



MARA FEENEY & ASSOCIATES

Community Relations and Socioeconomic Analysis

19 Beaver Street, San Francisco CA 94114

Tel. (415) 863-8760 FAX (415) 863-5671

e-mail: marafeeney@aol.com

FAX to: Mark Johnson	(510) 622-2464
Larry Mencin	(216) 566-2730
Mike Marsden	(510) 652-2246
Mara Feeney	(415) 863-5671
Ignacio Dayrit	(510) 658-8095
Barbara Cook	(510) 540-3819
Jane Riggan	(510) 622-4505
Susan Hugo	(510) 337-9335
Robert Cave	(415) 749-5030
Jody Sparks	(916) 341-7795
Paul Germain	(510) 655-2807
Ric Notini	(510) 923-7476
Vera Nelson	(650) 578-9131
Peggy Peischl	(415) 955-9041
Sandra Maxfield	(925) 935-5368

Pages (including cover sheet): 10

From: Melissa Mednick *mm*

Date: December 30, 1998

RE: Draft Working Papers from Sherwin-Williams Consultative Work Group meetings

Attached please find the Draft Working Papers from the 10/27/98 and 11/12/98 meetings of the Sherwin-Williams Consultative Work Group. Please feel free to contact Mara or me if you have any questions.

**DRAFT WORKING PAPER:
NOTES FROM MEETING OF THE CONSULTATIVE WORK GROUP
SHERWIN-WILLIAMS SITE, EMERYVILLE, CALIFORNIA**

October 27, 1998

This meeting took place at the Sherwin-Williams paint plant on Sherwin Street. The meeting agenda is attached, along with a list of those who attended the meeting. The agenda was approved, and it was announced that the project is proceeding on schedule. Sherwin-Williams received the grading permit from the City and plans to complete trenching activity this week. The NPDES permit renewal process is also underway. (Sherwin-Williams has decided not to pursue the sewer hookup permit further).

Chiron has prepared written comments on the Workplan Addendum. Sherwin-Williams is reviewing these and will have an opportunity to discuss them before they are submitted to RWQCB at the end of this week.

Entrix distributed a revised draft table summarizing ARARs. The group discussed whether some of the ARARs listed are applicable to the site, and whether some others might be missing. Comments should be sent to Sandra Maxfield before the November 11 CWG meeting.

The group then reviewed a draft Initial List of Potential Remedial Technologies (or response actions that could be taken at the site). The list is based on CERCLA guidance. Comments on this draft list were also requested by November 11.

Sandra Maxfield stated that Sherwin-Williams is considering the possibility of dividing the site into several operable units in the future, although no final decision had been made yet. This would allow remedial activities to go forward on some parts of the site while investigation could continue on others, if necessary. Four potential operable units were discussed: 1) the soil and groundwater within the slurry wall; 2) soil and groundwater on the Rifkin property; 3) soil outside the slurry wall; and 4) groundwater outside the slurry wall (and possibly Temescal Creek). At present, the plan is to move forward with remediation in all four areas simultaneously, but the areas could be separated in the future if different schedules or different technologies were to be applied to them. Dividing the site into operable units could provide more flexibility, could result in remediation of some operable units being completed expeditiously, and might be easier for the public to understand. The main disadvantage is that if the processes get too separate, multiple documents might be completed at different times, with separate public review and approval processes.

Entrix is proceeding with chemical mapping. The data are complex and difficult to summarize on a figure that will be legible. Entrix is working on several concepts for consolidating and presenting this data.

There was a discussion of assumptions being made for the Conceptual Site Model, e.g. that

future land use of the Rifkin property will not be residential, but will remain in commercial or industrial use, possibly with a deed restriction. Entrix will revise the draft text about assumptions for review at the next CWG meeting.

Reber Brown stated that the Public Health Assessment DHS prepared will be made available to community residents on November 9, 1998. DHS will receive written comments on the document until November 23, 1998. Members of the CWG urged DHS staff to carefully explain the limitations of the study to community members to avoid potential confusion. DHS is also working with a consultant to prepare a dust sampling workplan, which will be a separate document. This workplan will also be discussed at the meeting scheduled for the evening of November 9 at the 45th Street Artists' Cooperative. To help DHS staff prepare for the meeting, the group raised many questions that members of the community could ask, such as: why was the health assessment done, why wasn't it done before the removal action, how is a public health assessment different from a risk assessment, why bother doing an assessment if it is incomplete, etc. Others commented that it seemed premature to be releasing the public health assessment for comment before the dust sampling results were obtained.

