



ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICES  
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
1131 Harbor Bay Parkway, Suite 250  
Alameda, CA 94502-6577  
(510) 567-6700  
FAX (510) 337-9335

May 29, 2014

Ms. Carryl MacLeod  
Chevron Environmental Management Company  
6101 Bollinger Canyon Road  
San Ramon, CA 94583  
(sent via email to [CMacleod@chevron.com](mailto:CMacleod@chevron.com))

9401 San Leandro LP  
104 Caledonia Street  
Sausalito, CA 94965

Ms. Linda Hothem  
Linda Hothem and Pacam Group LLC  
104 Caledonia Street  
Sausalito, CA 94965

Ms. Gene Kida  
Gerber Products  
12 Vreeland Road  
Fiorham Park, NJ 07932

Linda Hothem Trust  
c/o Mr. Jan Greben  
Greben & Associates  
1332 Anacapa Street,  
Suite 110  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Subject: Request for Data Gap Work Plan Addendum; Fuel Leak Case No. RO0000412 and Geotracker Global ID T0600101789, Chevron #9-1723; 9757 San Leandro Street, Oakland, CA 94603

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen:

Alameda County Environmental Health (ACEH) staff has reviewed the case file including the *Site Conceptual Model and Data Gap Work Plan*, dated March 31, 2014, and the *First Quarter 2014 Semi-Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report*, dated May 20, 2014. Both reports were prepared and submitted on your behalf by Stantec Consulting Services, Inc (Stantec). The work plan recommends determining the status of four unmonitored offsite wells, and resampling of vapor at five existing onsite soil vapor wells.

ACEH has evaluated the data and recommendations presented in the above-mentioned reports, in conjunction with the case files, to determine if the site is eligible for closure as a low risk site under the State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCBs) Low Threat Underground Storage Tank Case Closure Policy (LTCP). Based on ACEH staff review, we have determined that the site fails to meet the LTCP General Criteria b (Petroleum Release Only), f (Secondary Source Removal), and the Media-Specific Criteria for Groundwater, the Media-Specific Criteria for Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air, and the Media-Specific Criteria for Direct Contact (see Geotracker for a copy of the review).

Therefore, at this juncture ACEH requests that you prepare a Revised Data Gap Investigation Work Plan that is supported by a focused Site Conceptual Model (SCM) to address the Technical Comments provided below.

#### **TECHNICAL COMMENTS**

- 1. LTCP General Criteria b (Unauthorized Release Consists Only of Petroleum)** – For purposes of this policy, petroleum is defined as crude oil, or any fraction thereof, which is liquid at standard conditions and temperature and pressure, which means 60 degrees Fahrenheit and 14.7 pounds per square inch absolute including the following substances: motor fuels, jet fuels, distillate fuel oils, residual fuel oils, lubricants, petroleum solvents and used oils, including any additives and blending agents such as oxygenates contained in the formulation of the substances.

A former waste oil underground storage tank (UST) was previously located in the northwestern downgradient corner of the subject site. Soil bores SB3 and SB-4 were installed in the general location of the former UST; however, soil was only analyzed for Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons as gasoline (TPHg), benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and total xylenes (BTEX), and Total Oil and Grease (TOG). Other standard waste oil constituents were not analyzed for. This includes analysis for Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons as diesel (TPHd), volatile organic compounds (VOCs; full scan including BTEX, MTBE, TBA, naphthalene, and chlorinated hydrocarbons [HVOCs]), Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs; including polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons [PAHs], pentachlorophenol, and creosote), wear metals, and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). In contrast, groundwater from wells MW-1, MW-7, and MW-9, the only wells located downgradient of the former waste oil UST (as documented by the existing rose diagram, and the groundwater contour map included in the SCM [ Figure 3]), detected HVOCs up to 61.0 micrograms per liter ( $\mu\text{g/l}$ ) 1,1-dichloroethene, 9.5  $\mu\text{g/l}$  1,1-dichloroethane, and 93.1  $\mu\text{g/l}$  1,1,1-trichloroethane. Each of these concentrations exceeds the December 2013 Environmental Screening Levels (ESLs) for groundwater for these compounds as defined by the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

Soil bores SB-1 to SB-8, installed at the former Shell service station immediately west of the subject site (identified as one of the downgradient flow directions), did not detect chlorinated VOCs in soil at that site, and as a result concluded the source of the HVOCs was offsite. A similar investigation has not been conducted at the subject site. It appears appropriate to investigate the potential for the former waste oil UST to be a source for this contamination, and it appears appropriate to redevelop and resample all wells installed to investigate the site vicinity for HVOCs. Please be aware that the lack of detection of HVOCs at wells upgradient of the former waste oil UST as provided in the referenced SCM and Work Plan is not an argument for the lack of a HVOC source at the subject site.

Please present a strategy in the Data Gap Work Plan (described in Technical Comment 6 below) to address the data gaps identified above. Please identify any additional data gaps, such as the need for analysis of other contaminants that are typically associated with waste oil contamination. Alternatively, please provide justification of why the site satisfies this general criterion in the focused SCM described in Technical Comment 6 below.

