

cont.... to discharge polluted water because evidence to indicate that it is resulting from potable water line break (levels of trihalomethanes, i.e. chloroform found in water at 0.6-1.6ppb chloroform). I inquired as to whether those levels are safe for aquatic life. Since their discharge ~~require~~ exemption is limited to one week, the RWQCB may be requiring some treatment (P&S Dvago, RWQCB). Lead sampling will be conducted w/in this next week.

7/16/96 Spoke to Eileen Fanelli - will have meeting w/ Walsh and Croplexus tomorrow re the preparation of a workplan for Block 2. The workplan will probably be submitted by mid-August '96. They are running behind schedule. Work should've begun in July '96.

9/30/96 Addendum I to the workplan, which addresses cleanup levels for PNA's & solvents, using RBCA, will be submitted to County at end of week, per Eileen Fanelli.

10/9/96 Spoke to David Blich & discussed comments on Add. 2 proposal - Refer to Comments Notes attached to Add. 2

10/10/96 Spoke to Eileen Fanelli w/ comment on Add. 2 & discussed metals issue & Use Constituting Response

5/23/97 Eileen Fanelli called to say that Excavation work would begin next wk at the site.

5/29/97 Called David Blich, Croplexus, to inquire as to the specific date of the excavation next wk.

2/8/96

Janet Naito, 510-540-3833, DTSC, returned my call re: my questions for what to do w/ the lead-contaminated soil @ 2,600ppm observed at 3-4' bgs in boring 6-1. She advised that more info be obtained on the following:

- 1) Were any surface samples collected from that area;
- 2) What depths were samples collected at from test pits adjacent to 6-1?
- 3) Were samples all collected from same lithology?
- 4) What was past use of area? Olden utility lines could contribute to Pb contamination.
- 5) If contamination is limited may be able to leave in place w/ paving, but some notification process needs to be in place if property use changes or is sold.

2/14/96

Had conference call w/ Eileen Favelli and David Colick. Decided to further delineate the 2,200ppm lead identified in former boring 6-1. EBNUD will collect 2 surface soil samples + one sample from 5' bgs in vicinity of boring 6-1. The deeper soil sample will be analyzed for Pb. The lateral extent of lead contamination was adequately defined since the samples collected from both boring 6-1 + adjacent test pits were collected at 3 to 4' bgs immediately beneath the rubble layer, in native silty sand to clayey sand. The lead could be resulting from former welding activity or from fill. A surface drain sump was also formerly located ~2 feet from boring 6-1. It was a 3'x4' concrete-lined ditch w/ gravel. The confirmatory samples from the over-excavation showed 2-13ppm TPH<sub>g</sub>, 16-15ppm TPH<sub>d</sub>, ND-1.7ppm Benzene. Outside of bldg footprint (by former boring 6-1). EBNUD has ~~no~~ permissi

2/7/96

Went out to site and met w/ Eileen Faulli and David Glick, Coopers. A great deal of water was observed flowing along the street. According to Mr. Glick, water observed in excavation was obviously resulting from a broken water line, due to the observed hood - The water was flowing out of the excavation pit and into street, initially. They pumped this water, ~ 30,000 gallons, ~~and~~ into a broken tank and brought it thru a series of carbon filters before discharging into the storm drain, w/ permission from Rio Drago, RW@CB. On the northeast corner of the excavation, the excavators ran into a former drain pipe that contained some product. They removed product spilling into excavation and are planning to either remove or seal this pipe. The excavation is 7 to 9' b'ys. No g.w. encountered - only <sup>limited</sup> perched water in rubble material & water from line leaks. Extensive clay soils noted at excavation boundaries & floor, indicating heavy leaching would be limited. Excavated soil will be hauled tomorrow. Soil analysis results for former test pits 10 thru 12, came up ND for PNAs & mostly low levels for lead, except for 280 and 220 ppm lead. However, EBWD could present argument that these levels will be covered & paved & will most likely not pose threat to water based on soil type & depth to water. Will check w/ DTSC to see what needs to be done w/ 2200 ppm lead initially identified in Boring 67.

2/8/96

Spoke to Eileen Faulli - she said that vapor barrier will actually not be installed for Phase I bldg due to budget, & wanted to know whether it was acceptable since soil concs are currently below RBCA default values in area where bldg. will be built. I said that ok.

## Contact Log

12/7/95 Spoke to Eileen Faulli. Will meet on Dec 20 at OSU to discuss sets. Geoplenus selected as consultant.

3/29/95 Reviewed 3/8/95 ltr fm Richard Sykes (EBMUD): they currently have **three USTs: two fuel (6K gas and 12K diesel), and one 2,500-gal waste oil**. Attached is a **construction schedule for excavation activities**. These 3 USTs will be removed by 1997. **Call Cynthia Adkisson and get addresses for the 3 USTs, and draw the USTs on Figure 2. Compare w/our dep ref list and files. Or get Norma or Pam Evans to do it (she's our new 94607 person)**. NO: all I need to do is check w/Norma or Connie re UST database for 2144 Poplar (2 fuel USTs) and 1200-21st St. (waste oil UST) permits.

