

Stantec Consulting Corporation 15575 Los Gatos Boulevard Building C Los Gatos CA 95032

Tel: (408) 356-6124 Fax: (408) 356-6138

May 14, 2009

Mr. Paresh Khatri Alameda County Health Care Services Agency Environmental Health Services 1131 Harbor Parkway, Suite 250 Alameda, CA 94502-6577

Dear Mr. Khatri:

Reference:

Corrective Action Work Plan

Goodyear DEX #9578

3430 Castro Valley Boulevard Castro Valley, California

RECEIVED

9:51 am, May 15, 2009

Alameda County Environmental Health

Stantec Consulting Corporation (Stantec) is pleased to present this *Corrective Action Work Plan* for the above referenced site. The scope of work outlined below is in response to the attached March 16, 2009 letter from Alameda County Environmental Health (ACEH) and an April 8, 2009 telephone conversation between Stantec and Mr. Paresh Khatri, ACEH case worker.

The site location is shown on Figure 1 and previous soil borings and groundwater monitoring well locations are shown on Figure 2.

BACKGROUND

Soil Data Summary

Prior to 1993, a 550-gallon used oil underground storage tank (UST) was removed from the site (Figure 2). In September 1993, two soil borings (No.1-South and No.2-North) were hand augered to 8 feet below ground surface (bgs) in proximity to the former UST. Soil samples from each borehole were submitted to Superior Analytical Laboratory (Superior Analytical) in Martinez, California for laboratory analysis of Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH) as Gasoline Range Organics (GRO); TPH as Diesel Range Organics (DRO); TPH as Oil and Grease (Oil & Grease)/ Total Recoverable Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TRPH); and Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene, and Xylenes (BTEX). Analytical results from these soil borings are presented in Table 1.

In September 1994, three groundwater monitoring wells (MW-1 through MW-3) were installed to approximately 20 feet bgs to further assess subsurface soil and groundwater conditions. No visible indications or odors of petroleum hydrocarbons were present in soils collected from the boreholes for MW-1 and MW-2. Hydrocarbon odors were noted in soils collected from soil boring MW-3. Two soil samples were collected from each borehole at 6 and 10 feet bgs and submitted to Superior Analytical for analysis of TPH-GRO/DRO; Oil & Grease; BTEX; Halogenated Volatile Organic Compounds (HVOCs); and Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs). Petroleum hydrocarbon analytical results from soil samples collected from MW-1 through MW-3 are presented in Table 1.

No BTEX or SVOCs were detected in the soil samples submitted from MW-1 through MW-3 with the exception of the following from MW-3: 500 mg/kg of 2-methyl-napthalene detected in soil sample MW 3-1-1, collected at 6 feet bgs; and 31 mg/kg of tetrachloroethene (PCE), 600 mg/kg of naphthalene, and 700 mg/kg of 2-methyl-napthalene detected in soil sample 3-2-2, collected at 10 feet bgs.

In December 1996, in support of a Tier 1 risk-based corrective action (RBCA) evaluation, four soil borings (PB-1 through PB-4) were advanced to approximately 10 to 16 feet bgs; and PB-4 was subsequently converted to monitoring well MW-4. Soil samples collected from PB-1 and PB-4 at approximately 3 feet bgs were submitted to Columbia Analytical Services of San Jose, California for analysis of TPH-GRO; BTEX; and

May 14, 2009 Page 2 of 8

Reference: Corrective Action Work Plan

Total Recoverable Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TRPH). Analytical results for these soil samples are presented in Table 1.

Stantec (formerly SECOR) was retained by Goodyear in September 2004 to conduct a limited subsurface investigation at the site. Four soil borings (HL-1 through HL-4) were advanced to approximately 12 feet bgs in the vicinity of the in-ground hydraulic lifts; one soil boring (OWS-1) was advanced to approximately 15 feet bgs adjacent to the assumed location of the oil water separator; one soil boring (UST-1) was advanced to approximately 12 feet bgs adjacent to and down-gradient of the former UST location; one soil boring (SB-1) was advanced to approximately 12 feet bgs near the western Site boundary and approximately 55 feet down-gradient of the former UST, and one soil boring (SA-1) was advanced via hand auger to approximately 1.5 feet bgs adjacent to the air compressors within the building. Soil samples were submitted to TestAmerica of Nashville, Tennessee (TestAmerica) for analysis of TPH-GRO/DRO and TRPH. Additionally, the soil sample from boring OWS-1 was analyzed for Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs).

