



DETAILED REVIEW CHECKLIST

| | | 00111 | No. 1000E |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| CLAIM NO.: 2/92 REGION: 2 PRIORITY ASSIGNED: B LEAD AGENCY // | | COUN | |
| PRIORITY ASSIGNED: BLEAD AGENCY ACCURRENT RANK: AND | am | ica i | Halth |
| DATE REVIEWED: 8-11-93 CONTACT PERSON: | 100 | | |
| REVIEWER: B. TOWLES PHONE NO.: (50) | 271 | - 458 | 30 |
| | T | • | |
| | | | 0.4 01.160 |
| | Klar | d, 1 | CA 94608 |
| CLAIMANT INFORMATION | ACC. | REJ. | HOW INFORMATION WAS VERIFIED |
| I. Claimant Identification | | | ; |
| Claimant is/was the owner and/or operator of the leaking UST? | V | | nherited property |
| 2. Have all applicable past and current UST | | | The state of the s |
| owners/operators been identified? | | | inherited property |
| 3. All required tax ID numbers provided? | v | | |
| 4. Date site/tanks acquired verified? | 1 | | inherited |
| II. Statement of Costs | nla | | |
| Valid third party claim? Claimed corrective action costs | 77.0 | | |
| exceed \$10,000? | | | |
| III. Joint Claimant | | | Olai |
| Joint Claimant is an owner and/or operator? | $\perp \perp$ | | 11/0. |
| 2. Tax ID number provided? | 1./- | | 14 |
| 3. Joint Claimant's priority class verified? | 1/2 | | |
| IV. Co-Payee 1. Tax ID No. provided? | 1 | | app; tax returns |
| 2. Mailing address/phone no. provided? | <u> </u> | | also |
| V. Contamination Site/Occurrence Description* | | | |
| Description of tank and use verified? | 16 | | URF |
| 2. Registered farm tank? | Yes | No | na . |
| 3. Leaking tank contained eligible substance? | 1 | | ill |
| 4. Is there any evidence that the UAR was the result of a spill, overfill or gross | | | and disafted in Append in |
| negligence? | V | | none midicated in county file |
| 5. If claimant submitted more than one claim | , | T | |
| for the site, each claim is for a | 1/2 | 4 | |
| separate occurrence? | 1 | | |
| 6. Site map provided? VII. Priority Class Worksheet | 1 | - | |
| 1. Claimant's priority verified? | 1 | | |
| 2. Claimant was both the owner and operator | | 1 | |
| at time of leak discovery? | Yes | No 🦯 | |
| 3. Claimant is the current owner and operator? | Yes | No/NA | tanks removed |
| 4. If either question = No, other party(s) | Ma | , - | |
| priority class was verified? VIII. Priority Class Designation | \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ | | |
| A. Priority Class A | 1 | | |
| Residential Motor Fuel Tanks | ` | \setminus | |
| UST located at the residence of a person | | | |
| and property zoned residential use | | 1 | |
| only at time of leak discovery? 2. UST located at property improved by an | | 1 | |
| owner – occupied single family | | | |
| dwelling or duplex at time of leak | | | |
| discovery? | ļ | <u> </u> | |
| 3. UST was not used for agricultural purposes | | | |
| or for resale on or after 1/1/85? | ├ | | |
| Residential Small Home Heating Oil Tanks | | | |
| 4. UST located at the residence of a person | | | |
| at time of leak discovery? | <u> </u> | | |
| 5. UST located at property improved by an | | | |
| owner – occupied single family | | | |
| dwelling or duplex at time of leak discovery? | | | |
| 6. UST has a capacity of 1,100 gallons or less? | + | + | |
| 7. UST is used only to store home heating oil | | | |
| for consumptive use on property? | | | |
| 8. UST was not located on agricultural property | / | | |
| on or after 1/1/85? | 1 | į | |