Reviewed 3/2/95 **Preliminary Site Assessment Report, by GeoPlexus**. They got 24,000 ppm O&G and 6,400 ppm TPHd (also 8010 VOCs) in EB2-7 near waste oil UST. EB1-1 and EB1-2 were near the existing gas and diesel USTs: low concs VOCs (BTEX) and TPHd, and ND TPHg; they still think there may be up to 200 yd<sup>3</sup> diesel contam soil, and up to 50 yd<sup>3</sup> gasoline contam soil, encountered during UST removal. So this gives me an idea of where the 3 existing USTs are. See Fig 5. Re their schedule: I want to discuss this w/Cynthia: I need more specifics re Block II, which is where we need our wells.

left mess C. Adkisson

3/30/95 spoke w/C. Adkisson: let's focus on Block II, bec. that's where the wells would be needed. My concern is that this site get forgotten by 7/97, which is when they anticipate all work to be completed in Block II. She suggested I put my concerns in writing, and give solid reasons for installing the wells sooner. Then she suggested we meet onsite to discuss the upcoming work. Will check her and Karl's schedule and get back to me.

4/7/95 mtg onsite w/C. Adkisson and K. Mayo. Toured site; see field report

2/16/95 Spoke w/D. Glick: They wanted to look at excavations and possibly do remediation, in conjunction w/construction of new bldgs. They'd like to finish construction before they install wells. He did 18 SBs around their 4 square block area. Got draft report to EBMUD. Some SBs adjacent to the UST area. Mostly ND. Sampled at 5', 13' and 18' depths. Confirmed that contam in the UST area did not extend very far. He said there's a 1" thick GEMS report, re overex, but does not include the actual tank removal bec. they were not involved w/that aspect. I somehow didn't see this report in my in-box. Geoplexus worked for GEMS on that project.

Reviewed the 12/29/94 "Interim Remedial Action Summary Report," by GEMS. There's a fairly good description of tank removal activities, so I'll consider this a Tank Removal Report. There's also HW manifests for 1,200 + 1,500 + 2,700 + 2,700 + 4,964 gal of vacuumed water (from the pits): the total is 13,064 gal. Another 90 yd<sup>3</sup> soil disposed at Vasco Rd. in Livermore as non-haz. Highest residual soil concs (upper 8'): 2,800 ppm TPHg, 16 ppm benzene, 440 ppm TPHd, and 900 ppm O&G. Water concs: 6,200 ppb TPHg, 340 benz, 2,400 TPHd (from 6K UST pit; presumed to be perched water). CONCLUSIONS: They do not attribute the contam in the upper strata to the USTs. RECOMMENDATIONS: The County postpone requirements for SBs/MWs until the ensuing demolition activities are completed and observed/logged/sampled by a PE or CEG.

Based on this, I'll have to revise my letter.

2/17/95 Revised ltr

2/24/95 Cynthia Adkisson phoned. Do I want to review their H&S plan? no, bec. the activity is not primarily environmental. Please send future correspondence to Richard Sykes (Regulatory Compliance Officer), mail stop 704 and just cc Karl Mayo. I should call Cynthia (287-1627) w/questions, instead of Karl. Is there another UST? She thinks there's a waste oil UST, and they plan to remove it later in the process. It's 2,500-gal, was installed in 1987, double walled waste oil UST. Located elsewhere on yard, not sure exactly where. They need a letter from us stating clearly that a gw invest. is needed. I can state this in my next ltr (approving timeline). She wants a copy of Basin Plan Amendments (w/NAA). Copied and sent it.

2-28 rec'd 2-24 ltr fm EBMUD

- 11/28/94 JE on vacation. Juliet Shin spoke w/David Glick, and also did site visit for overex sampling. See report.
- 12/2/94 JE back to work. Phoned Karl Mayo: He said he's waiting for Glick's report. Should get draft Mon. Had to close up pit. Rained every day over Thanksgiving. Thinks they got 99% of contam. A lot of contam was above the bottom of tank. Phoned David Glick; left mess. I want results for 4K UST and 5th and 6th USTs. Mess fm DG: will fax by 12/5.
- 12/5/94 lm DG: no fax yet. status of pit? Reviewed 11/29 letter fm EBMUD to OES. ask Karl: 3-4 more B forms, dep ref \$, pit backfill.
- 12/6/94 Reviewed 12/5 fax fm DG. Spoke w/Karl. They spent \$300,000 so far. Encouraged him to apply for Fund. 1,400 tons soil disposed as non-haz. Totally backfilled w/clean imported fill. Paved. They exed further laterally after I last saw pit. That's when JMS witnessed sampling; it was already backfilled to approx 8'bgs for stabilization. Final report on its way. I forgot to ask for more B forms.
- 12/13/94 Spoke w/Karl Mayo re B forms. TR report to me soon. Sent him 6 B forms.
- 1/17/95 Spoke w/David Glick: EBMUD has construction plans for 4 blocks to tear down all bldgs and rebuild. Used rotary wash for geotech borings (upper 10' not logged). So RP wants to do 16 SBs for upper 10' to augment construction specs. Will sample IF they encounter contamination (TPHg, BTEX, TPHd, O&G). Should they submit wp? NO, bec the primary purpose is geotech.
- 2/16/95 Reviewed their version of a Tank Removal Report: it's just a transmittal letter, dated 2/2/95, with attachments: HW tank manifests and certificates of destruction for the soil. The certificate is from REMCO for 1,391.21 tons of "HC material." The manifests cover all 6 USTs. This is unacceptable as a TR Report. **Wrote ltr to RP requesting TR Report, as per Tank Closure Plan.**