- 2. General Criteria f – Secondary Source Has Been Removed to the Extent Practicable** – “Secondary source” is defined as petroleum-impacted soil or groundwater located at or immediately beneath the point of release from the primary source. Unless site attributes prevent secondary source removal (e.g. physical or infrastructural constraints exist whose removal or relocation would be technically or economically infeasible), petroleum-release sites are required to undergo secondary source removal to the extent practicable as described in the policy. “To the extent practicable” means implementing a cost-effective corrective action which removes or destroys-in-place the most readily recoverable fraction of source-area mass. It is expected that most secondary mass removal efforts will be completed in one year or less. Following removal or destruction of the secondary source, additional removal or active remedial actions shall not be required by regulatory agencies unless (1) necessary to abate a demonstrated threat to human health or (2) the groundwater plume does not meet the definition of low threat as described in this policy.

Two generations of USTs and associated infrastructure (dispensers, piping, etc.) have been installed at the subject site. Both generations of USTs are reported to have been removed prior to 1978 and the environmental era, and no removal records have been reported or submitted to document actions taken at the time of removal, including the disposal of soil or of the USTs. At present, it cannot be determined that secondary sources have been removed to the extent practicable. It is also not certain that all USTs and associated appurtenances were removed due to the lack of reports.

Soil bores SB-7, SB-8, SB-10, VP-2, VP-3, and VP-4 document soil concentrations equal or greater than 100 milligrams per kilogram TPHg in soil between approximately 0 and 5 feet below grade surface (bgs). Except for VP-2 and VP-4, each bore appears to be installed through, or immediately adjacent to, former UST or dispenser locations. Additionally, soil bores SB-4 and SB-9 document fill material for which no samples were submitted for analysis, and associated soil produced either moderate or the highest

photoionization detector (PID) responses for the bores. Finally, multiple USTs, dispensers, and a fill box were located offsite in the public right-of-way and although they are reported to have been removed no data has been presented to document this. Based on the distribution of onsite contaminant concentrations, offsite structures appear to be one source of onsite contamination.

ACEH recognizes that should secondary sources be present in these areas, they may not be substantial contributors to groundwater contamination onsite at this time; however, residual soil contamination affects other criteria of the LTCP (soil vapor, direct contact and outdoor air exposure). At a minimum it appears appropriate to investigate the magnitude of residual soil contamination at offsite locations in the event that a Site Management Plan is required to handle residual contamination at the site upon closure.

Please present a strategy in the Data Gap Work Plan (described in Technical Comment 6 below) to address the items discussed above.

- 3. LTCP Media Specific Criteria for Groundwater** – To satisfy the media-specific criteria for groundwater, the contaminant plume that exceeds water quality objectives must be stable or decreasing in areal extent, and meet all of the additional characteristics of one of the five classes of sites listed in the policy.

Our review of the case files indicates that insufficient data collection and analysis has been presented to support the requisite characteristics of plume stability or plume classification as follows:

- a. Length of Groundwater Plume** – The length of the groundwater plume associated with gasoline contamination appears to be essentially defined; however, the soil and groundwater chemical signature at the site indicates that diesel fuel may also have been dispensed at the facility. A substantial number of historic groundwater and soil analytical results document higher concentrations of total xylenes than total benzene. Because diesel fuel contains substantially more xylenes than benzene by formulation, ACEH requests the inclusion of TPHd analysis of groundwater from all wells for a minimum of one monitoring event. ACEH recognizes that preferential degradation of benzene over xylenes can also produce this result. However, the presence, or lack thereof, of detectable TPHd at the site can affect the determination of the downgradient and lateral extent of a groundwater plume under the LTCP. Additionally, the presence, or lack thereof, of detectable TPHd at the site can also affect the importance of analytical samples for naphthalene in soil and groundwater. The need for additional analysis for TPHd is requested to be evaluated thereafter.
- b. Extent of Soil Contamination** – The lateral extent of soil contamination does not appear to be defined onsite. Soil bores located around the property perimeter (MW-5, SB-22, SB-23, SB-4 (1989), SB-6 (1989), SB-5 (1989), MW-6, SB-3, SB-4, SB-11, SV-6, SB-12, VP-3, SB-13, and etc.) indicate that the extent of soil contamination has not been defined. Each of these soil bores contains TPHg concentrations greater than 100 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) in soil in either the 0 to 5 or the 5 to 10 foot zones. This can affect the extent of groundwater contamination at the site and vicinity. ACEH recognizes that contaminant concentrations may have undergone a reduction in soil since collection; however, this also has not been documented.
- c. Preferential Pathways** – The SCM states that a utility preferential pathway was not conducted as existing data indicates that known sources appear to be present only onsite. ACEH disagrees with this assessment as discussed in detail in Technical Comment 2 above. Additionally, relatively shallow groundwater indicates that it is appropriate to conduct a utility survey at the site and local vicinity due to the potential for offsite sources to be present, and due to the potential that the lateral extent of the groundwater plume may be affected by these conduits.
- d. Distance to Existing Water Supply Well** – Up to three water supply wells as close as 100 feet to the site have previously been reported in the immediate vicinity of the site. Although the SCM reports that a well survey was conducted in November 2013; however, a table summarizing, and a figure depicting approximate well locations, was not included. ACEH recognizes that well construction details are confidential; however, a table and figure without these details are appropriate and substantially assist ACEH in determining the suitability of the site to meet this criterion of the LTCP. ACEH requests a tabulation and well location depiction be submitted in the requested work plan addendum below. Please note that all deep constructions (cathodic, extraction industrial, irrigation, recovery,

