RO 2740

W. A. Craig, Inc.
Construction & Engineering

6940 Tremont Road
Dixon, CA 95620
Tel. (707) 693-2929
Fax (707) 693-2922
A, B Haz License #455752

December 29, 2005

Mr. Jerry Wickham
Alameda County Environmental Health Services
1131 Harbor Bay Parkway, Suite 250
Alameda, CA 94502-6577

Re: MBM Corporation, 5675 Sunol Boulevard, Pleasanton, California
Case No. RO0002740

Dear Mr. Wickham:

Three underground storage tanks (USTs) (two 20,000-gallons and one 6,000-gallon) were removed from MBM Corporation, 5675 Sunol Blvd, Pleasanton, California (the "Site") on May 13, 2004. The UST removals were permitted and overseen by the local regulating agency, the Livermore-Pleasanton Fire Department.

On May 20, 2004, a W.A. Craig, Inc. (WAC) technician collected six soil and three water samples from the tank excavation. The soil samples were collected from the sidewalls and the water samples were collected from three separate indentations, one from each former UST. Groundwater was not present across the entire pit bottom, only in the tank indentations. Only one soil sample (TP-5 MBM) collected from the northeast corner of the UST excavation, contained total petroleum hydrocarbons as diesel (TPH-d) at 5.7 mg/Kg. Petroleum hydrocarbon constituents were not detected in the other soil samples. Low concentrations of TPH-d ($\leq$5.5 mg/L) were also detected in each water sample. Fuel additives, oxygenates, lead scavengers, and BTEX constituents were not detected in any of the soil or water samples.

Prior to backfilling, groundwater in the tank pit was removed by vacuum and disposed of properly. Per regulatory direction, additional soil samples were collected beneath the location of the former 6,000-gallon tank, the location of the highest TPH-d concentrations detected in the

water samples. These samples did not contain detectable concentrations of TPH-d, BTEX, MtBE, or other fuel additives.

While low concentrations of TPH-d were detected in each of the water samples, soil samples collected one to two feet beneath the water sample locations did not contain detectable petroleum hydrocarbons. This indicates that neither free-phase petroleum products nor petroleum contaminated water were in contact with soil in this location. In addition, these sample locations were excavated with a backhoe bucket and groundwater did not flow into the sample excavation. This indicates the hydraulic conductivity or permeability of the soil is very low.

Additionally, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board-San Francisco Bay Region (SFRWQCB) has published (SFRWQCB, 2005) environmental screening levels (ESL) for sites with potential soil and groundwater contamination. All of the soil analytical results indicate detected TPH-d concentrations are well below the 100 mg/Kg (TPH middle distillates) final ESL for residual soil contamination and protection from groundwater leaching for deep soil with groundwater as a potential source of drinking water (Table C-2). In addition, water sample analytical results indicate one of the water samples is below the 100 µg/L final ESL for ground water contamination and one sample is only 10 µg/L above the 220µg/L drinking water toxicity concentration (Table F-1). Based on the data presented above and abundant leaking UST removal and investigation experience, I believe the analytical results indicate that no further action is required.

Thank you,
W.A. Craig, Inc.

David W. Janney, P.G.
Senior Geologist

Attachments: Site Plan

References: Screening for Environmental Concerns at Sites with Contaminated Soil and Groundwater, Interim Final, SFRWQCB, February 2005.

MBM Customized Foodservice Distribution
5675 Sunol Blvd.
Pleasanton, CA 94566