A summary of soil analytical results is provided in Table 1. Previous soil borings and groundwater monitoring well locations are shown on Figure 2.

Groundwater Data Summary

Groundwater monitoring from MW-1 through MW-4 began in 1994. Concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons and related constituents, including MTBE, have generally been below laboratory reporting limits (LRLs) in site wells. Since groundwater monitoring began, TPH-GRO has not been detected above LRLs in wells MW-1, MW-2, and MW-4. TPH-DRO was reported in these three wells only from one sampling event (September 2004) at concentrations ranging from 78 to 103 micrograms per liter (μ g/L). Beyond the September 2004 sampling event, concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons have been consistently below LRLs, with the exception of 87 μ g/L TPH-DRO reported in MW-4 in December 2006. BTEX concentrations have not been detected above LRLs in samples from wells MW-1, MW-2, and MW-4.

Well MW-3, installed approximately 30 feet downgradient of the former used oil UST, has periodically contained free-phase product (free product). Initial sampling at this location in 1994 and 1995 reported TPH-GRO at concentrations up to 290 μ g/L, TPH-DRO at concentrations up to 960 μ g/L, and BTEX concentrations (benzene and total xylenes) up to 29 μ g/L. Benzene was detected in well MW-3 at a concentration of 95 μ g/L in 1996. Passive free product removal using adsorbant socks was implemented between August 2002 and December 2007. During this time, MW-3 was sampled only one time, in March 2005, at which time TPH-GRO, TPH-DRO, BTEX, and MTBE were detected above LRLs. Free product removal was discontinued in 2007 at the direction of ACEH, who requested evaluation of more aggressive remediation techniques.

Total lead has been sporadically detected in all site wells at concentrations ranging from 5.6 to 28 μ g/L. The presence in lead at similar concentrations in all site wells is likely indicative of a background condition unrelated to the historical release of petroleum hydrocarbons from the former used oil UST.

Neither HVOCs nor SVOCs were detected in groundwater samples collected from MW-1, MW-2, or MW-3 in 1994 except for 1.0 and 1.7 ug/L of chloroform in MW-1 and MW-2, respectively, and 10 ug/L of bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthlate in MW-1. The following HVOCs were detected in MW-3: 8.3 ug/L of vinyl chloride; 1.6 ug/L of 1,1-dichloroethene; 17 ug/L of 1,1-dichloroethene; 8.4 ug/L of cis-1,2-dichloroethene; 12 ug/L of 1,1,1-trichloroethene; 1.2 ug/L of trichloroethene; and, 12 ug/L of tetrachloroethene.

Historical groundwater analytical results are summarized in Table 2

May 14, 2009 Page 3 of 8

Reference: Corrective Action Work Plan

SOIL AND WATER QUALITY GOALS

Stantec proposes using Environmental Screening Levels (ESLs) as soil and water quality goals to guide remedial activities at the site. ESLs are conservative, risk-based screening levels established by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB, 2008).

Soil screening levels are subdivided based on depth, into soils less than 3 meters deep, and soils equal to or greater than 3 meters deep, and based on assumed site use (residential vs. commercial). Groundwater screening levels are subdivided into those protective of groundwater as an existing or potential drinking water resource, and those that disregard groundwater as a source of drinking water. In order to be appropriately conservative, and in accordance with the RWQCB's, (San Francisco Bay Region) 2007 Basin Plan. Stantec proposes using groundwater screening levels protective of groundwater as a potential drinking water resource. The assumed site use will be commercial.

Stantec has identified screening levels for TPH-GRO, TPH-DRO, BTEX, and MTBE in soil and groundwater. Because no screening level exists for TRPH, Stantec has substituted the screening level for 'TPH – residual fuels', which is typically representative of long-chain petroleum hydrocarbons such as motor oil. Proposed soil and groundwater screening levels are presented in the table below.

