ALAMEDA COUNTY
HEALTH CARE SERVICES
AGENCY
DAVID J. KEARS, Agency Director

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

August 22, 2006

Mr. John Berry
Alameda Gateway Limited
2900 Main Street, Suite 100
Alameda, CA 94501

NOTICE OF VIOLATION

Subject: Fuel Leak Case No. RO0000483, Alameda Gateway 2900 Main Street, Alameda, CA

Dear Mr. Berry:

Alameda County Environmental Health (ACEH) staff previously requested in correspondence dated May 3, 2006 (copy attached) that you submit a Soil and Groundwater Investigation Work Plan (Work Plan) for your site by July 1, 2006. To date, we have not received either a Work Plan or a request for a schedule extension. **Your site is out of compliance with directives from this agency.** In reviewing the case file, we also note that the current failure to submit a Work Plan by July 1, 2006 is one of a series of occasions on which you have failed to implement work and submit reports within the established schedule.

As directed in the May 3, 2006, correspondence you are to submit a Work Plan that addresses the technical comments in the interest of moving the site investigation and cleanup forward. In addition, ACEH requested a Preferential Pathway and Utility Corridor Survey be completed prior to the implementation of the SWI. To date we have not received the Preferential Pathway and Utility Survey. In order for your site to return to compliance, please **submit the previously requested documents Work Plan and Preferential Pathway and Utility Survey by September 15, 2006.** This date is not an extension of your due date, reports for this site are late and your site is out of compliance. ACEH's May 3, 2006 correspondence, which describes the requirements for the work, is included as an attachment.

ACEH is concerned about the significant delays that are occurring in submitting reports for this site. Please be informed, if these delays continue 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.

TECHNICAL REPORT REQUEST

Please submit technical reports to Alameda County Environmental Health (Attention: Steven Plunkett), according to the following schedule:

- **September 15, 2006** – Work Plan for Soil and Groundwater Investigation and Preferential Pathway and Utility Survey

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

Effective **January 31, 2006**, 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. Instructions for submission of electronic documents to the Alameda County Environmental Cleanup Oversight Program ftp site are provided on the attached "Electronic Report Upload (ftp) Instructions." Please do not submit reports as attachments to electronic mail.

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. Submission of reports to the Geotracker website does not fulfill the requirement to submit documents to the Alameda County ftp site. In September 2004, the SWRCB adopted regulations that require electronic submittal of information for 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 monitor wells, and other data to the Geotracker database over the Internet. Beginning July 1, 2005, electronic submittal of a complete copy of all necessary reports was required in Geotracker (in PDF format). Please visit the SWRCB website for more information on these requirements (http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/ust/cleanup/electronic_reporting).

In order to facilitate electronic correspondence, we request that you provide up to date electronic mail addresses for all responsible and interested parties. Please provide current electronic mail addresses and notify us of future changes to electronic mail addresses by sending an electronic mail message to me at steven.plunkett@acgov.org.

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

ACEH is concerned about the significant delays that are occurring in submitting reports for this site. Please be informed, if these delays continue 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.

If you have any questions, please call me at (510) 383-1767.

Sincerely,

Steven Plunkett
Hazardous Materials Specialist

Attachment: ACEH Correspondence Dated May 3, 2006

Enclosure: ACEH Electronic Report Upload (ftp) Instructions

cc: Sunil Ramdass
SWRCB Cleanup Fund
1001 I Street, 17th floor,
Sacramento, CA 95814-2828

Ms. Helen Mawhinney
1548 Jacob Avenue
San Jose, Ca 95118

Mr. Stephen Osborne
Fugro West
1000 Broadway, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94607-4099

Donna Drogos, ACEH
Steven Plunkett, ACEH
File

Alyce C. Sandbach
Alameda County District Attorney
1225 Fallon Street, Suite 800
Oakland, CA 94612

Mr. Crispin Kraft
Bay Ship & Yacht Co.
2900 Main Street
Alameda, CA 94501

ALAMEDA COUNTY
HEALTH CARE SERVICES
AGENCY
DAVID J. KEARS, Agency Director

SENT
05-27-06

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

May 25, 2006

Mr. Crispin Kraft
Bay Ship & Yacht Co.
2900 Main Street
Alameda, CA 94501

Northern California Power Agency
2900 Main Street
Alameda, CA 94501

Zaccor Companies Inc.
2900 Main Street
Alameda, CA 94501

Subject: Fuel Leak Case No. RO0000483, Alameda Gateway Ltd., 2900 Main Street, Alameda, CA 94501

Dear Mr Kraft:

Alameda County Environmental Health Department (ACEH) staff has reviewed recently submitted report entitled, "Work Plan for Well Installation MW-2R", dated May 2, 2006 and prepared on your behalf by Fugro West, Inc. ACEH concurs with the proposed scope of work presented in the Work Plan report.

