Vic's Automotive
245 8th Street, Oakland, California
ACEH RO#00000202

Date: May 3, 2011

Time: 10:00AM

Location: Alameda County Environmental Health

Attendees: Vic Lum, Owner of Vic's Automotive
Ricky Bradford, Project Engineer, AEI Consultants
Peter McIntyre, Senior Project Manager, AEI Consultants
Jerry Wickham, Case Manager, Alameda County Environmental Health
Donna Drogos, Supervisor, Alameda County Environmental Health —Did not attend

1) Site Overview
   a) Brief Site Description and History
      i) Initial UST removal/release detected, soil borings, well install and groundwater monitoring, light non-aqueous phase liquid (LNAPL) detected, passive LNAPL removal, high-vacuum dual phase extraction (HVDPE) pilot test, soil vapor probe install and monitoring, HVDPE remediation, groundwater plume delineation, active UST system decommissioned/removed, source zone investigation, and air sparging for residual source removal
   b) During Last Meeting (December, 2009) We Discussed the Following:
      i) Initial results of MW-14 to MW-16 install / groundwater plume delineation
      ii) Proposed source zone investigation (SB-16 to SB-19)
      iii) HVDPE system optimization / rebound evaluation
      iv) Air sparging for residual source removal

2) Recent Activities
   a) Rebound Evaluations #1 (Dec, 2009 to April, 2010) and #2 (April, 2010 to August, 2010)
   b) Source Zone Investigation (March, 2010)
      i) No LNAPL-saturated cores = HVDPE LNAPL removal was successful
      ii) However, residual TPH source identified from ~18 to 22-feet bgs
   c) Air Sparge Well Installation (June – July, 2010)
   d) Pilot Scale Air Sparging System Install (August – October, 2010)
   e) Initial Air Sparging Pilot Test w/ Rigorous Soil Gas Monitoring (November, 2010)
   f) Continued Air Sparging w/ HVDPE System Optimization (November, 2010 – Present)

3) Purpose of Meeting
   a) Discuss Low Risk Closure (SWRQCB Resolution 92-49)
   b) Framework / Key Factors for Low Risk Closure (SWRQCB Resolutions 2009-0081)
      i) Groundwater plume defined and affected groundwater is limited in extent
      ii) Further migration of impacted groundwater is unlikely
      iii) Drinking water wells (or other sensitive receptors) not located close to plume
      iv) Depth to impacted groundwater relative to water well construction requirements
      v) Appropriate corrective action, including adequate source removal, was performed
      vi) Residual petroleum does not pose a threat to human health or safety