		TPH- gasoline	TPH- diesel	TPH- residual fuels	Benzene	Toluene	Ethylbenzene	Total Xylenes	MTBE
Soil (mg/kg)	<3 m	83	83	2,500	0.044	2.9	3.3	2.3	0.023
	>3 m	83	83	5,000	0.044	2.9	3.3	2.3	0.023
Groundwater (µg/L)		100	100	100	1.0	40	30	20	5.0

Reference: RWQCB ESLs, Updated May 2008

REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVE EVALUATION AND SELECTION

The purpose of this section is to identify and compare possible removal action alternatives that may best achieve the soil and water quality objectives identified in this document. Possible actions include excavation and off-site disposal of soils; in-situ treatment of soils using chemical oxidation; and passive free product removal in one or more wells. These remedial alternatives were screened and evaluated on the basis of their effectiveness, implementability, and cost criteria.

- 1. Alternative 1 Passive Free Product Removal. This alternative would consist of re-installing the adsorbant socks into monitoring well MW-3, and possibly installing additional wells to intercept and remove free product. This method would entail monthly to quarterly maintenance of the product removal equipment and monitoring of the amount of free product present in the wells. The timeline for complete removal of free product originating from the former UST is unknown, and would be dependent on site conditions such as groundwater flow gradient and transmissivity of subsurface soils.
- Alternative 2 In Situ Chemical Oxidation. This alternative would consist of introducing a chemical oxidant such as hydrogen peroxide to oxidize residual petroleum hydrocarbons in soil and groundwater. This alternative would require additional scoping work to identify the mass of product to be treated, and may benefit from a pilot study. The effectiveness of chemical oxidation is limited by

May 14, 2009 Page 4 of 8

Reference: Corrective Action Work Plan

the ability of the oxidant to move through the subsurface and come into physical contact with petroleum hydrocarbons. Chemical oxidation treatment often benefits from a secondary enhanced bioremediation program to accelerate bacterial degradation of dissolved-phase hydrocarbons.

3. Alternative 3 — Excavation of Impacted Soils and One-Time Removal of Impacted Groundwater. Alternative 3 would consist of excavating the historical source area and much of the area between the former UST and well MW-3, estimated to be an area approximately 30 feet by 15 feet by approximately 11 feet below grade. Prior to beginning excavation, Stantec proposes conducting soil and grab groundwater sampling between the former UST and MW-3 to better define the downgradient boundary of excavation, and additional groundwater sampling downgradient of MW-3 in order to site a new well to monitor groundwater conditions following excavation. The excavation would be extended approximately one foot into first-encountered groundwater, reported to occur at 10 feet below grade. After opening and stabilizing the excavation, the excavation would be evacuated of approximately two volumes of groundwater, corresponding to approximately 3,400 gallons. This effort should result in 'flushing' the formation adjacent to the excavation, and accelerate the rate at which water quality objectives are met.

Stantec reviewed the possible remedial alternatives by independently evaluating each method in terms of effectiveness, implementability, and cost. In addition to these parameters, the most important comparison criterion was the ability for a particular remedy to achieve the ESLs selected as soil and water quality objectives. Although all of the alternatives are technically feasible and would result in net reductions in chemical concentrations in soil and groundwater, overexcavation of impacted soils has the greatest probability of effectively removing petroleum hydrocarbons from soil and thereby removing the source of impact to groundwater. Once the source of impact is removed, water quality objectives can be met in a reasonable amount of time by natural attenuation of petroleum hydrocarbons. Initial costs associated with overexcavation are higher than those for passive product removal and chemical oxidation; however, if iterative oxidant injections are required, the overall costs between chemical oxidation and excavation would likely become comparable. Therefore, Stantec considers excavation the remedial method most likely to achieve cleanup goals in a reasonable period of time.

PROPOSED CORRECTIVE ACTION

The proposed corrective action consists of the following key tasks:

Soil and groundwater investigation to delineate the downgradient extent of excavation, and to site a new well to replace MW-3 for post-excavation groundwater monitoring;
Excavation of impacted soils, and removal of groundwater from the excavation; and

☐ Installation of a new well downgradient of the proposed excavation.

These tasks are described in the following sections.

Soil and Groundwater Investigation

Preliminary Activities

A Site-specific health and safety plan (HASP) will be prepared for use by personnel implementing the work plan. The HASP will address the proposed field work, and a copy of the HASP will be available on-site at all times. Subcontractors performing field activities will be provided with a copy of the HASP prior to initiating work.

May 14, 2009 Page 5 of 8

Reference: Corrective Action Work Plan

Stantec will conduct a subsurface utility clearance prior to initiating field activities. The utility clearance will include notifying Underground Service Alert (USA) of the proposed work a minimum of 48 hours prior to initiating the field investigation, and securing the services of a private utility locating company to confirm the absence of underground utilities at each boring location. Stantec will obtain a soil boring permit from the Alameda County Public Works Agency, and arrange for the on-site field inspection as necessary.