geotechnical wells, and etc.) within ¼-mile of the site are requested to be included in the summary table and located. All have the potential to act as vertical conduits, and all can be impacted by contamination from the site. Please also be aware that abandoned, non-destroyed, wells may still be vertical conduits. For deep wells proximal to the subject site (especially well P2 and others located within 100 feet of the site), ACEH requests further determination be provided (owner, DWR, ACPWA, etc.) that wells stated or assumed to be abandoned or destroyed are so.

Please present a strategy in the Revised Data Gap Work Plan (described in Technical Comment 6 below) to address the items discussed above.

- 4. LTCP Media Specific Criteria for Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air** – The LTCP describes conditions, including bioattenuation zones, which if met will assure that exposure to petroleum vapors in indoor air will not pose unacceptable health risks to human occupants of existing or future site buildings, and adjacent parcels. Appendices 1 through 4 of the LTCP criteria illustrate four potential exposure scenarios and describe characteristics and criteria associated with each scenario.

Our review of the case files indicates that the site data collection and analysis fail to support the requisite characteristics of one of the four scenarios. This is also the finding of the SCM, and a work plan was included with the SCM to conduct additional soil vapor sampling at all vapor wells (VP-1 to VP-5). Please see Technical Comment 7 for initial comments relative to this portion of the work plan.

ACEH's review of site data for this criterion, indicates that multiple soil bores document hydrocarbon contamination over 100 mg/kg in the 0 to 5 foot depth (SB-7, SB-8, and SB-10) and the majority of vapor wells (VP-2 to VP-6) document soil oxygen content between 0.84 and 2.9%. While soil samples that were collected at vapor wells VP-2, VP-3, and VP-4 were collected at a depth of 6 feet, the detection of TPHg over 100 mg/kg in these soil samples implies the distribution of shallow hydrocarbon concentrations at the site is more widespread. Based on existing soil vapor data, scenario 4 of the vapor intrusion to indoor air criterion is precluded as benzene concentrations at all soil vapor wells were over the requisite LTCP soil vapor value at a commercial site without a bioattenuation zone of 280 micrograms per cubic meter ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ) benzene. Concentrations ranged up to 540,000  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  benzene.

The soil vapor work plan proposed a series of actions with which ACEH is in general agreement with; however, ACEH requests one modification to the approach. Specifically, vapor samples are proposed to be analyzed by TO-15 for naphthalene. Please be aware that Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) documents recommend that TO-17 should be used to confirm TO-15 sampling results (Appendix E, *Active Soil Gas Investigations Advisory*, dated April 30, 2012). In part this appears to be related to lower naphthalene concentrations when Nylaflow tubing is used to sample soil vapor. Therefore ACEH requests that TO-17 be used to confirm naphthalene results by TO-15.

Additionally, please ensure that your strategy is consistent with the field sampling protocols described in the Department of Toxic Substances Control's Final Vapor Intrusion Guidance (October 2011).

- 5. LTCP Media Specific Criteria for Direct Contact and Outdoor Air Criteria** – The LTCP describes conditions where direct contact with contaminated soil or inhalation of contaminants volatilized to outdoor air poses a low threat to human health. According to the policy, release sites where human exposure may occur satisfy the media-specific criteria for direct contact and outdoor air exposure and shall be considered low-threat if the maximum concentrations of petroleum constituents in soil are less than or equal to those listed in Table 1 for the specified depth bgs. Alternatively, the policy allows for a site specific risk assessment that demonstrates that maximum concentrations of petroleum constituents in soil will have no significant risk of adversely affecting human health, or controlling exposure through the use of mitigation measures, or institutional or engineering controls.

Our review of the case files indicates that insufficient data collection and analysis has been presented to satisfy the media-specific criteria for direct contact and outdoor air exposure. Specifically, concentrations of benzene and / or ethylbenzene at a depth of 10 feet bgs in soil bores B-10 and B-15 fail the LTCP numeric goals for these contaminants. Concentrations up to 99 mg/kg benzene, and 150 mg/kg ethylbenzene were

detected at these locations. Stantec indicates that the data is older (April 1996), was collected in the groundwater zone, was thus more representative of groundwater concentrations at the time, and may have biodegraded in the interim period of time. Stantec considers more recent analytical data, collected at a shallower depth (6 feet), to be more representative of current concentrations at the site. Conversely, ACEH's review of groundwater analytical concentrations in site wells during the 1996 time period did not find similar groundwater concentrations to these concentrations. Concentrations only up to 2,100 µg/l TPHg, 280 µg/l benzene, and 56 µg/l ethylbenzene were documented in 1996 at vicinity wells. ACEH is in agreement that degradation is likely to have occurred in the intervening years; however, is limited to available analytical data and cannot make assumptions that contamination is below specific LTCP goals for a site.

