
Tel (925) 484-1919 Fax (925) 600-3002 www.testamericainc.com

Comments
No additional comments.

Receipt
All samples were received in good condition within temperature requirements.

GC/MS VOA
No analytical or quality issues were noted.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY - Detections

Client: Crawford Consulting Inc

Job Number: 720-30292-1

Lab Sample ID / Analyte	Client Sample ID	Result / Qualifier	Reporting Limit	Units	Method
720-30292-1	**MW-1**				
Trichloroethene		57	5.0	ug/L	8260B
Tetrachloroethene		420	5.0	ug/L	8260B
720-30292-2	**MW-2**				
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene		6.2	5.0	ug/L	8260B
Tetrachloroethene		180	5.0	ug/L	8260B
720-30292-3	**MW-3**				
1,1-Dichloroethene		0.64	0.50	ug/L	8260B
720-30292-4	**MW-4**				
Tetrachloroethene		0.64	0.50	ug/L	8260B
720-30292-5	**DUP-1**				
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene		6.5	5.0	ug/L	8260B
Tetrachloroethene		200	5.0	ug/L	8260B

METHOD SUMMARY

Client: Crawford Consulting Inc

Job Number: 720-30292-1

Description	Lab Location	Method	Preparation Method
Matrix Water			
Volatile Organic Compounds (GC/MS)	TAL SF	SW846 8260B	
Purge and Trap	TAL SF		SW846 5030B

Lab References:

TAL SF = TestAmerica San Francisco

Method References:

SW846 = "Test Methods For Evaluating Solid Waste, Physical/Chemical Methods", Third Edition, November 1986 And Its Updates.

SAMPLE SUMMARY

Client: Crawford Consulting Inc

Job Number: 720-30292-1

Lab Sample ID	Client Sample ID	Client Matrix	Date/Time Sampled	Date/Time Received
720-30292-1	MW-1	Water	09/03/2010 0827	09/03/2010 1120
720-30292-2	MW-2	Water	09/03/2010 1000	09/03/2010 1120
720-30292-3	MW-3	Water	09/03/2010 0920	09/03/2010 1120
720-30292-4	MW-4	Water	09/03/2010 0748	09/03/2010 1120
720-30292-5	DUP-1	Water	09/03/2010 0000	09/03/2010 1120
720-30292-6	TB-1	Water	09/03/2010 0000	09/03/2010 1120

Client: Crawford Consulting Inc

Job Number: 720-30292-1

Client Sample ID: **MW-1**

Lab Sample ID: 720-30292-1
Client Matrix: Water

Date Sampled: 09/03/2010 0827
Date Received: 09/03/2010 1120

8260B Volatile Organic Compounds (GC/MS)

Method:	8260B	Analysis Batch: 720-77480	Instrument ID: HP9
Preparation:	5030B		Lab File ID: 09041014.D
Dilution:	10		Initial Weight/Volume: 10 mL
Date Analyzed:	09/04/2010 1618		Final Weight/Volume: 10 mL
Date Prepared:	09/04/2010 1618		

Analyte	Result (ug/L)	Qualifier	RL
1,1-Dichloroethene	ND		5.0
1,1-Dichloroethane	ND		5.0
Dichlorodifluoromethane	ND		5.0
Vinyl chloride	ND		5.0
Chloroethane	ND		10
Trichlorofluoromethane	ND		10
Methylene Chloride	ND		50
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	ND		5.0
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	ND		5.0
Chloroform	ND		10
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ND		5.0
Carbon tetrachloride	ND		5.0
1,2-Dichloroethane	ND		5.0
Trichloroethene	57		5.0
1,2-Dichloropropane	ND		5.0
Dichlorobromomethane	ND		5.0
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	ND		5.0
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	ND		5.0
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	ND		5.0
Tetrachloroethene	420		5.0
Chlorodibromomethane	ND		5.0
Chlorobenzene	ND		5.0
Bromoform	ND		10
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	ND		5.0
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	ND		5.0
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	ND		5.0
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	ND		5.0
Chloromethane	ND		10
Bromomethane	ND		10
1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane	ND		5.0
EDB	ND		5.0
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	ND		10

Surrogate	%Rec	Qualifier	Acceptance Limits
Toluene-d8 (Surr)	94		70 - 130
4-Bromofluorobenzene	93		67 - 130
1,2-Dichloroethane-d4 (Surr)	98		67 - 130