The next CWG meeting was scheduled for 9:00 a.m. on Thursday, November 12, 1998, at the Sherwin-Williams plant in Emeryville.

**PROPOSED AGENDA FOR OCTOBER 27, 1998
CWG MEETING
Sherwin-Williams Facility, Emeryville, California**

- I. INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL PROGRESS REPORT**
- II. STATUS OF REPORT PREPARATION FOR WORKPLAN ADDENDUM**
- III. DRAFT APPLICABLE, RELEVANT, AND APPROPRIATE REQUIREMENTS AND STANDARDS (ARARS) TABLE FOR THE UPCOMING WORKPLAN ADDENDUM REPORT**
- IV. DRAFT INITIAL SCREENING LIST OF POTENTIAL REMEDIAL TECHNOLOGIES**
- V. REVISED DRAFT CONCEPTUAL SITE MODELS FOR HUMAN HEALTH AND ECOLOGICAL RISK ASSESSMENTS**
- VI. CONCEPT OF OPERABLE UNITS AT THE SHERWIN-WILLIAMS FACILITY**
- VII. STATUS OF MAPPING CHEMICAL DATABASE**
- VIII. CDHS DRAFT PUBLIC HEALTH ASSESSMENT (10-19-98)**
- IX. "ACTION ITEMS"**

SIGN-IN SHEET:
10/27/98 CWG MEETING

Name	Representing	Tel./Fax
Jane Reggan	CDHS	510-450-3818/3773
Ignacia Dalton	Emeryville	510-964-356/6588095
JOHN BINS	ENTRIX	925-988-1225
Sandra Maxfield	ENTRIX	510-622-2393/2464
Steve Morse	RWQCB	510-655-7400
ROB SCOFIELD	ENVIRON	(510) 622-2497 / 2464
Mark Johnson	AVACB	(510) 622-2385
Anders Lundgren	CRAWQLIB	(650) 578-1172
Vera Nelsen	EKI	(510) 923-2484
Ric Notini	Chimn	916/341-7790
Jody Sparks	California Environmental Research Group	925-253-4980x420/4985
Peggy Peischl	Treadwell & Rolfe	949-654-1275/1303
CHUCK PAINE	SHELL OIL CO.	925-988-1220/925-5361
Wini Curley	ENTRIX	510-450-3818/510-450-377
Robert Brown	CDHS	510-596-9553/510-652-4906
Michael Marsden	LEP	816-566-1768
LARRY MENCIN	The Sherwin-Williams Co	(415) 863-8760/(415) 863-567
MARA FEENEY	Mara Feeney & Assoc.	(510) 540-3843
Barbara Cook	DTSC	

DRAFT WORKING PAPER:
NOTES FROM MEETING OF THE CONSULTATIVE WORK GROUP
SHERWIN-WILLIAMS SITE, EMERYVILLE, CALIFORNIA
November 12, 1998

This meeting took place at the Sherwin-Williams paint plant on Sherwin Street. The meeting agenda and a list of those in attendance are attached.