Therefore, please present a strategy in the Revised Data Gap Work Plan described in Item 6 below to collect sufficient data to satisfy the direct contact and outdoor air exposure criteria at the site in a sufficient number of appropriate areas. Sample and analyze soil in the 0 to 5 and the 5 to 10 foot intervals to characterize the vertical soil profile, at the groundwater interface, lithologic changes, and at areas of obvious impact. The collection of naphthalene analysis is also requested.

- 6. Revised Data Gap Investigation Work Plan and Focused Site Conceptual Model** – Please prepare Revised Data Gap Investigation Work Plan to address the technical comments listed above. Please support the scope of work in the Revised Data Gap Investigation Work Plan with a focused SCM and Data Quality Objectives (DQOs) that relate the data collection to each LTCP criteria. For example please clarify which scenario within each Media-Specific Criteria a sampling strategy is intended to apply to.

In order to expedite review, ACEH requests the focused SCM be presented in a tabular format that highlights the major SCM elements and associated data gaps, which need to be addressed to progress the site to case closure under the LTCP. Please see Attachment A "Site Conceptual Model Requisite Elements". Please sequence activities in the proposed revised data gap investigation scope of work to enable efficient data collection in the fewest mobilizations possible.

#### **TECHNICAL REPORT REQUEST**

Please upload technical reports to the ACEH ftp site (Attention: Mark Detterman), and to the State Water Resources Control Board's Geotracker website, in accordance with the following specified file naming convention and schedule:

- **August 15, 2014** – Work Plan Addendum  
File to be named: RO412\_WP\_ADEND\_R\_YYYY-mm-dd
- **November 21, 2014** – Semi-Annual Groundwater Monitoring  
File to be named: RO412\_GWM\_R\_YYYY-mm-dd
- **60 Days After Work Plan Approval** – Subsurface Investigation  
File to be named: RO412\_SWI\_R\_YYYY-mm-dd

These reports are being requested pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 25296.10. 23 CCR Sections 2652 through 2654, and 2721 through 2728 outline the responsibilities of a responsible party in response to an unauthorized release from a petroleum UST system, and require your compliance with this request.

Online case files are available for review at the following website: <http://www.acgov.org/aceh/index.htm>. Additionally, if your email address does not appear on the cover page of this notification, ACEH is requesting you provide your email address so that we can correspond with you quickly and efficiently regarding your case.

Ladies and Gentlemen  
RO0000412  
May 29, 2014, Page 6

If you have any questions, please call me at 510-567-6876 or send me an email at [mark.detterman@acgov.org](mailto:mark.detterman@acgov.org).

Sincerely,

Mark E. Detterman, PG, CEG  
Senior Hazardous Materials Specialist

Enclosures: Attachment 1 - Responsible Party(ies) Legal Requirements/Obligations &  
ACEH Electronic Report Upload (ftp) Instructions

Attachment A – Site Conceptual Model Requisite Elements

cc: Ms. Alexis Fischer, Chevron Environmental Management Company, 6101 Bollinger Canyon Road, San Ramon, CA 94583; (sent via email to [AFischer@chevron.com](mailto:AFischer@chevron.com))

Travis Flora, Stantec Consulting Services, Inc., 15575 Los Gatos Blvd, Los Gatos, CA 95032; (sent via email to [travis.flora@stantec.com](mailto:travis.flora@stantec.com))

Dilan Roe (sent via email to [dilan.roe@acgov.org](mailto:dilan.roe@acgov.org))

Mark Detterman (sent via email to [mark.detterman@acgov.org](mailto:mark.detterman@acgov.org))

Electronic file, GeoTracker

## Attachment 1

### Responsible Party(ies) Legal Requirements / Obligations

#### REPORT REQUESTS

These reports are being requested pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 25296.10. 23 CCR Sections 2652 through 2654, and 2721 through 2728 outline the responsibilities of a responsible party in response to an unauthorized release from a petroleum UST system, and require your compliance with this request.

#### ELECTRONIC SUBMITTAL OF REPORTS

ACEH's Environmental Cleanup Oversight Programs (LOP and SLIC) require submission of reports in electronic form. The electronic copy replaces paper copies and is expected to be used for all public information requests, regulatory review, and compliance/enforcement activities. Instructions for submission of electronic documents to the Alameda County Environmental Cleanup Oversight Program FTP site are provided on the attached "Electronic Report Upload Instructions." Submission of reports to the Alameda County FTP site is an addition to existing requirements for electronic submittal of information to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) GeoTracker website. In September 2004, the SWRCB adopted regulations that require electronic submittal of information for all groundwater cleanup programs. For several years, responsible parties for cleanup of leaks from underground storage tanks (USTs) have been required to submit groundwater analytical data, surveyed locations of monitoring wells, and other data to the GeoTracker database over the Internet. Beginning July 1, 2005, these same reporting requirements were added to Spills, Leaks, Investigations, and Cleanup (SLIC) sites. Beginning July 1, 2005, electronic submittal of a complete copy of all reports for all sites is required in GeoTracker (in PDF format). Please visit the SWRCB website for more information on these requirements ([http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/ust/electronic\\_submittal/](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/ust/electronic_submittal/)).