Client: Crawford Consulting Inc

Job Number: 720-30292-1

Client Sample ID: **MW-2**

Lab Sample ID: 720-30292-2
Client Matrix: Water

Date Sampled: 09/03/2010 1000
Date Received: 09/03/2010 1120

8260B Volatile Organic Compounds (GC/MS)

Method:	8260B	Analysis Batch: 720-77480	Instrument ID: HP9
Preparation:	5030B		Lab File ID: 09041015.D
Dilution:	10		Initial Weight/Volume: 10 mL
Date Analyzed:	09/04/2010 1651		Final Weight/Volume: 10 mL
Date Prepared:	09/04/2010 1651		

Analyte	Result (ug/L)	Qualifier	RL
1,1-Dichloroethene	ND		5.0
1,1-Dichloroethane	ND		5.0
Dichlorodifluoromethane	ND		5.0
Vinyl chloride	ND		5.0
Chloroethane	ND		10
Trichlorofluoromethane	ND		10
Methylene Chloride	ND		50
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	ND		5.0
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	6.2		5.0
Chloroform	ND		10
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ND		5.0
Carbon tetrachloride	ND		5.0
1,2-Dichloroethane	ND		5.0
Trichloroethene	ND		5.0
1,2-Dichloropropane	ND		5.0
Dichlorobromomethane	ND		5.0
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	ND		5.0
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	ND		5.0
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	ND		5.0
Tetrachloroethene	180		5.0
Chlorodibromomethane	ND		5.0
Chlorobenzene	ND		5.0
Bromoform	ND		10
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	ND		5.0
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	ND		5.0
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	ND		5.0
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	ND		5.0
Chloromethane	ND		10
Bromomethane	ND		10
1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane	ND		5.0
EDB	ND		5.0
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	ND		10

Surrogate	%Rec	Qualifier	Acceptance Limits
Toluene-d8 (Surr)	95		70 - 130
4-Bromofluorobenzene	93		67 - 130
1,2-Dichloroethane-d4 (Surr)	98		67 - 130

Client: Crawford Consulting Inc

Job Number: 720-30292-1

Client Sample ID: **MW-3**

Lab Sample ID: 720-30292-3
Client Matrix: Water

Date Sampled: 09/03/2010 0920
Date Received: 09/03/2010 1120

8260B Volatile Organic Compounds (GC/MS)

Method:	8260B	Analysis Batch: 720-77480	Instrument ID: HP9
Preparation:	5030B		Lab File ID: 09041016.D
Dilution:	1.0		Initial Weight/Volume: 10 mL
Date Analyzed:	09/04/2010 1722		Final Weight/Volume: 10 mL
Date Prepared:	09/04/2010 1722		

Analyte	Result (ug/L)	Qualifier	RL
1,1-Dichloroethene	0.64		0.50
1,1-Dichloroethane	ND		0.50
Dichlorodifluoromethane	ND		0.50
Vinyl chloride	ND		0.50
Chloroethane	ND		1.0
Trichlorofluoromethane	ND		1.0
Methylene Chloride	ND		5.0
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	ND		0.50
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	ND		0.50
Chloroform	ND		1.0
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ND		0.50
Carbon tetrachloride	ND		0.50
1,2-Dichloroethane	ND		0.50
Trichloroethene	ND		0.50
1,2-Dichloropropane	ND		0.50
Dichlorobromomethane	ND		0.50
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	ND		0.50
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	ND		0.50
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	ND		0.50
Tetrachloroethene	ND		0.50
Chlorodibromomethane	ND		0.50
Chlorobenzene	ND		0.50
Bromoform	ND		1.0
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	ND		0.50
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.50
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.50
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.50
Chloromethane	ND		1.0
Bromomethane	ND		1.0
1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane	ND		0.50
EDB	ND		0.50
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	ND		1.0

Surrogate	%Rec	Qualifier	Acceptance Limits
Toluene-d8 (Surr)	94		70 - 130
4-Bromofluorobenzene	92		67 - 130
1,2-Dichloroethane-d4 (Surr)	97		67 - 130

Client: Crawford Consulting Inc

Job Number: 720-30292-1

Client Sample ID: **MW-4**

Lab Sample ID: 720-30292-4
Client Matrix: Water

Date Sampled: 09/03/2010 0748
Date Received: 09/03/2010 1120

8260B Volatile Organic Compounds (GC/MS)