+ gw invest .

Site Summary STID 3917  
EBMUD Corporation Yard  
1200-21st St.  
Oak 607

11/17/94 **Removal of 6K gas and 4K gas USTs.** Mucho problemas. See field report. 4K UST pit has a lot of contamination. No samples taken on this day due to all the unforeseen contingencies. Mark Kemp said (re 4K UST) that water and gasoline is pouring out of holes in places on the sides. It's got 9" liquid before they uncovered it. Vac truck expected at 3pm.

11/18/94 8:25am arrived onsite; they are not ready to sample. There is water in the 4K pit with a dark substance floating on it. They want to vac it out before sampling sidewalls, said Rick Machaco. Mark Kemp was not yet onsite. Left site 8:35 am.

10:35 spoke w/Mark Kemp. He said they ordered a Baker tank and 2 pumps to pump out the dirty water in 4K UST pit; it's expected between 11 and 12pm. **They found another UST: concrete vault, 6-7' high and 4-5' wide; approx 1000 gal.** They've exposed 1.5 sides. It's full of water; can't agree whether it's gasoline or waste oil UST. Has steel fill spout; so maybe there is a steel UST inside the vault. The soil around the vault is extremely contaminated; it makes the 4K UST pit look clean by comparison. I told him that it looks like this case will be LOP, so they don't have to deposit any more \$\$, but they DO have to fill out another closure plan. They want to try to remove the vault today, but I have another tank removal at 1pm. I will try to work around it.

11/21/94 Onsite for **removal of 500-gal waste oil UST.**

11/22/94 Onsite for **removal of the 5K concrete vault containing two 500-gal steel USTs.**

11/23/94 Mark Kemp phoned. They found **yet another UST!** They had to remove it because the excavator had dug it up inadvertently and it was about to drop, so they just placed it on the side of the pit instead. It's approx 350-gal, steel, has many holes, thinks it's gasoline, empty, put on plastic. Wants me out there at 3pm. They got results from 6K UST: all ND. I have not received my fax.

**Onsite to see the sixth UST removed: 350-gal steel UST.** It was already removed prior to my arrival. Also did sampling.



## PHONE LOG

11/28/94

EBMUD - West Grand / Adelina  
21st St. Driveway (1 block west of Grand)

David Colick, consultant &amp; Juliet Shui

Mr. Colick gave me a <sup>brief</sup> summary of site in order to prepare me to oversee today's confirmatory sampling, in the absence of Jennifer Burke.

Two tanks, one 4,000-gallon and one 6,000-gallon tank were removed. In process of tank removals, 3 addit. OSTs were revealed & removed. Free product was observed around tanks in soil. Interim remedial action was taken to abate the free product. The pit was overexcavated in the shape of a "T". The top part of "T" excavation was 25' x 40' x 16' deep. The rest of "T" extended approx. 50'. Soil samples were collected from bottom and sidewalls of overexcavation. The bottom samples came out to ND to 11ppm TPH<sub>g</sub> & ND for benzene. Sidewall samples collected below 7' bgs also only identified 6-8 ppm TPH<sub>g</sub> and .005 - .1 ppm benz. (There were 3 of these samples). The rest of the sidewall samples were collected from a zone of obvious contamination that extends vertically from ~3' to 5' bgs and extends laterally throughout the excavation area. This zone of contamination could be resulting from a surface spill. The excavation extends up to, & possibly beyond, the W. Grand sidewalk. G.W. appears to be at ~16' bgs - ~~shows~~ upward recharge (slow). Perched water was found in excavation, but never recharged.

\* Today they plan on backfilling portions of pit from 16' to 7' bgs, beneath zone of contamination, to prevent undermining integrity of sidewalk. This office approved. →

They also intend on chasing the zone of contamination  
& ~~collect~~ plan to collect confirmatory samples today.  
I requested that they notify me at least 1 hour in  
advance so that an inspector can be out at site to  
oversee sampling

Janice, 11/30

I spoke to David  
Clich on 11/28/94 &  
want out to site that  
day to oversee sampling.

If you have any  
questions, just let me  
know. - Juliet S.

P.S.  
Do you have  
an S-10 # for case &  
are you planning to transfer to  
LOP?