Soil Boring Advancement and Sample Collection

Stantec proposes advancing up to six direct-push soil borings on ten-foot centers along a transect extending south (downgradient) of the former UST. Soil borings will be advanced to approximately 20 feet bgs for collection of soil and grab groundwater samples. During borehole advancement, recovered soils will be examined for evidence of chemical impact, and three soil samples from each borehole will be retained for laboratory analysis. At each location, soil samples exhibiting signs of petroleum impact will be submitted for analysis; if no such impact is noted, soil samples will be collected from select intervals between the ground surface and the total depth of the boring. At least one saturated soil sample will be retained from each borehole to characterize concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons present in the saturated zone.

Grab groundwater samples will be collected by removing the soil sampling tool string, inserting a temporary well screen into the borehole, and filling laboratory-supplied containers using a disposable bailer. Soil and grab groundwater samples will be stored on ice and transported to a certified laboratory under chain-of-custody protocol. Soil and grab groundwater samples will be analyzed for the following constituents:

	TPH-GRO,	BTEX,	and	MTBE	by	EPA	Method	8260B;	and
--	----------	-------	-----	------	----	-----	--------	--------	-----

☐ TPH-DRO and TRPH by EPA Method 8015.

Analysis and Transmittal of Data

Soil and groundwater analytical results will be used to refine the proposed area of excavation, and to site a new monitoring well downgradient of the excavation. Analytical results will also be used to profile the soil and groundwater for disposal. Stantec will transmit the findings of the investigation, and the impact of the findings on the proposed scope of work, to ACEH in a brief letter.

Soil Excavation

Preliminary Activities

Stantec will update the site HASP to incorporate excavation activities, mark the work area in white paint, and notify Underground Service Alert. Stantec's contractor will obtain a grading permit from Alameda County, and notify the Bay Area Air Quality Management District as necessary.

Excavation of Soils

Pending receipt of the pre-excavation soil and groundwater analytical results, Stantec assumes excavating an area approximately 15 feet by 30 feet to 11 feet below grade. Prior to beginning excavation activities, the site will be secured with temporary fencing. A qualified geotechnical engineer will review site soil conditions and make recommendations regarding shoring. It is assumed that the eastern sidewall, adjacent to the onsite building, will be shored with sheet piles to preserve the integrity of the building's foundation. The remaining

May 14, 2009 Page 6 of 8

Reference: Corrective Action Work Plan

three sidewalls will be benched at approximately 2:1, or as directed by the geotechnical engineer or onsite competent professional.

Soils will be removed using a track-mounted excavator or backhoe. Stantec anticipates that the soils will be pre-profiled for disposal in a certified Class II landfill; therefore, soils will be direct-loaded to the extent possible. Should stockpiling be deemed necessary, soils will be placed on and beneath plastic sheeting and surrounded with a temporary berm to prevent migration of soil or water away from the stockpile. Stantec's subcontractor will adhere to accepted Best Management Practices with respect to preventing migration of soils or water into storm drains or other receptors.

During excavation, soils will be screened using a photoionization detector (PID) and a TPH field test kit. To the extent practical, the excavation may be extended in one or more directions based on field observations of impacted soils.

Confirmation Sampling

One confirmation sample will be collected for approximately every 10 linear feet of excavation sidewall. Based on the assumed dimensions of excavation, this corresponds to nine confirmation samples. Soil samples will be collected from dry material above the soil/groundwater interface, anticipated at approximately 10 feet bgs. Because the excavation will be extended into shallow groundwater, no confirmation samples will be collected from the base of the excavation. Soil samples will be submitted to TestAmerica of Pleasanton, CA for analysis of TPH-GRO, TPH-DRO, TRPH, and BTEX/MTBE on a 24-hour turnaround basis.

Should analytical results indicate the presence of petroleum hydrocarbons above their respective ESLs, additional excavation will be performed and additional confirmation soil samples will be collected and analyzed. The excavation will be covered with plywood and barricaded during the sampling period.

Removal of Groundwater

It is anticipated that the proposed excavation will extend approximately one foot into first-encountered groundwater. In order to accelerate remediation of impacted groundwater, Stantec proposes pumping the excavation of at least two volumes of water, corresponding to approximately 3,400 gallons. Stantec anticipates that pumping will occur concurrent with excavation. Groundwater will be stored in an on-site tank pending analysis, profiling, and disposal.