Method:	8260B	Analysis Batch: 720-77480	Instrument ID: HP9
Preparation:	5030B		Lab File ID: 09041017.D
Dilution:	1.0		Initial Weight/Volume: 10 mL
Date Analyzed:	09/04/2010 1754		Final Weight/Volume: 10 mL
Date Prepared:	09/04/2010 1754		

Analyte	Result (ug/L)	Qualifier	RL
1,1-Dichloroethene	ND		0.50
1,1-Dichloroethane	ND		0.50
Dichlorodifluoromethane	ND		0.50
Vinyl chloride	ND		0.50
Chloroethane	ND		1.0
Trichlorofluoromethane	ND		1.0
Methylene Chloride	ND		5.0
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	ND		0.50
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	ND		0.50
Chloroform	ND		1.0
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ND		0.50
Carbon tetrachloride	ND		0.50
1,2-Dichloroethane	ND		0.50
Trichloroethene	ND		0.50
1,2-Dichloropropane	ND		0.50
Dichlorobromomethane	ND		0.50
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	ND		0.50
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	ND		0.50
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	ND		0.50
Tetrachloroethene	0.64		0.50
Chlorodibromomethane	ND		0.50
Chlorobenzene	ND		0.50
Bromoform	ND		1.0
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	ND		0.50
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.50
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.50
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.50
Chloromethane	ND		1.0
Bromomethane	ND		1.0
1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane	ND		0.50
EDB	ND		0.50
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	ND		1.0

Surrogate	%Rec	Qualifier	Acceptance Limits
Toluene-d8 (Surr)	94		70 - 130
4-Bromofluorobenzene	91		67 - 130
1,2-Dichloroethane-d4 (Surr)	101		67 - 130

Client: Crawford Consulting Inc

Job Number: 720-30292-1

Client Sample ID: **DUP-1**

Lab Sample ID: 720-30292-5
Client Matrix: Water

Date Sampled: 09/03/2010 0000
Date Received: 09/03/2010 1120

8260B Volatile Organic Compounds (GC/MS)

Method:	8260B	Analysis Batch: 720-77480	Instrument ID: HP9
Preparation:	5030B		Lab File ID: 09041018.D
Dilution:	10		Initial Weight/Volume: 10 mL
Date Analyzed:	09/04/2010 1827		Final Weight/Volume: 10 mL
Date Prepared:	09/04/2010 1827		

Analyte	Result (ug/L)	Qualifier	RL
1,1-Dichloroethene	ND		5.0
1,1-Dichloroethane	ND		5.0
Dichlorodifluoromethane	ND		5.0
Vinyl chloride	ND		5.0
Chloroethane	ND		10
Trichlorofluoromethane	ND		10
Methylene Chloride	ND		50
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	ND		5.0
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	6.5		5.0
Chloroform	ND		10
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ND		5.0
Carbon tetrachloride	ND		5.0
1,2-Dichloroethane	ND		5.0
Trichloroethene	ND		5.0
1,2-Dichloropropane	ND		5.0
Dichlorobromomethane	ND		5.0
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	ND		5.0
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	ND		5.0
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	ND		5.0
Tetrachloroethene	200		5.0
Chlorodibromomethane	ND		5.0
Chlorobenzene	ND		5.0
Bromoform	ND		10
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	ND		5.0
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	ND		5.0
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	ND		5.0
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	ND		5.0
Chloromethane	ND		10
Bromomethane	ND		10
1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane	ND		5.0
EDB	ND		5.0
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	ND		10

Surrogate	%Rec	Qualifier	Acceptance Limits
Toluene-d8 (Surr)	94		70 - 130
4-Bromofluorobenzene	92		67 - 130
1,2-Dichloroethane-d4 (Surr)	102		67 - 130

Client: Crawford Consulting Inc

Job Number: 720-30292-1

Client Sample ID: **TB-1**

Lab Sample ID: 720-30292-6
Client Matrix: Water

Date Sampled: 09/03/2010 0000
Date Received: 09/03/2010 1120

8260B Volatile Organic Compounds (GC/MS)