#### PERJURY STATEMENT

All work plans, technical reports, or technical documents submitted to ACEH must be accompanied by a cover letter from the responsible party that states, at a minimum, the following: "I declare, under penalty of perjury, that the information and/or recommendations contained in the attached document or report is true and correct to the best of my knowledge." This letter must be signed by an officer or legally authorized representative of your company. Please include a cover letter satisfying these requirements with all future reports and technical documents submitted for this fuel leak case.

#### PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATION & CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

The California Business and Professions Code (Sections 6735, 6835, and 7835.1) requires that work plans and technical or implementation reports containing geologic or engineering evaluations and/or judgments be performed under the direction of an appropriately registered or certified professional. For your submittal to be considered a valid technical report, you are to present site specific data, data interpretations, and recommendations prepared by an appropriately licensed professional and include the professional registration stamp, signature, and statement of professional certification. Please ensure all that all technical reports submitted for this fuel leak case meet this requirement.

#### UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK CLEANUP FUND

Please note that delays in investigation, later reports, or enforcement actions may result in your becoming ineligible to receive grant money from the state's Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Fund (Senate Bill 2004) to reimburse you for the cost of cleanup.

#### AGENCY OVERSIGHT

If it appears as though significant delays are occurring or reports are not submitted as requested, we will consider referring your case to the Regional Board or other appropriate agency, including the County District Attorney, for possible enforcement actions. California Health and Safety Code, Section 25299.76 authorizes enforcement including administrative action or monetary penalties of up to \$10,000 per day for each day of violation.

<b>Alameda County Environmental Cleanup Oversight Programs (LOP and SLIC)</b>	<b>REVISION DATE:</b> May 15, 2014
	<b>ISSUE DATE:</b> July 5, 2005
	<b>PREVIOUS REVISIONS:</b> October 31, 2005; December 16, 2005; March 27, 2009; July 8, 2010, July 25, 2010
<b>SECTION:</b> Miscellaneous Administrative Topics & Procedures	<b>SUBJECT:</b> Electronic Report Upload (ftp) Instructions

The Alameda County Environmental Cleanup Oversight Programs (LOP and SLIC) require submission of all reports in electronic form to the county's ftp site. Paper copies of reports will no longer be accepted. The electronic copy replaces the paper copy and will be used for all public information requests, regulatory review, and compliance/enforcement activities.

## REQUIREMENTS

- **Please do not submit reports as attachments to electronic mail.**
- Entire report including cover letter must be submitted to the ftp site as **a single portable document format (PDF) with no password protection.**
- It is **preferable** that reports be converted to PDF format from their original format, (e.g., Microsoft Word) rather than scanned.
- **Signature pages and perjury statements must be included and have either original or electronic signature.**
- **Do not password protect the document.** Once indexed and inserted into the correct electronic case file, the document will be secured in compliance with the County's current security standards and a password. **Documents with password protection will not be accepted.**
- Each page in the PDF document should be rotated in the direction that will make it easiest to read on a computer monitor.
- Reports must be named and saved using the following naming convention:

RO#\_Report Name\_Year-Month-Date (e.g., RO#5555\_WorkPlan\_2005-06-14)

## Submission Instructions

- 1) Obtain User Name and Password
  - a) Contact the Alameda County Environmental Health Department to obtain a User Name and Password to upload files to the ftp site.
    - i) Send an e-mail to [deh.loptoxic@acgov.org](mailto:deh.loptoxic@acgov.org)
  - b) In the subject line of your request, be sure to include "**ftp PASSWORD REQUEST**" and in the body of your request, include the **Contact Information, Site Addresses**, and the **Case Numbers (RO# available in Geotracker) you will be posting for.**
- 2) Upload Files to the ftp Site
  - a) Using Internet Explorer (IE4+), go to <ftp://alcoftp1.acgov.org>
    - (i) Note: Netscape, Safari, and Firefox browsers will not open the FTP site as they are NOT being supported at this time.
  - b) Click on Page located on the Command bar on upper right side of window, and then scroll down to Open FTP Site in Windows Explorer.
  - c) Enter your User Name and Password. (Note: Both are Case Sensitive.)
  - d) Open "My Computer" on your computer and navigate to the file(s) you wish to upload to the ftp site.
  - e) With both "My Computer" and the ftp site open in separate windows, drag and drop the file(s) from "My Computer" to the ftp window.
- 3) Send E-mail Notifications to the Environmental Cleanup Oversight Programs
  - a) Send email to [deh.loptoxic@acgov.org](mailto:deh.loptoxic@acgov.org) notify us that you have placed a report on our ftp site.
  - b) Copy your Caseworker on the e-mail. Your Caseworker's e-mail address is the entire first name then a period and entire last name @acgov.org. (e.g., firstname.lastname@acgov.org)
  - c) The subject line of the e-mail must start with the RO# followed by **Report Upload**. (e.g., Subject: RO1234 Report Upload) If site is a new case without an RO#, use the street address instead.
  - d) If your document meets the above requirements and you follow the submission instructions, you will receive a notification by email indicating that your document was successfully uploaded to the ftp site.