Backfilling, Compaction, and Site Restoration

Following confirmation that the cleanup goals have been met, the excavation will be backfilled with imported fill materials and compacted to 90 percent relative compaction. The excavation will then be resurfaced with asphalt and/or concrete to match the pre-existing surface.

Monitoring Well Installation

Stantec will install a monitoring well downgradient of the excavation to monitor post-remediation groundwater conditions. The two-inch-diameter well will be screened between approximately 15 and 25 feet bgs. The well will be properly developed and sampled approximately 72 hours following completion.

May 14, 2009 Page 7 of 8

Reference: Corrective Action Work Plan

Continuation of Semi-Annual Groundwater Monitoring

As required by ACEH, Stantec will continue semi-annual groundwater sampling at the Site during the Second and Fourth Quarter 2009. Groundwater samples will be submitted to Test America for the following analyses as specified in the ACHCSA directive:

- 8015B for TPH-GRO:
- 8015B for TPH-DRO;
- 8440 for TRPH:
- 8260B for BTEX:
- 8260B for MTBE;
- 8270C for SVOCs;
- 6010B for Pb; and
- 8260B for lead scavengers (ethylene dichloride [EDC] and ethylene dibromide [EDB]).

Reporting

Following completion of the corrective action plan and each semi-annual groundwater sampling event, Stantec will prepare a Letter Report that will include well details, groundwater analytical results, field procedures, tables, figures, field notes, and laboratory reports for the groundwater sampling event, as well as conclusions and planned activities. The Letter Report will be submitted to Goodyear and ACEH no later than 45 days after the end of each sampling event.

State Water Resource Control Board Geotracker Reporting

Following completion of the corrective action plan and each semi-annual groundwater sampling event, Stantec will proceed with the uploading of the each completed report, depth to water data, and analytical data, as required by the State Water Resource Control Board's Geotracker electronic reporting database.

May 14, 2009 Page 8 of 8

Reference: Corrective Action Work Plan

We appreciate the opportunity to submit this work plan to ACWD, and trust that this document meets with your approval. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

STANTEC CONSULTING CORPORATION

Mel Doran, P.G.

Jack Hardin, REA Managing Principal Tel: (408) 356-6124 Fax: (408) 356-6138 jack.hardin@stantec.com

cc. Mr. Matthew McClellan, Goodyear Mr. Dennis Middleton, Stantec

Attachments:

Table 1 – Historical Soil Analytical Results
Table 2 – Historical Groundwater Analytical Results

Figure 1 – Site Location Map Figure 2 – Site Plan Senior Geologist Tel: (916) 861-0400 Fax: (916) 861-0430

neil.doran@stantec.com

NEIL H. DORAN No. 8503

TABLES

TABLE 1 Historical Soil Analytical Results

Former Merritt Tire Sales/Goodyear DEX #9578 3430 Castro Valley Blvd.,

			and the second of the second o	5450 Gasko					
Sample ID	Date Sampled	TPH as Gasoline (mg/kg)	TPH as Diesel (mg/kg)	O&G/TRPH (mg/kg)	Benzene (mg/kg)	Toluene (mg/kg)	Ethyl- benzene (mg/kg)	Total Xylenes (mg/kg)	MTBE (mg/kg)
ESL (mg/kg)		83	2,500	2,500	0.044	2.9	3.3	2.3	0.023
No. 1 South	09/22/93	230	2,400	6,100	0.88	7.6	3.6	24	NT
No. 2 North	09/22/93	22	388	1,600	0.099	0.88	0.34	2.4	NT
1-1-3	09/28/94	<1	<10	<50	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005	NT
1-2-2	09/28/94	<1	<10	<50	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005	< 0.005	NT
2-1-1	09/28/94	<1	<10	<50	<0.005	<0.005	< 0.005	<0.005	NT
2-2-1	09/28/94	<1	<10	<50	<0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	<0.005	NT
3-1-1	09/28/94	4	210	550	0.022	0.072	0.067	0.28	NT
3-2-2	09/28/94	14	560	1,300	0.047	0.016	0.068	0.58	NT
PB-1	12/13/96	120	NT	8,200	0.6	3.8	1.6	10	NT
PB-4	12/13/96	<1	NT	<10	<0.005	< 0.005	<0.005	<0.005	NT
OWS-1	09/30/04	NT	<12.1	<12.0	<0.0024	<0.0024	<0.0024	<0.0024	<0.0024
UST-1	09/30/04	NT	1050	2,490	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT
SB-1	09/30/04	<6.10	<12.1	<12.1	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT
SA-1	09/30/04	NT	<10.2	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT
HL-1	09/30/04	NT	899	818	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT
HL-2	09/30/04	NT	<10.1	10.6	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT
HL-3	09/30/04	NT	<9.96	10.9	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT
HL-4	09/30/04	NT	<10.2	11.1	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT

