M E M O R A N D U M Alameda County Department of Environmental Health

DATE:

June 9, 1997

TO:

Madhulla Logan

FROM:

Amy Leech

FROM:

Allly Leccii

SUBJECT:

RBCA Evaluation for Former Merrit Tires at 3430 Castro Valley Blvd, Castro Valley

STID #1715

Please review the attached RBCA Evaluation for the subject site and let me know of your comments/suggestions. I have listed my comments below. In addition, it appears that there are several items missing from this report which I have also listed below. Before requesting these items from the RP, I wanted to get your comments, so they can be incorporate in one letter. Thanks. Amy

Background

Attached are some old reports for background information. In a nutshell, a waste oil tank was removed. Three wells were installed. Monitoring well MW-3 located adjacent to and downgradient of the former tank has had TPH-G, TPH-D, BTEX, and various 8010 constituents. Free-product has been intermittently detected in MW-3 as well. Recently, four more borings (PB-1 through PB-4) and a monitoring well (MW-4/PB-4)) were installed at the site for further assessment. The results of this recent assessment is found in the EMCON report.

Comments

- 1. Construction worker scenario was not evaluated. This property and adjacent properties are well established commercial lots/businesses. To my knowledge, there is currently no construction planned in this area. I agree with the pathways they evaluated.
- 2. There has been free-product intermittently detected in monitoring well MW-3. Contrary to the report conclusion, it appears that the free product originated from the former waste oil tank and is not hydraulic oil.
- 3. Where did they get all the RBSLs for the listed HVOCs in Table 1. Do we need a reference?
- Is it even appropriate to complete a RBCA evaluation and ask for closure when free product is intermittently detected at MW-3? We discussed this before and you questioned their rationale? Maybe it would be best if they evaluated the site against the RWQCB Interim Guidelines and proposed to remediate/remove the free product before requesting closure. What do you think?
- 5. Monitoring well MW-4 seems to be screened inappropriately for HVOCs. Do you agree?

Missing

Missing analytical results for:

- -free product analysis
- -groundwater samples for MW-3 and MW-4
- -HVOC results for the soil sample collected from PB-1

Attachments (3)

- -"Expanded Assessment and RBCA Evaluation" EMCON, March 4, 1997
- -"Groundwater Monitoring and Sampling Report" Touchstone, April 8, 1996
- -"Initial Subsurface Investigation for Waste Oil UST" Touchstone, November 1, 1994

Amy,

- They have mentioned that they did not evaluate soil / groundwater to indoor area because based on the current scenario, there are no structures. But however, what about the future scenario? If they want to completely overlook the future scenario, they need to do a risk management plan.
 - 2. The concentration in MW-3 does not show a decrease? So what is the guarantee
 - 3. Collected TOC from the hot spot
 - MW-4 Too far from MW-3 and no groundwater or soil sample collected from PB-2.
 - 5. Maybe we should look for MTBE, since high concentrations of BTEX was found.
 - 6. Equations used in RBCA are not valid for concentrations above saturation.

Madhulla

1

TABLE C HISTORICAL GROUNDWATER ANALYTICAL SUMMARY

Goodyear Service Center 3430 Castro Valley Boulevard - Castro Valley, California

Results in ug/L - parts per billion topal

Well ID DTW DATE	Year	Quarter	TPH - Gasoline	Benzene	Toluene	Ethyl- benzene	Xylenes	TPH - Diesel	тов	8010	8270	Cadmlum (ppm)	Chromium (ppm)	Lead	Nickel (ppm)	Zinc
MW-1 4,43 24-Apr-95	95	2nd	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	CAR	ND	ND	0.052	0,0056	0.060	0,13
MW-1 5.91 2-Aug-95	95	3rd	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	CAR	ND	ND	0.16	ND	0.160	0.22
MW-1 6.40 23-Oct-95	95	4th	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	NA	CAR	ND	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
MW-1 3.93 9-Feb-96	96	1st	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	NA	CAR	ND	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
MW-2 4.38 24-Apr-95	95	2nd	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	CAR	ND	ND	0.054	0.0075	0.067	0.12
MW-2 5.04 2-Aug-95	95	3rd	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	CAR	ND	ND	0.062	ND	0.082	0.11
MW-2 6.0 Z.23-Oct-95	95	4th	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	NA:	NA	CAR	ND	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
MW-2 3,62 9-Feb-96	96	1st	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	NA	NA	CAR	ND	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
MW-3 4.91 24-Apr-95	95	2nd	53	12	0.84	0,69	2.4	960	ND	CAR	ND	ND	0.029	0.0071	0.075	0.08
MW-3 / 2 2-Aug-95	95	3rd	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP
MW-3 1 23-Oct-95	95	4th	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP
MW-3 4, 16 9-Feb-96		fst	52	9.6	1.4	1.2	2.0	700	NA.	CAR	ND	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

9.6 1.4	1.2 2.0	700 NA CAR	ND NA	NA.	
80/0	MW-	WM-5	MW-3	MCLS	
Chloroform	2.4	3.2	ND		
1,1 - OCA	ND		7.8.3.	5.0	
Ci5-1,2-DC€	1	1			
PCE				6.0	
			0.77	5.0	
			1.1	200	
			0.73	5.0	
tringl cheoride	1	4	8.5	0.5	
	11 1			11 1	
	Clieroform 1,1-OCA Cis-1,2-DCE PCE 1,1,1-TCA TCE	80/0 MW-1 Clis-1,1-0CA ND Cis-1,2-DCE PCE 1,1,1-TCA	8010 MW-1 MW-2 Clistoform 2.4 3.2 1,1-OCÁ ND ND Cis-1,2-DCE PCE 1,1,1-TCA TCE	80/0 MW-1 MW-2 MW-3 Clistoform 2.4 3.2 ND 1,1-OCA ND ND 10 Cis-1,2-DCE 3.5 PCE 0.77 1,1,1-TCA 1.1 TCE 0.73	

NA = Analysis not requested by Alameda County

FP 8010 4 82703

94-14HIS.XLS

ask Don to enspect Lever lines - CV Santary District can identity Can analyze product. -

ND = Not Detected at or above the laboratory detection limits.

CAR - See studytical laboratory reports for results.

FP = No analytical data available due to the presence of separate-phase floating product

