

Oro Loma Sanitary District
April 10, 2012 Meeting Notes
9:30 – 10:45

Meet with David Kleesattel (Trihydro) and Jason Warner (Oro Loma); David provided an agenda as requested.

Discuss site and data gaps that remain at the site; the site has not had its story told such that it hangs together yet. There are many bits of existing data that remain unconnected, these suggest how to move the site forward, but these other critical bits of data have yet to be collected. These have been asked for in the last several DIR letters. The agenda was used as a launching point but was not used extensively. Because the agenda contained a section on the potential Low-Threat Policy, we discussed the timing of potential implementation of the policy. While elements of the policy are likely to apply at the site, the site doesn't fit the policy in several ways, but might if additional data is collected to show this; this is just a part of the story not yet told.

We agree that a SCM is appropriate at the site. They have the most recent groundwater monitoring event (with an uptick in groundwater concentrations; remedial excavation induced?), and will submit shortly, but will summarize some data, and will respond to some of our questions and will recommend an SCM in a separate letter, to which we will respond (to cover for USTCF). This will convey what happened (answer questions raised) and what might be happening at the site. Is groundwater brackish or salt water? (increases cleanup goals if so); tried ORC, but not documented in the existing excavation report, and now site is stated to be anaerobic (but not documented); what concentrations are within excavation now? (low or high? And what's that tell us on the success of the excavation); what remedial options are available if concentrations are high (use granular backfill to quickly mitigate groundwater impacts rather than wait for it to work through groundwater system?); wells are reported to dewater, (but this information is not on purge sheets so this is news); is vapor an issue for buildings? (due to perimeter confirmation samples with elevated concentrations; and apparent reuse of impacted soil; buildings are reported to have rat slab and crawl space); where does contamination go offsite (appears to use sanitary sewer trunk line, but where does water in granular backfill go – to bay?)...

Also discuss the diesel AST well, its status, if it's been sampled recently, if so, or if not, use silica-gel cleanup to remove non-petroleum hydrocarbons.



Meeting Agenda
Alameda County Health Care Services Offices
April 10, 2012, 9:30 AM – 10:30 AM

Oro Loma Sanitary District
San Lorenzo, CA

HEALTH AND SAFETY:

- Building Emergency Evacuation Routes

DISCUSSION TOPICS:

1. Site and Investigation History

- Current and future land use
- 1995: Former 1,000-gallon gasoline UST removed (May)
- 1999: Three groundwater monitoring wells installed to define local groundwater gradient
- 2002: Three additional groundwater monitoring wells installed to monitor contaminants
- 2009: Reduced quarterly groundwater monitoring to semi-annual monitoring
- Changes in contaminant concentrations since 1999

2. Remediation Activities

- UST Removal (May 1995)
- Soil Excavation and ORC Placement (April 2008)
- Groundwater Interceptor Trench Construction (April 2008)

3. Conceptual Site Model

- Soil type (Bay Mud) and stratigraphy
- Depth to groundwater
- Groundwater gradient and flow
- Industrial Land Use/No residential
- No sensitive receptors
- Limits of contamination
- No discharge to surface water
- Natural Attenuation

4. Low-Threat UST Tank Case Closure Scenario

- Site meets the general criteria established by the State Water Resources Control Board
- The contaminant plume size is stable
- The contaminant plume is decreasing in concentration (has been decreasing since remediation began)
- The natural fine-grain soil (Bay Mud) inhibits migration of soil vapor.

5. Future Activities