**ATTACHMENT A**

**Site Conceptual Model Requisite Elements**

# ATTACHMENT A

## Site Conceptual Model

The site conceptual model (SCM) is an essential decision-making and communication tool for all interested parties during the site characterization, remediation planning and implementation, and closure process. A SCM is a set of working hypotheses pertaining to all aspects of the contaminant release, including site geology, hydrogeology, release history, residual and dissolved contamination, attenuation mechanisms, pathways to nearby receptors, and likely magnitude of potential impacts to receptors.

The SCM is initially used to characterize the site and identify data gaps. As the investigation proceeds and the data gaps are filled, the working hypotheses are modified, and the overall SCM is refined and strengthened until it is said to be "validated". At this point, the focus of the SCM shifts from site characterization towards remedial technology evaluation and selection, and later remedy optimization, and forms the foundation for developing the most cost-effective corrective action plan to protect existing and potential receptors.

For ease of review, Alameda County Environmental Health (ACEH) requests utilization of tabular formats to (1) highlight the major SCM elements and their associated data gaps which need to be addressed to progress the site to case closure (see Table 1 of attached example), and (2) highlight the identified data gaps and proposed investigation activities (see Table 2 of the attached example). ACEH requests that the tables presenting the SCM elements, data gaps, and proposed investigation activities be updated as appropriate at each stage of the project and submitted with work plans, feasibility studies, corrective action plans, and requests for closures to support proposed work, conclusions, and/or recommendations.

The SCM should incorporate, but is not limited to, the topics listed below. Please support the SCM with the use of large-scaled maps and graphics, tables, and conceptual diagrams to illustrate key points. Please include an extended site map(s) utilizing an aerial photographic base map with sufficient resolution to show the facility, delineation of streets and property boundaries within the adjacent neighborhood, downgradient irrigation wells, and proposed locations of transects, monitoring wells, and soil vapor probes.

- a. Regional and local (on-site and off-site) geology and hydrogeology. Include a discussion of the surface geology (e.g., soil types, soil parameters, outcrops, faulting), subsurface geology (e.g., stratigraphy, continuity, and connectivity), and hydrogeology (e.g., water-bearing zones, hydrologic parameters, impermeable strata). Please include a structural contour map (top of unit) and isopach map for the aquitard that is presumed to separate your release from the deeper aquifer(s), cross sections, soil boring and monitoring well logs and locations, and copies of regional geologic maps.
- b. Analysis of the hydraulic flow system in the vicinity of the site. Include rose diagrams for depicting groundwater gradients. The rose diagram shall be plotted on groundwater elevation contour maps and updated in all future reports submitted for your site. Please address changes due to seasonal precipitation and groundwater pumping, and evaluate the potential interconnection between shallow and deep aquifers. Please include an analysis of vertical hydraulic gradients, and effects of pumping rates on hydraulic head from nearby water supply wells, if appropriate. Include hydraulic head in the different water bearing zones and hydrographs of all monitoring wells.
- c. Release history, including potential source(s) of releases, potential contaminants of concern (COC) associated with each potential release, confirmed source locations, confirmed release locations, and existing delineation of release areas. Address primary leak source(s) (e.g., a tank, sump, pipeline, etc.) and secondary sources (e.g., high-

## ATTACHMENT A

### Site Conceptual Model (continued)

concentration contaminants in low-permeability lithologic soil units that sustain groundwater or vapor plumes). Include local and regional plan view maps that illustrate the location of sources (former facilities, piping, tanks, etc.).

- d. Plume (soil gas and groundwater) development and dynamics including aging of source(s), phase distribution (NAPL, dissolved, vapor, residual), diving plumes, attenuation mechanisms, migration routes, preferential pathways (geologic and anthropogenic), magnitude of chemicals of concern and spatial and temporal changes in concentrations, and contaminant fate and transport. Please include three-dimensional plume maps for groundwater and two-dimensional soil vapor plume plan view maps to provide an accurate depiction of the contaminant distribution of each COC.
- e. Summary tables of chemical concentrations in different media (i.e., soil, groundwater, and soil vapor). Please include applicable environmental screening levels on all tables. Include graphs of contaminant concentrations versus time.
- f. Current and historic facility structures (e.g., buildings, drain systems, sewer systems, underground utilities, etc.) and physical features including topographical features (e.g., hills, gradients, surface vegetation, or pavement) and surface water features (e.g. routes of drainage ditches, links to water bodies). Please include current and historic site maps.
- g. Current and historic site operations/processes (e.g., parts cleaning, chemical storage areas, manufacturing, etc.).
- h. Other contaminant release sites in the vicinity of the site. Hydrogeologic and contaminant data from those sites may prove helpful in testing certain hypotheses for the SCM. Include a summary of work and technical findings from nearby release sites, including the two adjacent closed LUFT sites, (i.e., Montgomery Ward site and the Quest Laboratory site).
- i. Land uses and exposure scenarios on the facility and adjacent properties. Include beneficial resources (e.g., groundwater classification, wetlands, natural resources, etc.), resource use locations (e.g., water supply wells, surface water intakes), subpopulation types and locations (e.g., schools, hospitals, day care centers, etc.), exposure scenarios (e.g. residential, industrial, recreational, farming), and exposure pathways, and potential threat to sensitive receptors. Include an analysis of the contaminant volatilization from the subsurface to indoor/outdoor air exposure route (i.e., vapor pathway). Please include copies of Sanborn maps and aerial photographs, as appropriate.
- j. Identification and listing of specific data gaps that require further investigation during subsequent phases of work. Proposed activities to investigate and fill data gaps identified.

