



The Sherwin-Williams Company
Coatings Division
101 Prospect Avenue, N.W.
Cleveland, OH 44115

Page 1 of four pages.

October 30, 1995

Mr. Sum Arigala
CA. Regional Water Quality Control Board
2101 Webster Street, Suite 500
Oakland, CA 94612

RE: Meeting of 10/21/95 (at S-W plant)
Key Points/Action Plan

Dear Sum:

We appreciate the fact that you and Susan Hugo could meet with us on-site, and we appreciate your complimentary remarks after having seen our Remediation Project. I have attempted here to note the significant points and action plans we agreed to during our 3-1/2 hour review.

A. Proposed S-W site monitoring wells

1. We reviewed the 10/12/95 subject work plan (and drawing) as prepared for us by Levine•Fricke (L•F) for the installation of twelve (12) new and replacement monitoring wells. During our site tour we saw every existing well and the proposed well locations; we understood that the proposed well locations were acceptable to both CaRWQCB and Alameda County.

S-W is currently negotiating another access agreement with Southern Pacific Lines (SPL) for the installation of three replacement and two new wells down-gradient and west of the S-W property; we will attempt to place the northernmost well as close as practical to Temescal Creek.

2. Plan

- The monitoring wells will be installed right after the SPL agreement is in place--if this is delayed, we will install the 7 on-site wells first.
- Sampling Plan--at this meeting and on 8/8/95 we discussed quarterly monitoring of water levels and semi-annual sampling/analysis of organics and arsenic. This initial monitoring plan will be submitted to the CaRWQCB. Based on the results of the first ground of samples from the new wells and historic data, S-W intends to meet with the Water Board to present our rationale for future sampling.

8/18/95
NOV 15 1995
TVI

Meeting of 10/21/95

B. Site Tour

1. We reviewed the general routing of the slurry wall and the recently completed environmental cap. We also reviewed the electrical slab/slurry wall area where the UST was closed-in-place during the slurry wall construction. As suggested by Susan Hugo, the details of this event will be covered in the "slurry wall" section of the L.F Project Completion Report.
2. Groundwater treatment system--we saw the location of the three extraction wells and reviewed the flow-through, the Andco (heavy metals removal) system and the Tri-Bio (organics removal) system. These systems were started up approximately mid-September and the treated effluent is being collected in a temporary 20,000-gal storage tank, pending certified lab results (before discharging via the NPDES permit). The preliminary effluent results show arsenic to be approx. 15-20 ppb, within the temporary limits of the NPDES permit. However, adjustments were made to the Andco system, and the test run completed on 10/17/95 resulted in effluent arsenic levels of "N/D" (non detect).
3. In response to a question by Susan Hugo, I advised that the Remediation Project engineering and construction costs were about \$3.5 million.

C. Rifkin Property

1. Quarterly sampling--we reviewed the results of the August sampling (see L.F report of 9/12/95). The data shows that the plume is not moving. The next sampling is scheduled for November.

Plan

After the November results are available, we will present our rationale for future sampling of this site, including time/concentration graphs.

2. Future slurry wall options
Mark Knox presented two plans/overlays for installing a slurry wall and extraction wells on this property:
 - a) A full cement/bentonite slurry wall, covering approx. 40,400 ft.² on the southern section of this site, with the eastern portion running under Horton Street.

This is the option preferred by S-W, as it gives full hydraulic containment of contaminants associated with S-W and will prevent migration of up-gradient or adjacent plumes (into a cone-of-influence of groundwater pump and treat options proposed by S-W). It also has the advantage of requiring minimal disposal of hazardous soil. With proper planning, this option should not negatively impact Chiron's future building plans.

Meeting of 10/21/95

- b) A "one-third" or partial slurry wall (enclosing only 13,200 ft.²) that would follow the eastern border of the proposed Horton Street Bypass as it cuts across the Rifkin property.

This option should not have impact on the structural plans for Chiron's future campus (tower building), but it does not provide full or sufficient hydraulic containment for plumes attributed to S-W. This option could also result in the generation of hazardous soil. Pump and treat options conducted outside the slurry wall would likely draw additional contaminants onto the site. S-W Management would not approve this option at this time.

Sum, you indicated that the Water Board will continue to evaluate these options as matters develop. You also suggested a future Risk Assessment for these two options may need to be provided and a more aggressive de-watering of the Rifkin property (3-4 extraction wells) may be an alternative to consider before the Chiron Tower is built (12-15 years hence).

- c) The 9/5/95 EKI report showing contamination in the Rifkin and adjacent properties was loaned to S-W for copying purposes, for which we are grateful.
- d) A recent TMC report has been issued to Susan Hugo, and L.F will make copies for our review.

D. Shellmound Property

You provided Mark Knox with a copy of the AGI Technologies report (which will be copied) which apparently shows arsenic in the groundwater at 50-200 ppb. We will review and discuss at our next meeting--(January ?).

E. Containment Zone Policy

We discussed this proposed Water Board Policy for the "brown field" development of that part of Emeryville where contamination will be "contained" in place and not cleaned up to background or drinking water levels. You gave us copies of Resolution No. 92-49, and S-W review this document prior to the 11/8/95 Sacramento Public Hearing.

Meeting of 10/21/95

Plan

- S-W will later develop a Site Risk Management Plan and request to be considered a "Containment Zone", consistent with the work conducted to date on our Remediation Project.
- You will provide us with a copy of such a Plan that has been submitted and approved by the Water Board, to serve as a model for us to follow.

Again, another productive meeting. Please advise if you have clarification or modifications to these notes.

Very truly yours,



David B. Gustafson
Director of Engineering
and Environmental, REM

DBG/mgd
1030d.dbg

cc: R.Arulanantham
A.Danzig
S.Hugo
M.Knox, L.F
F.McHugh
L.Mencin