1. *RWQCB Introduction.* Steve Morse of the RWQCB began the meeting by explaining that Sandra Maxfield from Entrix would chair the meeting.
2. *Sherwin-Williams Report on Site Activities.* There was no report or discussion of this agenda item.
3. *Status of CWG Review of Workplan Addendum.* Sandra explained that this meeting would conclude the CWG's review of the intermediate work products that Entrix has prepared for the Workplan Addendum. Entrix plans to submit the Draft Workplan Addendum to the Water Board in December.
4. *Regional Geology of East Bay, Local Site Geology.* Sandra explained that a relatively new report on the geology of the East Bay is being used in development of the Workplan Addendum. The report was funded by the Water Board and written by an outside consultant. The report states that the Sherwin-Williams site is within a geological sub-area called the Berkeley Sub-area, which has characteristics distinct from other Bay Area sub-areas. The Berkeley Sub-area is characterized by limited natural groundwater resources, which, according to the report, are insufficient for municipal use. The report also states that saltwater intrusion limits groundwater use in this sub-area. Jody Sparks commented that since the report has not been formally adopted/approved by the Water Board she does not think the document should be quoted in the Workplan Addendum as "the gospel", but only as a reference document. Sandra responded that this is what Entrix is planning to do.
5. *Electronic Deliverable for Soil and Groundwater Data.* Sandra explained that soil and groundwater data in the Workplan Addendum would also be available in an electronic format. Linda from Entrix explained that soil and groundwater data from the site will be linked to a site map in a CD format. This format will allow users to click on a specific location on the site map and pull up data about the type and concentrations of contaminants found there. Users will be able to print out information from the CD, but will not be able to download data to another program and/or manipulate it. Jody Sparks asked how community members who do not have access to computers will be able to get this information. Larry responded that this data is also available in hard copy form in the 1998 Current Conditions Report, which has been placed in the Information Repositories. Reber Brown from DHS asked if a subset of the data could be ordered or if the data can be manipulated at all. Linda responded that Entrix is not planning to provide the data in a form that can be manipulated (unless a user wants to reenter the data into his/her own database and then manipulate it).
6. *Groundwater and Soil Chemistry Maps.* Sandra prefaced the discussion of this agenda item by reminding CWG members that the total VOC and SVOC soil chemistry maps in the Workplan Addendum are not driving the Risk Assessment or the analysis of data gaps. She stated that the maps are being done primarily because the Water Board order requires that the vertical and lateral extent of the contamination at the site be delineated according to the Preliminary Remediation Goals. Large-scale copies of the maps were set up in the meeting room and meeting participants were given an opportunity to review these and ask questions. Ignacio Dayrit from the City of Emeryville asked whether it would be possible to set up electronic maps so that they could be overlaid. Linda responded that the purpose of providing information electronically is to save paper and make the data easier to

use, not to give readers additional tools above and beyond what hard copies of the data/maps would provide. Jody then asked whether hard copies of site maps that could function as overlays could be provided to the CWG. She commented that this has often been done on other similar projects she has worked on. Larry Mencin stated that he is concerned about the legal implications of providing electronic site data that can be manipulated. Steve Morse then commented that he assumes S-W will, however, be providing some subset of the site information database to the City for its Brownfields database. Larry responded that this is probably workable and that the CWG may want to help decide what information should go into the City's database.

7. *Conduit Evaluation.* Sandra provided meeting attendees with a copy of a draft table Entrix has developed for evaluating known and potential conduits at the site and in the site vicinity. Vera Nelson of EKI commented that she feels it is very important that the Conduit Evaluation address two separate issues: 1) identification of conduits that currently have the potential to transport contaminants and 2) identification of conduits that may have transported process materials and associated contaminants in the past. Sandra responded that both of these issues will be addressed in the Workplan Addendum's conduit evaluation.
8. *Temescal Creek/Tidal Influences.* Sandra provided information on this topic. At high tide, the Creek channel flows inland and contains over 2.5 feet of brackish water with lots of sediment. At low tide, the channel empties. There is no indication that groundwater is seeping from the sidewalls of the channel. Sandra referred to a 1998 RWQCB study on arsenic in SF Bay sediments, and said that RWQCB considers background for arsenic in deep bay sediments to be at least 10-20 ppm. Entrix is preparing a draft geologic cross-section of the Temescal Creek creek bed. Vera Nelson requested that high/low water levels be shown on the cross-section.
9. *Proposed Soil/Groundwater Sampling Locations.* Entrix has looked at where sampling has been done in the past, as well as what further sampling has been proposed in the Workplan Addendum. They have examined the relationship between sources, potential conduits and current sampling locations, as well as data needs for the Remedial Investigation and the Risk Assessment. In addition, they have considered the potential for dividing the site into operable units. Based on these considerations, they are recommending several new sampling points. For Building 35, for example, they are recommending that 3 of the 10 sampling points be rearranged. There would be 7 sampling points remaining inside the building. The other 3 would be relocated to areas outside the building--2 to the north and inside the slurry wall and the other to the old incinerator location. Vera Nelson suggested that Entrix look at the potential for the elevator shaft in Building 35 to have acted as a conduit in the past.
10. *DHS Dust Sampling Meeting at Co-op.* The group asked Reber Brown to provide an update on DHS activities and to report on the meeting held at the 45th Street Artists' Co-op on Monday, November 9. Reber said the purpose of the meeting was to present an overview of the draft Public Health Assessment that is now available for public review and to inform residents about DHS' proposed dust sampling program. A DHS contractor has proposed a nonrandom sampling plan, and some residents have specifically requested that their units be sampled. The plan will be adjusted to include units where children live. Members of the CWG asked why DHS had decided to do this sampling and what the next steps would be if they found 'unsafe' levels of lead or arsenic in the units. Reber said DHS decided to do this sampling in response to results that were brought to their attention indicating high levels of lead and arsenic in one of the Co-op units. He said DHS has no enforcement authority and it was not clear what steps they would take if high levels are found in other units, but they will try to help find a solution. This made various members of the group uneasy, and more questions were raised about who would be expected to pay for cleanup of the units, as well as what would be done with the