**TABLE 1  
INITIAL SITE CONCEPTUAL MODEL**

<b>CSM Element</b>	<b>CSM Sub-Element</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Data Gap</b>	<b>How to Address</b>
Geology and Hydrogeology	Regional	<p>The site is in the northwest portion of the Livermore Valley, which consists of a structural trough within the Diablo Range and contains the Livermore Valley Groundwater Basin (referred to as "the Basin") (DWR, 2006). Several faults traverse the Basin, which act as barriers to groundwater flow, as evidenced by large differences in water levels between the upgradient and downgradient sides of these faults (DWR, 2006). The Basin is divided into 12 groundwater basins, which are defined by faults and non-water-bearing geologic units (DWR, 1974).</p> <p>The hydrogeology of the Basin consists of a thick sequence of fresh-water-bearing continental deposits from alluvial fans, outwash plains, and lacustrine environments to up to approximately 5,000 feet bgs (DWR, 2006). Three defined fresh-water bearing geologic units exist within the Basin: Holocene Valley Fill (up to approximately 400 feet bgs in the central portion of the Basin), the Plio-Pleistocene Livermore Formation (generally between approximately 400 and 4,000 feet bgs in the central portion of the Basin), and the Pliocene Tassajara Formation (generally between approximately 250 and 5,000 or more feet bgs) (DWR, 1974). The Valley Fill units in the western portion of the Basin are capped by up to 40 feet of clay (DWR, 2006).</p>	None	NA
	Site	<p><b>Geology:</b> Borings advanced at the site indicate that subsurface materials consist primarily of finer-grained deposits (clay, sandy clay, silt and sandy silt) with interbedded sand lenses to 20 feet below ground surface (bgs), the approximate depth to which these borings were advanced. The documented lithology for one on-site boring that was logged to approximately 45 feet bgs indicates that beyond approximately 20 feet bgs, fine-grained soils are present to approximately 45 feet bgs. A cone penetrometer technology test indicated the presence of sandier lenses from approximately 45 to 58 feet bgs and even coarser materials (interbedded with finer-grained materials) from approximately 58 feet to 75 feet bgs, the total depth drilled. The lithology documented at the site is similar to that reported at other nearby sites, specifically the Montgomery Ward site (7575 Dublin Boulevard), the Quest laboratory site (6511 Golden Gate Drive), the Shell-branded Service Station site (11989 Dublin Boulevard), and the Chevron site (7007 San Ramon Road).</p> <p><b>Hydrogeology:</b> Shallow groundwater has been encountered at depths of approximately 9 to 15 feet bgs. The hydraulic gradient and groundwater flow direction have not been specifically evaluated at the site.</p>	<p>As noted, most borings at the site have been advanced to approximately 20 feet bgs, and one boring has been advanced and logged to 45 feet bgs; CPT data was collected to 75 feet bgs at one location. Lithologic data will be obtained from additional borings that will be advanced on site to further the understanding of the subsurface, especially with respect to deeper lithology.</p> <p>The on-site shallow groundwater horizontal gradient has not been confirmed. Additionally, it is not known if there may be a vertical component to the hydraulic gradient.</p>	<p>Two direct push borings and four multi-port wells will be advanced to depth (up to approximately 75 feet bgs) and soil lithology will be logged. See items 4 and 5 on Table 2.</p> <p>Shallow and deeper groundwater monitoring wells will be installed to provide information on lateral and vertical gradients. See Items 2 and 5 on Table 2.</p>
Surface Water Bodies		The closest surface water bodies are culverted creeks. Martin Canyon Creek flows from a gully west of the site, enters a culvert north of the site, and then bends to the south, passing approximately 1,000 feet east of the site before flowing into the Alamo Canal. Dublin Creek flows from a gully west of the site, enters a culvert approximately 750 feet south of the site, and then joins Martin Canyon Creek approximately 750 feet southeast of the site.	None	NA
Nearby Wells		The State Water Resources Control Board's GeoTracker GAMA website includes information regarding the approximate locations of water supply wells in California. In the vicinity of the site, the closest water supply wells presented on this website are depicted approximately 2 miles southeast of the site; the locations shown are approximate (within 1 mile of actual location for California Department of Public Health supply wells and 0.5 mile for other supply wells). No water-producing wells were identified within 1/4 mile of the site in the well survey conducted for the Quest Laboratory site (6511 Golden Gate Drive; documented in 2009); information documented in a 2005 report for the Chevron site at 7007 San Ramon Road indicates that a water-producing well may exist within 1/2 mile of the site.	A formal well survey is needed to identify water-producing, monitoring, cathodic protection, and dewatering wells.	Obtain data regarding nearby, permitted wells from the California Department of Water Resources and Zone 7 Water Agency (Item 11 on Table 2).