Notes:

mg/kg = milligram per killogram

NT = Not tested

ESL = Environmental Screening Levels from California Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region - Shallow Soils were groundwater is a current or potential soure of drinking water - November 2007 (Revised May 2008)

TPH = Total petroleum hydrocarbons

TPH as Gasoline = historically analyzed by EPA Method 8015B; beginning December 3, 2007 TPHg analyzed by LUFT GC/MS 8260B TPH as Diesel = analyzed by EPA Method 8015B/3510

O&G/TRPH = Oil and grease and total recoverable petroleum hydrocarbons analyzed by EPA Method 5520 in 1993 and 1994, by EPA Method 418.1 in 1996, and by EPA Method 1664 in 2004.

BTEX compounds = historically analyzed by EPA Method 8021B; in 2004 VOCs analyzed by EPA Method 8206B

MTBE = Methyl tert-butyl ether; historically analyzed by EPA Method 8021B; in 2004 VOCs analyzed by EPA Method 8206B

TABLE 2 Historical Groundwater Analytical Results

Former Merritt Tire Sales/Goodyear DEX #9578 3430 Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley. California

Castro Valley, California										
	Date	TPH as Gasoline	TPH as Diesel	O&G/TRPH	Benzene	Toluene	Ethyl-	Total Xylenes	MTBE	1
Sample ID	Sampled	(µg/L)					benzene			Lead
	Jampieu		(µg/L)	(µg/L)	(µg/L)	(µg/L)	(µg/L)	(µg/L)	(µg/L)	(µg/L)
ESL (µg/L)		100	100	100	1.0	40	30	20	5.0	2.5
SB-1	09/30/94	<50.0	<50	<100	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT
MW-1	09/30/94	<50	<50	<5,000	< 0.5	<0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	NT	<50
	04/24/95	<50	<50	<5,000	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	NT	5.6
	08/28/02	<50	<50	207	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	20
	09/30/03	<50	<50	<5,000	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	<5.0
	09/30/04	<100	87	<5,000	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<5.0
	03/29/05	<100	<100	<5,210	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<5.0
	05/30/06	<50	<50	<2,500	<0.5**	<0.5**	<0.5**	<0.5**	NT	<100
	06/15/06	NT	NT	NT	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	NT	NT
	12/14/06	<50	<70	<2,600	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	NT	<100
	06/27/07	<50	<490	<4,700	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<4.0	<5.0	25
	12/03/07	<100	<100	<5,000	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	<1.0	<1.0	6.2
	06/30/08	<50.0	<49.0	<5,260	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	<5.00
	12/04/08	<50	<50	<2,500	<0.50	<0.50	< 0.50	<1.0	<0.50	<5.0
MW-2	09/30/94	<50	<50	<5,000	<0.5	<0.5	< 0.5	<0.5	NT	<50
	04/24/95	<50	<50	<5,000	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	NT	7.5
	08/28/02	<50	<50	162	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	10
	09/30/03	<50	<50	<5,000	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	<5.0
	09/30/04	<100	78	<5,000	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<5.0
	03/29/05	<100	<100	<5,490	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<5.0
	05/30/06	<50	<50	<2,400	<0.5**	<0.5**	<0.5**	<0.5**	NT	<100
	06/15/06	NT	NT	NT	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	NT	NT
	12/14/06	<50	<70	<2,700	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	NT	<100
	06/27/07	<50	<480	<4,700	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<4.0	<5.0	17
	12/03/07	<100	<100	<5,000	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	<1.0	<1.0	<5.0
	06/30/08	<50.0	<47.6	<5,210	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	<5.00
	12/04/08	<50	<50	<2,500	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	<1.0	< 0.50	<5.0