Method:	8260B	Analysis Batch: 720-77478	Instrument ID: HP5
Preparation:	5030B		Lab File ID: 090410010.D
Dilution:	1.0		Initial Weight/Volume: 10 mL
Date Analyzed:	09/04/2010 1414		Final Weight/Volume: 10 mL
Date Prepared:	09/04/2010 1414		

Analyte	Result (ug/L)	Qualifier	RL
1,1-Dichloroethene	ND		0.50
1,1-Dichloroethane	ND		0.50
Dichlorodifluoromethane	ND		0.50
Vinyl chloride	ND		0.50
Chloroethane	ND		1.0
Trichlorofluoromethane	ND		1.0
Methylene Chloride	ND		5.0
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	ND		0.50
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	ND		0.50
Chloroform	ND		1.0
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ND		0.50
Carbon tetrachloride	ND		0.50
1,2-Dichloroethane	ND		0.50
Trichloroethene	ND		0.50
1,2-Dichloropropane	ND		0.50
Dichlorobromomethane	ND		0.50
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	ND		0.50
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	ND		0.50
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	ND		0.50
Tetrachloroethene	ND		0.50
Chlorodibromomethane	ND		0.50
Chlorobenzene	ND		0.50
Bromoform	ND		1.0
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	ND		0.50
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.50
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.50
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.50
Chloromethane	ND		1.0
Bromomethane	ND		1.0
1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane	ND		0.50
EDB	ND		0.50
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	ND		1.0

Surrogate	%Rec	Qualifier	Acceptance Limits
Toluene-d8 (Surr)	94		70 - 130
4-Bromofluorobenzene	97		67 - 130
1,2-Dichloroethane-d4 (Surr)	104		67 - 130

DATA REPORTING QUALIFIERS

Lab Section	Qualifier	Description

Client: Crawford Consulting Inc

Job Number: 720-30292-1

QC Association Summary

Lab Sample ID	Client Sample ID	Report Basis	Client Matrix	Method	Prep Batch
GC/MS VOA					
Analysis Batch:720-77478					
LCS 720-77478/5	Lab Control Sample	T	Water	8260B	
LCSD 720-77478/6	Lab Control Sample Duplicate	T	Water	8260B	
MB 720-77478/4	Method Blank	T	Water	8260B	
720-30292-6	TB-1	T	Water	8260B	
Analysis Batch:720-77480					
LCS 720-77480/5	Lab Control Sample	T	Water	8260B	
LCSD 720-77480/6	Lab Control Sample Duplicate	T	Water	8260B	
MB 720-77480/4	Method Blank	T	Water	8260B	
720-30292-1	MW-1	T	Water	8260B	
720-30292-2	MW-2	T	Water	8260B	
720-30292-3	MW-3	T	Water	8260B	
720-30292-4	MW-4	T	Water	8260B	
720-30292-5	DUP-1	T	Water	8260B	

Report Basis

T = Total

Client: Crawford Consulting Inc

Job Number: 720-30292-1

Method Blank - Batch: 720-77478

Method: 8260B
Preparation: 5030B

Lab Sample ID: MB 720-77478/4
Client Matrix: Water
Dilution: 1.0
Date Analyzed: 09/04/2010 1031
Date Prepared: 09/04/2010 1031

Analysis Batch: 720-77478
Prep Batch: N/A
Units: ug/L

Instrument ID: HP5
Lab File ID: 090410004.D
Initial Weight/Volume: 10 mL
Final Weight/Volume: 10 mL

Analyte	Result	Qual	RL
1,1-Dichloroethene	ND		0.50
1,1-Dichloroethane	ND		0.50
Dichlorodifluoromethane	ND		0.50
Vinyl chloride	ND		0.50
Chloroethane	ND		1.0
Trichlorofluoromethane	ND		1.0
Methylene Chloride	ND		5.0
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	ND		0.50
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	ND		0.50
Chloroform	ND		1.0
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ND		0.50
Carbon tetrachloride	ND		0.50
1,2-Dichloroethane	ND		0.50
Trichloroethene	ND		0.50
1,2-Dichloropropane	ND		0.50
Dichlorobromomethane	ND		0.50
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	ND		0.50
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	ND		0.50
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	ND		0.50
Tetrachloroethene	ND		0.50
Chlorodibromomethane	ND		0.50
Chlorobenzene	ND		0.50
Bromoform	ND		1.0
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	ND		0.50
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.50
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.50
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.50
Chloromethane	ND		1.0
Bromomethane	ND		1.0
1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane	ND		0.50
EDB	ND		0.50
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	ND		1.0