data. It was pointed out that previous biological (blood, urine and hair) sampling of Co-op residents had shown no elevated levels of lead or arsenic prior to the cleanup of the area. There were also questions about how the level of concern would be defined. Reber said HUD guidelines were being used for lead and the USEPA reference dose would be used for arsenic. The group suggested that DHS and the City be prepared for liability and action questions in case the sampling results show concentrations of lead or arsenic above the defined levels of concern.

11. *Next Deliverables, Comment Period and Meeting Date:* The draft RI Workplan will be completed and circulated for review during the second week of December. It was suggested the group take about 3 weeks to review the document and provide preliminary written comments by January 4, 1999 if possible. Entrix will then be able to present a summary of the comments received and some tentatively proposed responses at the next CWG meeting. **The next CWG meeting will be held at 9:00 a.m. on Thursday, January 14, 1999, at the Sherwin-Williams plant in Emeryville.**

**AGENDA FOR CONSULTATIVE WORK GROUP
NOVEMBER 12, 1998 MEETING**

- 1. RWQCB INTRODUCTION**
- 2. SHERWIN-WILLIAMS REPORT ON SITE ACTIVITIES**
- 3. STATUS OF CWG REVIEW OF WORKPLAN
ADDENDUM**
- 4. REGIONAL GEOLOGY OF EAST BAY, LOCAL SITE
GEOLOGY**
- 5. ELECTRONIC DELIVERABLE FOR SOIL AND
GROUNDWATER DATA (ELECTRONIC PROTOTYPE)**
- 6. GROUNDWATER AND SOIL CHEMISTRY MAPS**
- 7. CONDUIT EVALUATION**
- 8. TEMESCAL CREEK/TIDAL INFLUENCES**
- 9. PROPOSED SOIL/GROUNDWATER SAMPLING
LOCATIONS**
- 10. ACTION ITEMS**

Sherrin - Williams
Nov. 12, 1998
CWT meeting

<u>Name</u>	<u>Org.</u>	<u>Phone + e-mail</u>
Mark Johnson	RWQCB	510 622-2493, MEJER@2.surcb.ca
Melissa Mednick	Mara Feeny + Assoc.	(510) 653 7848 MLSMEDNICK@aol.com (Mike - please FAX monthly rep to me - Melissa)
Peggy Peischl	Treadwell & Kolla	(925) 253-4980 ext 420/mkpeischl@treadwellkolla.com
Rob Scofield	ENVIRON	(510) 655-7400 RSCOFIELD@ENVIRONCORP.
Jody Sparks	California Env. Res. Group	916/341-7790 tag@dcv.davis.ca.us
Linda Demartino	ENTRIX	(925) 935-9920 ldemartino@entrix.com
Wini Curley	ENTRIX	925-935-9920 wcurley@entrix.com
Reber Brown	CDHS	510-450-3878 cdhsreber@earthlink.net
LARRY MERCIN	The Sherrin-Williams Co	216 566 1768 lmercin@sherrin.com
Michael Marsden	LFR	510 596-9553 Michael.Marsden@LFR.com
Ignacio Dagnit	City of Emeryville	510 764 256 / 658 8095 idagnit@emeryville.ca.us
MARA FEENEY	Mara Feeny Assoc.	(415) 863-8760 marafeeny@aol.com
James Maxfield	ENTRIX	925-988-1225
Steve Morse	SF Bay RWQCB	510-622-2393 sim@rb2.surcb.ca.us
Anders Lundgren	CIRWQLB	(510) 622-2385 AGL@rb2.surcb.ca.us
Vera Nelson	EKI	(650) 578-1172 VNELSON@EKI.conso.ca.us