CLAIM NO. 2192

LOCAL AGENCY NO.____

| CLAIMANT INFORMATION | I ACC | REJ. | HOW INFORMATION WAS VERIFIED |
|--|--------------|-------------|--|
| B. Priority Class B | i | | |
| Financial Review Team has determined | | | |
| that the claimant qualifies for Priority Class B. | | | |
| C. Priority Class C | | | |
| Financial Review Team has determined | , | | |
| that the claimant qualifies for Priority Class C. | nla | ľ | |
| IX. Eligibility Requirements* | <u> </u> | | |
| UAR reporting requirements satisfied and | 1 . | | |
| date release discovered verified? | | | signed ulf |
| | | | |
| exercised due diligence or | nh | | |
| previous owner was eligible? | 1 11 PC | ĺ | |
| 3. Claimant either had or applied for a permit | | | ince and the same |
| by 1/1/90, or was able to | ا ر ا | | 1987 permit app. |
| substantiate why not obtained? | | | |
| 4. UST is not grossly out of compliance with | | | |
| permit requirements? | سا | | |
| 5. Claimant was required to initiate | | | |
| corrective action? | سسا | | 10/23/90 Alamedu Hr. |
| 6. If claimant discovered UAR prior to 1/1/88 | | | LATIN Handre of the |
| required corrective action was | 101 | | 10/4/10 |
| initiated on or before 6/30/88? | Na | r | 1 10 14 190 |
| 7. Corrective action is in compliance with | + | | \$ \\ \frac{1}{2} |
| regulatory requirements? | | | SEE PAGE 3 OF CHECKLIST |
| 8. Claimant is in compliance with financial | 1.7 | | |
| responsibility requirements? | na | ļ | tanks removed |
| X-XII. Certifications/Agreements/Statements/Verification | | | |
| Claim contains original signatures of all | 1 // | | |
| claimants and joint claimants? | 1 | | |
| 2. Required documentation was submitted for | | | |
| authorized representative? | 10 | | |
| | · · · · · | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| · | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| · | _ | . — | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| • | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | · |
| | | | , and the state of |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 1 | | | |

^{*} Compliance with requirements for items listed in Section V. (Contamination Site/Occurrence Description) and Section IX. (Eligibility Requirements) may require lead agency confirmation. Any items that cannot be verified through the applicant and which will require lead agency review and confirmation, should be highlighted for further review. In all cases lead agency confirmation of corrective action compliance will be required.

| CLAIM NO. | 2192 | |
|-----------|------|--|
| CLAIM NO. | ~ ~ | |

LOCAL AGENCY NO. 819

SITE ADDRESS 3516 Adeline, Oakland

| CORRECTIVE | ACTION COMPLIANCE DOCUMENTATION PAGE 3 |
|---------------|---|
| DATE | ACTION REQUIRED/RESPONSE |
| 9-7-90 | Removal permit app'd by County |
| 10-4-90 | Tank removal observed by Alameda (3 tanks) |
| 10-24-90 | Lab analysis received from semo |
| 10-23-90 | Mameda Itr to James L. Quick requesting corrective action plan. |
| 10-8-91 | Hameda Itr to Leah champion approving removal pumit |
| 10-31-91 | Hameda Itr to Leah champion approving removal pumit " observed removal of one 250g UST. Litr from Uriah Inc to Alameda - exeauation will continue until |
| 1-17-92 | Ltr from Uriah Inc to Alameda - excavation will continue until |
| | contamination is removed. |
| 5-19-92 | Interim rept on assessment and remediation submitted by |
| | Uriah |
| 3-31-93 | Installation, Development + Sampling of 3 GWMW's rept |
| | submitted by Uriah |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| OONE IS NOT S | |
| CONFIRMATION | NOF CORRECTIVE ACTION COMPLIANCE: After reviewing the lead agency site file, the claim reviewer has determined that the claimant is in substantial compliance with corrective action requirements. |
| | Hessy Jones 8/12/93 |
| LEAD AGENCY | FEVIEWER'S SIGNATURE DATE SIGNED CONCURRENCE: As of this date, the lead agency epresentative concurs with the determination that |
| | the claimant is in compliance with applicable corrective action requirements. |
| | I from I feet |
| STAFF RECOM | |
| REVIEWER'S SI | GNATURE: DATE SIGNED |