Surrogate	% Rec	Acceptance Limits
Toluene-d8 (Surr)	95	70 - 130
4-Bromofluorobenzene	94	67 - 130
1,2-Dichloroethane-d4 (Surr)	102	67 - 130

Client: Crawford Consulting Inc

Job Number: 720-30292-1

Lab Control Sample/
Lab Control Sample Duplicate Recovery Report - Batch: 720-77478

Method: 8260B
Preparation: 5030B

LCS Lab Sample ID:	LCS 720-77478/5	Analysis Batch:	720-77478	Instrument ID:	HP5
Client Matrix:	Water	Prep Batch:	N/A	Lab File ID:	090410005.D
Dilution:	1.0	Units:	ug/L	Initial Weight/Volume:	10 mL
Date Analyzed:	09/04/2010 1115			Final Weight/Volume:	10 mL
Date Prepared:	09/04/2010 1115				

LCSD Lab Sample ID:	LCSD 720-77478/6	Analysis Batch:	720-77478	Instrument ID:	HP5
Client Matrix:	Water	Prep Batch:	N/A	Lab File ID:	090410006.D
Dilution:	1.0	Units:	ug/L	Initial Weight/Volume:	10 mL
Date Analyzed:	09/04/2010 1147			Final Weight/Volume:	10 mL
Date Prepared:	09/04/2010 1147				

	% Rec.						
Analyte	LCS	LCSD	Limit	RPD	RPD Limit	LCS Qual	LCSD Qual
1,1-Dichloroethene	102	97	64 - 128	5	20		
1,1-Dichloroethane	101	96	70 - 130	5	20		
Dichlorodifluoromethane	88	90	42 - 188	2	20		
Vinyl chloride	108	101	65 - 156	7	20		
Chloroethane	98	100	62 - 138	2	20		
Trichlorofluoromethane	106	106	74 - 146	0	20		
Methylene Chloride	98	93	73 - 147	6	20		
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	103	98	75 - 131	5	20		
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	108	102	70 - 130	6	20		
Chloroform	102	96	70 - 130	6	20		
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	107	102	70 - 130	5	20		
Carbon tetrachloride	110	105	77 - 146	5	20		
1,2-Dichloroethane	103	94	70 - 126	9	20		
Trichloroethene	103	97	70 - 130	6	20		
1,2-Dichloropropane	107	100	70 - 130	7	20		
Dichlorobromomethane	107	100	70 - 130	7	20		
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	105	95	70 - 130	9	20		
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	109	101	70 - 130	7	20		
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	111	100	86 - 135	10	20		
Tetrachloroethene	103	97	70 - 130	7	20		
Chlorodibromomethane	98	90	78 - 145	9	20		
Chlorobenzene	102	97	70 - 130	5	20		
Bromoform	113	102	68 - 136	10	20		
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	116	101	70 - 130	13	20		
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	104	99	70 - 130	5	20		
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	103	97	82 - 113	7	20		
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	102	96	70 - 130	6	20		
Chloromethane	95	98	52 - 175	3	20		
Bromomethane	96	98	43 - 151	2	20		
1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane	102	96	42 - 162	6	20		
EDB	112	100	70 - 130	12	20		
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	110	101	70 - 130	9	20		

Client: Crawford Consulting Inc

Job Number: 720-30292-1

Surrogate	LCS % Rec	LCSD % Rec	Acceptance Limits
Toluene-d8 (Surr)	100	99	70 - 130
4-Bromofluorobenzene	107	107	67 - 130
1,2-Dichloroethane-d4 (Surr)	102	98	67 - 130

Client: Crawford Consulting Inc

Job Number: 720-30292-1

Method Blank - Batch: 720-77480

Method: 8260B
Preparation: 5030B

Lab Sample ID: MB 720-77480/4
Client Matrix: Water
Dilution: 1.0
Date Analyzed: 09/04/2010 1027
Date Prepared: 09/04/2010 1027

Analysis Batch: 720-77480
Prep Batch: N/A
Units: ug/L

Instrument ID: HP9
Lab File ID: 09041004.D
Initial Weight/Volume: 10 mL
Final Weight/Volume: 10 mL