**TABLE 2  
DATA GAPS AND PROPOSED INVESTIGATION**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Data Gap</b>	<b>Proposed Investigation</b>	<b>Rationale</b>	<b>Analysis</b>
5	Evaluate the possible presence of impacts to deeper groundwater.  Evaluate deeper groundwater concentration trends over time.  Obtain data regarding the vertical groundwater gradient.  Obtain more lithological data below 20 feet bgs.	Install four continuous multichannel tubing (CMT) groundwater monitoring wells (aka multi-port wells) to approximately 65 feet bgs in the northern parking lot with ports at three depths (monitoring well locations may be adjusted pending results of shallow grab groundwater samples; we will discuss any potential changes with ACEH before proceeding). Groundwater monitoring frequency to be determined. Soil samples will be collected only if there are field indications of impacts. Soil lithology will be logged. However, information regarding the moisture content of soil may not be reliable using sonic drilling technology (two borings will be logged using direct push technology; see Item 4, above).	One well is proposed at the western (upgradient) property boundary to confirm that there are no deeper groundwater impacts from upgradient. Two wells are proposed near the center of the northern parking lot to evaluate potential impacts in an area where deeper impacts, if any, would most likely to be found. One well is proposed at the eastern (downgradient) property boundary to confirm that there are no impacts extending off-site. Port depths will be chosen based on the locations of saturated soils (as logged in direct push borings; see Item 4, above), but are expected at approximately 15, 45, and 60 feet bgs.	<i>Groundwater:</i> VOCs by EPA Method 8260, dissolved oxygen, oxidation/reduction potential, temperature, pH, and specific conductance.
6	Evaluate possible off-site migration of impacted soil vapor in the downgradient direction (east).  Evaluate concentration trends over time.	Install 4 temporary nested soil vapor probes at approximately 4 and 8 feet bgs along the eastern property boundary. Based on the results of the sampling, two sets of nested probes will be converted to vapor monitoring wells to allow for evaluation of VOC concentration trends over time.	Available data indicate that PCE and TCE are present in soil vapor in the eastern portion of the northern parking lot. Samples are proposed on approximately 50-foot intervals along the eastern property boundary to provide a transect of concentrations through the vapor plume. The depths of 4 and 8 feet bgs are chosen to provide data closest to the source (i.e., groundwater) while avoiding saturated soil, and also provide shallower data to help evaluate potential attenuation within the soil column. Two sets of nested vapor probes will be converted into vapor monitoring wells (by installing well boxes at ground surface); the locations of the permanent wells will be chosen based on the results of samples from the temporary probes.	<i>Soil vapor:</i> VOCs by EPA Method TO-15.
7	Evaluate potential for off-site migration of impacted groundwater in the downgradient direction (east).	Advance two borings to approximately 20 feet bgs in the parking lot of the property east of the Crown site for collection of grab groundwater samples.	Two borings are proposed off-site, on the property east of the Crown site, just east of the building in the expected area of highest potential VOC concentrations.	<i>Groundwater:</i> VOCs by EPA Method 8260, dissolved oxygen, oxidation/reduction potential, temperature, pH, and specific conductance.
8	Evaluate VOC concentrations just north of the highest concentration area.	Advance two borings to approximately 20 feet bgs north of Building A for collection of soil and grab groundwater samples. Soil samples will be collected at two depths in the vadose zone. Soil samples will be collected based on field indications of impacts (PID readings, odor, staining) or, in the absence of field indications of impacts, at 5 and 10 feet bgs.	The highest concentrations of PCE in groundwater were detected at boring NM-B-32, just north of Building A. The nearest available data to the north are approximately 75 feet away. One of the borings will be advanced approximately 20 feet north of NM-B-32 to provide data close to the highest concentration area. A second boring will be advanced approximately halfway between the first boring and former boring NM-B-33 to provide additional spatial data for contouring purposes. These borings will be part of a transect in the highest concentration area.	<i>Groundwater:</i> VOCs by EPA Method 8260, dissolved oxygen, oxidation/reduction potential, temperature, pH, and specific conductance.  <i>Soil:</i> VOCs by EPA Method 8260 (soil samples to be collected using field preservation in accordance with EPA Method 5035).
9	Evaluate VOC concentrations in soil vapor in the south parcel of the site.	Install four temporary soil vapor probes at approximately 5 feet bgs around boring SV-25, where PCE was detected in soil vapor at a low concentration.	PCE was detected in soil vapor sample SV-25 in the southern parcel, although was not detected in groundwater in that area. Three probes will be installed approximately 30 feet from of boring SV-25 to attempt to delineate the extent of impacts. A fourth probe is proposed west of the original sample, close to the property boundary and the location of mapped utility lines, which may be a potential conduit, to evaluate potential impacts from the west.	<i>Soil vapor:</i> VOCs by EPA Method TO-15.
10	Obtain additional information regarding subsurface structures and utilities to further evaluate migration pathways and sources.	Ground penetrating radar (GPR) and other utility locating methodologies will be used, as appropriate, to further evaluate the presence of unknown utilities and structures at the site.	Utilities have been identified at the site that include an on-site sewer lateral and drain line, and shallow water, electric, and gas lines. Given the current understanding of the distribution of PCE in groundwater at the site, it is possible that other subsurface utilities, and specifically sewer laterals, exist that may act as a source or migration pathway for distribution of VOCs in the subsurface.	NA