

6000 S CORPORATION

42080 OSGOOD ROAD FREMONT, CALIFORNIA 94539 (415) 657-7633 FAX: (415) 657-8010

April 1, 1992

Ms. G. F. Duerig
Alameda County Water District
PO Box 5110
Fremont, CA 94537

92 APR -3 11:54

RE: Quarterly Monitoring Report - 1st Quarter 1992

6000 S Corporation
6000 Stevenson Blvd.
Fremont, CA 94538

Dear Ms. Duerig:

In accordance with Section 13267(b) of the California Water Code, 6000 S Corporation is hereby reporting on actions taken during the period of January 1, 1992 thru March 31, 1992 regarding environmental issues at the 6000 Stevenson Blvd. site.

As reported in our 4th Quarter Report, three environmental concerns remained in the site, which included:

- o Foundry Sand
- o Contaminated Soil (California Oil Recyclers)
- o Installation of additional Ground Water Monitoring Wells

Issue One - Foundry Sand

All of the Foundry Sand has been removed from the site by the generator, American Brass & Iron. The material was removed under the authority of the Honorable William Dunbar, Judge of the Superior Court, in Alameda County Superior Court Action No. H151806-5, dated February 28, 1992, and identified as Interlocutory Judgement And Order For Abatement Of Private Nuisance.

Ms. G.F. Duerig
Alameda County Water District

April 1, 1992
Page 2

Issue Two - Contaminated Soil


There has been no change in the status of the contaminated soil. Several settlement discussions on this issue have generated no definitive determination as to who will remove or test the soils. The California Superior Court is in control of this issue and has consistently pressed for an out-of-court remedy in lieu of a trial that could delay the remedy for several years. Some conclusion on this issue is anticipated on or before the end of the second quarter of 1992.

Issue Three - Installation of Additional Ground Water Monitoring Wells

As reported in the fourth Quarter Report of 1991, after ACWD's review and inspection of the site to locate monitoring wells, 6000 S Corporation solicited bids from three environmental contractors who contacted ACWD for specifications to bid the work. Bids were received from Resna, K.T.W. and E.T.I.C. A contract was let in January 1992, for completion of the work by March 1, 1992. After the contract was let to Resna, they applied for drilling permits, but were refused the permits unless the scope of work was expanded beyond the original scope set forth by ACWD. 6000 S Corporation responded by cancelling the contract for monitoring well installation and putting the matter on hold until the lead agency can provide reasonable specifications. 6000 S Corporation does not anticipate any further activity on Monitoring Well Installation until the contaminated soils issue is resolved by the court.

If there are any questions concerning this report, or if further information is required on any matters reviewed, please contact me at (510) 657-7633.

Sincerely,



Dale W. Sobek
President

DWS:s

cc: Ms. L. Vrabel, C.O.F.
Mr. R. Hiatt, R.W.Q.C.B.
Mr. S. Seery, A.C.D.E.W.
Mr. Larry E. Lulofs, Esq.

Almost every urban area has tainted groundwater

APR - 2 1992

BY JERRY MERAL

IF YOU cannot see or squeeze a sponge, how do you clean it? That is the dilemma facing Californians today concerning a resource that we depend upon for survival — our groundwater.

Groundwater provides almost half of the state's drinking water. After six years of drought, our reliance upon groundwater is even greater.

Not long ago it was thought that groundwater was safe from poisons dumped on the surface. It was believed that water percolating through sponge-like sediment and permeable rock to the water table would cleanse itself of toxic materials on the way down.

This belief was tragically wrong. Now, after decades of toxic waste being dumped on the ground, we are faced with contaminated groundwater in almost every urban area of California.

Every day more than five million pounds of hazardous waste generated in California is destined for disposal. The Environmental Protection Agency estimates that 26,000 hazardous waste sites in California are leaking. A disturbing number of leaks migrate to aquifers that hold groundwater.

Today there are more than 900 wells in almost every urban area of the state that are contaminated. In the Santa Clara Valley there are 903 confirmed leaking fuel tanks, only 100 of which are closely monitored.

The state has long recognized that contaminated groundwater is a problem and has borrowed millions of dollars

over the years to help fund cleanup attempts. Additionally, the EPA's Superfund, established to help deal with contamination, has proven to be a slow and ineffective solution. It provides the mechanism to hold polluters responsible, but for several reasons the messes remain:

- Many polluters were small business owners that have gone out of business.
- Many still in business are unable to pay the cost of restoration.

- Numerous sites have contamination that is so old and from so many sources that isolating the responsible parties is impossible.

- Even when polluters are discovered, years of litigation can pass before the cleanup actually begins. In the meantime, the poisons spread far and wide because the state lacks the money to begin the cleanup itself.

People are not the only species to suffer from the lack of water. California, one of the most biologically diverse regions in the world, is also an epicenter of extinction.

One reason is damage to our water resources. More than 80 percent of our coastal wetlands and 95 percent of the state's riparian habitat have been lost. Much of that loss can be attributed to the development of urban water programs — projects that have caused enormous damage to our fish and wildlife resources.

Senate Bill 959, which will go before the Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee on April 7, would impose a small fee on urban water users, thus establishing a stable funding source to help clean up groundwater



GEOFFREY MOSS

basins, provide safe drinking water grants and loans, and restore fish and wildlife. The bill would cost the average urban household less than \$2 per month and would stop the endless cycle of borrowing, then taxing, to pay for clean, safe drinking water.

Polluters would still be held accountable. Funds would be used for the enforcement of site cleanup by responsible parties. Not more than 2 percent would be expended for administrative costs.

Fish and wildlife would also benefit. A portion of the funds raised through SB 959 would go to fish and wildlife restoration and development, as well as the maintenance of streams, rivers, wetlands, riparian habitat, and other aquatic habitat resources.

California's groundwater crisis will get worse as time passes and the contamination spreads. We must act now to preserve this precious resource.

Jerry Meral is executive director of the Planning and Conservation League in Sacramento.