Analyte	Result	Qual	RL
1,1-Dichloroethene	ND		0.50
1,1-Dichloroethane	ND		0.50
Dichlorodifluoromethane	ND		0.50
Vinyl chloride	ND		0.50
Chloroethane	ND		1.0
Trichlorofluoromethane	ND		1.0
Methylene Chloride	ND		5.0
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	ND		0.50
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	ND		0.50
Chloroform	ND		1.0
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ND		0.50
Carbon tetrachloride	ND		0.50
1,2-Dichloroethane	ND		0.50
Trichloroethene	ND		0.50
1,2-Dichloropropane	ND		0.50
Dichlorobromomethane	ND		0.50
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	ND		0.50
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	ND		0.50
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	ND		0.50
Tetrachloroethene	ND		0.50
Chlorodibromomethane	ND		0.50
Chlorobenzene	ND		0.50
Bromoform	ND		1.0
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	ND		0.50
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.50
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.50
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.50
Chloromethane	ND		1.0
Bromomethane	ND		1.0
1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane	ND		0.50
EDB	ND		0.50
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	ND		1.0

Surrogate	% Rec	Acceptance Limits
Toluene-d8 (Surr)	95	70 - 130
4-Bromofluorobenzene	96	67 - 130
1,2-Dichloroethane-d4 (Surr)	94	67 - 130

Client: Crawford Consulting Inc

Job Number: 720-30292-1

Lab Control Sample/
Lab Control Sample Duplicate Recovery Report - Batch: 720-77480

Method: 8260B
Preparation: 5030B

LCS Lab Sample ID:	LCS 720-77480/5	Analysis Batch:	720-77480	Instrument ID:	HP9
Client Matrix:	Water	Prep Batch:	N/A	Lab File ID:	09041005.D
Dilution:	1.0	Units:	ug/L	Initial Weight/Volume:	10 mL
Date Analyzed:	09/04/2010 1111			Final Weight/Volume:	10 mL
Date Prepared:	09/04/2010 1111				

LCSD Lab Sample ID:	LCSD 720-77480/6	Analysis Batch:	720-77480	Instrument ID:	HP9
Client Matrix:	Water	Prep Batch:	N/A	Lab File ID:	09041006.D
Dilution:	1.0	Units:	ug/L	Initial Weight/Volume:	10 mL
Date Analyzed:	09/04/2010 1143			Final Weight/Volume:	10 mL
Date Prepared:	09/04/2010 1143				

	% Rec.						
Analyte	LCS	LCSD	Limit	RPD	RPD Limit	LCS Qual	LCSD Qual
1,1-Dichloroethene	103	102	64 - 128	0	20		
1,1-Dichloroethane	97	98	70 - 130	1	20		
Dichlorodifluoromethane	63	62	42 - 188	2	20		
Vinyl chloride	82	83	65 - 156	1	20		
Chloroethane	92	91	62 - 138	1	20		
Trichlorofluoromethane	95	95	74 - 146	1	20		
Methylene Chloride	101	99	73 - 147	2	20		
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	104	104	75 - 131	0	20		
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	104	104	70 - 130	1	20		
Chloroform	99	99	70 - 130	1	20		
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	100	101	70 - 130	1	20		
Carbon tetrachloride	106	106	77 - 146	0	20		
1,2-Dichloroethane	93	93	70 - 126	0	20		
Trichloroethene	103	103	70 - 130	0	20		
1,2-Dichloropropane	101	101	70 - 130	0	20		
Dichlorobromomethane	106	105	70 - 130	1	20		
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	106	105	70 - 130	1	20		
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	106	105	70 - 130	1	20		
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	104	105	86 - 135	1	20		
Tetrachloroethene	100	101	70 - 130	1	20		
Chlorodibromomethane	108	108	78 - 145	0	20		
Chlorobenzene	100	102	70 - 130	2	20		
Bromoform	103	109	68 - 136	5	20		
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	96	97	70 - 130	2	20		
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	100	101	70 - 130	0	20		
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	100	101	82 - 113	0	20		
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	99	99	70 - 130	1	20		
Chloromethane	85	85	52 - 175	0	20		
Bromomethane	96	95	43 - 151	1	20		
1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane	105	104	42 - 162	1	20		
EDB	101	102	70 - 130	1	20		
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	97	98	70 - 130	2	20		