TABLE 2 Historical Groundwater Analytical Results

Former Merritt Tire Sales/Goodyear DEX #9578 3430 Castro Valley Blvd.,

Castro Valley, California										
		TPH as	TPH as				Ethyl-	Total		
	Date	Gasoline	Diesel	O&G/TRPH	Benzene	Toluene	benzene	Xylenes	MTBE	Lead
Sample ID	Sampled	(µg/L)	(µg/L)	(µg/L)	(µg/L)	(µg/L)	(µg/L)	(µg/L)	(µg/L)	(µg/L)
MW-3	09/30/94	290	72	<5,000	29	3.2	3.3	29	NT	<50
	04/24/95	53	960	<5,000	12	0.84	0.69	2.4	NT	7.1
	02/09/96				9.6	1.4	1.2	2	NT	NT
	12/31/96				95	7	19	53	NT	NT
	08/28/02	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
	09/30/03	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
	09/30/04	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
	03/29/05	274	2,430	<5,260	81	7.8	8	11.5	23.6	<5.0
	05/30/06	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
	12/14/06	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
	06/27/07	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
	12/03/07	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
	06/30/08	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
	12/04/08	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
MW-4	12/31/96	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	NT	NT
	08/28/02	<50	<50	<100	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	11
	09/30/03	<50	<50	<5,000	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	<5.0
	09/30/04	<50	103	<5,000	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	11.0
	03/29/05	<100	<100	<5,320	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<5.0
	05/30/06	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
	12/14/06	<50	87	<3,500	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	NT	<400
	06/27/07	<50	<470	<4,800	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<4.0	<5.0	28
	12/03/07	<100	<100	<4,700	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	<1.0	<1.0	<5.0
	06/30/08	<50	<58.8	<5,210	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	15.8
	12/04/08	<50	<50	<2,500	< 0.50	<0.50	< 0.50	<1.0	<0.50	<5.0

TABLE 2 Historical Groundwater Analytical Results

Former Merritt Tire Sales/Goodyear DEX #9578 3430 Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley, California

				-	out valley, oall	orrina				
		TPH as	TPH as				Ethyl-	Total		
	Date	Gasoline	Diesel	O&G/TRPH	Benzene	Toluene	benzene	Xylenes	MTBE	Lead
Sample ID	Sampled	(µg/L)	(µg/L)	(µg/L)	(µg/L)	(µg/L)	(µg/L)	(µg/L)	(µg/L)	(µg/L)
Notes:										
	= micrograms p									
ND	= Not detected	above laborate	ory reportin	g limits						
NS	= Not Sampled									
NT	= Not tested									
	= Environmenta	al Screening Le	evels from	California Rec	ional Water	Quality Cont	rol Board Sar	n Francisco	Bay Region - S	Shallow Soils where
ESL	groundwater is	a current or no	otential sou	re of drinking	water - Nov	ember 2007 (Revised May	2008)	za, 1.0g.011 c	Shallow Soils where
	= Maximum Co									
	= Total petroleu			in Tude 22, C	alliornia Co	de oi Regulai	lions (Septen	ibel 2003)		
		,		O1ED: basinsi	D	2 2007 TD)	bullIET Of	C/MC 0000D	
TPH as Gasoline					ng Decemb	er 3, 2007 TP	rng analyzed	by LUFT GO	C/MS 8260B	
	TPH as Diesel = analyzed by EPA Method 8015B/3510									
O&G/TRPH	O&G/TRPH = Oil and grease, and total recoverable petroleum hydrocarbons analyzed by EPA Method 5520 in 1993 and 1994, by EPA Method 418.1 in 1996, and by EPA Method 1664 beginning September 30, 2003.									
	1996, and by E	PA Method 16	64 beginnii	ng September	30, 2003.	00 0000 1	100	TO A	1 U LOGGOD	
BTEX compounds	= nistorically an	alyzed by EPA	4 ivietnod 8	UZTB; peginni	ng Septemb	er 30, 2003 \	/OCs analyze	ea by EPA N	rietnoa 8206B	

MTBE = Methyl tert-butyl ether; historically analyzed by EPA Method 8021B; beginning September 30, 2003 VOCs analyzed by EPA Method 8206B

EDC and EDB = analyzed by EPA Method 8260B

^{**} Due to the laboratory exceeding the hold time for VOC analysis, MW-1 and MW-2 were resampled on 6/15/06.

FIGURES

ì