Client: Crawford Consulting Inc

Job Number: 720-30292-1

Surrogate	LCS % Rec	LCSD % Rec	Acceptance Limits
Toluene-d8 (Surr)	98	97	70 - 130
4-Bromofluorobenzene	96	98	67 - 130
1,2-Dichloroethane-d4 (Surr)	93	92	67 - 130

1266645

Test America
1220 Quarry Lane, Pleasanton, CA 94566
(925) 484-1919 FAX (925) 484-1096

CHAIN OF CUSTODY / LABORATORY ANALYSIS REQUEST FORM

720-30292

Service Request:

Date: 9/3/10

Project Name: Alameda Facility
Project Number: CS1605
Project Manager: Dana Johnston
Company/Address: Crawford Consulting, Inc.
4 North Second St, Suite 650
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: (408) 287-9934

Sampler's Signature:

Sample I.D.	Date	Time	LAB I.D.	Sample Matrix	Number of Containers	Volatile Organics (VOCs) (EPA 8021B)	Pb (7421); As (7060) Same as Metals	COD, TKN 500 ml plastic H_2SO_4	Chloride, Nitrate 500 ml plastic NP	pH, Conductivity 500 ml plastic NP	Total Phenols 2 x 500 ml glass H_2SO_4	**Volatile Organics (8010) 3 x 40 ml vial**	TPHgBTEX 2 x 40 ml vial HCl			REMARKS
					Analysis Requested											
MW-1	9-3-10	0827		Water	3							X				
MW-2	9-3-10	1000		Water	3							X				
MW-3	9-3-10	0920		Water	3							X				
MW-4	9-3-10	0748		Water	3							X				
DUP-1	9-3-10	—		Water	3							X				
TB-1	9-3-10	—		Water	3							X				

Page 20 of 21

Relinquished By	Received By
Signature: Margaret L. Gallegos	Signature: Joan Mullen
Printed Name: F.S.E.	Printed Name: Mullen
Firm: 9-3-10 1120	Firm: Test America
Date/Time	Date/Time: 9-3-10 1120
Relinquished By	Received By
Signature	Signature
Printed Name	Printed Name
Firm	Firm
Date/Time	Date/Time

TURNAROUND REQUIREMENTS
___ 24 hr ___ 48 hr ___ 5 day
x Standard (5 working days)
___ Provide Verbal Preliminary Results
x Provide pdf Results
Due Date

REPORT REQUIREMENTS
___ I. Routine Report
x II. Report (includes DUP, MS MSD, as required, may be charged as samples)
___ III. Data Validation Report (includes All Raw Data)
___ RWQCB
(MDLs/PQLs/TRACE#)

INVOICE INFORMATION
P.O. #
Bill to:

SAMPLE RECEIPT
Shipping VIA:
Shipping #:
Condition:

Special Instructions/Comments:

Please report MRLs only

Please pdf results to: Dana Johnston at dana@crawfordconsulting.com

Please provide EDF for Geotracker. Global ID is SL0600177511

5.9°c

Login Sample Receipt Check List

Client: Crawford Consulting Inc

Job Number: 720-30292-1

Login Number: 30292

List Source: TestAmerica San Francisco

Creator: Mullen, Joan

List Number: 1

Question	T / F/ NA	Comment
Radioactivity either was not measured or, if measured, is at or below background	N/A	
The cooler's custody seal, if present, is intact.	N/A	
The cooler or samples do not appear to have been compromised or tampered with.	True	
Samples were received on ice.	True	
Cooler Temperature is acceptable.	True	
Cooler Temperature is recorded.	True	
COC is present.	True	
COC is filled out in ink and legible.	True	
COC is filled out with all pertinent information.	True	
Is the Field Sampler's name present on COC?	True	
There are no discrepancies between the sample IDs on the containers and the COC.	True	
Samples are received within Holding Time.	True	
Sample containers have legible labels.	True	
Containers are not broken or leaking.	True	
Sample collection date/times are provided.	True	
Appropriate sample containers are used.	True	
Sample bottles are completely filled.	True	
Sample Preservation Verified	True	
There is sufficient vol. for all requested analyses, incl. any requested MS/MSDs	True	
VOA sample vials do not have headspace or bubble is <6mm (1/4") in diameter.	True	
If necessary, staff have been informed of any short hold time or quick TAT needs	True	
Multiphasic samples are not present.	True	
Samples do not require splitting or compositing.	True