We request that you address the following technical comments and send us the reports described below. Please provide 72-hour advance written notification to this office (e-mail preferred to steven.plunkett@acgov.org) prior to the start of field activities.

TECHNICAL COMMENTS

1. **Proposed Monitoring Well Installation.** Upon completion of the monitoring well installation we request that you submit all well construction details, technical specifications and well litoholgic logs in the report requested below. In addition, we request that a licensed professional surveyor survey the monitoring well location. ACEH requests that a site map be prepared showing the location of the former UST, former building 133, new monitoring well MW-2R and any other site feature that may be pertinent. Please also present these figures in the report requested below.

TECHNICAL REPORT REQUEST

Please submit technical reports to Alameda County Environmental Health (Attention: Mr. Steven Plunkett), according to the following schedule:

- **July 15, 2006** – Monitoring Well Installation Completion Report

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

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. Instructions for submission of electronic documents to the Alameda County Environmental Cleanup Oversight Program ftp site are provided on the attached "Electronic Report Upload (ftp) Instructions." Please do not submit reports as attachments to electronic mail.

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. Submission of reports to the Geotracker website does not fulfill the requirement to submit documents to the Alameda County ftp site. In September 2004, the SWRCB adopted regulations that require electronic submittal of information for 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 monitor wells, and other data to the Geotracker database over the Internet. Beginning July 1, 2005, electronic submittal of a complete copy of all necessary reports was required in Geotracker (in PDF format). Please visit the SWRCB website for more information on these requirements (http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/ust/cleanup/electronic_reporting).

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.

If you have any questions, please call me at (510) 383-1767.

Sincerely,

Steven Plunkett
Hazardous Materials Specialist

cc: Mr. John Berry
Alameda Gateway Limited
2900 Main Street, Suite 100
Alameda, CA 94501

Mr. Stephen Osborne
Fugro West Inc.
1000 Broadway, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94607

Donna Drogos, ACEH
Steven Plunkett, ACEH
File

SENT
8-25-06

ALAMEDA COUNTY
HEALTH CARE SERVICES
AGENCY
DAVID J. KEARS, Agency Director

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

May 3, 2006

Mr. John Berry
Alameda Gateway LTD.
2900 Main Street, Suite 100
Alameda, CA 94501

Subject: Fuel Leak Case No. RO0000483, Alameda Gateway LTD, 2900 Main Street, Alameda, CA 94501

Dear Mr. Berry:

Please be advised that I have taken over the above referenced site from Mr. Amir Ghloami. Alameda County Environmental Health Department (ACEH) staff has reviewed the case file for the above referenced site. ACEH has determined the need for additional investigation to characterize the contamination in the vicinity of former UST #133 and the potential migration of petroleum hydrocarbons along the preferential pathway that may be associated with the underground utilities adjacent to former UST #137.

Based on ACEH staff review of the case file, we request that you address the following technical comments and prepare a work plan detailing work to be performed, and send us the reports described below. Please provide 72-hour advance written notification to this office (e-mail preferred to steven.plunkett@acgov.org) prior to the start of field activities.

TECHNICAL COMMENTS

1. **Location and Reinstallation of Monitoring Wells MW-1 and MW-3.** Currently, the status of groundwater monitoring wells MW-1, and MW-3 are unknown. Due to the possibility of vertical migration of contamination in improperly decommissioned wells every effort should be made to locate the monitoring wells, including using underground location techniques. If the monitoring wells are located and still in operable condition they should be redeveloped and included in future groundwater monitoring activities at the site. However, if the monitoring wells are located and determined to be inoperable the monitoring wells are to be decommissioned in accordance with Alameda County Public Works guidelines.

   However, in the likelihood that monitoring wells MW-1 and MW-3 cannot be located ACEH recommends new monitoring wells MW-1A and MW-3A be installed in their place. It is important to ensure that the replacement wells be constructed in a manner that is consistent with Alameda County Public Works guidelines for monitoring well installation, and the proper permits are obtained prior to well installation. Please present your proposal for monitoring well replacement in the Site Investigation and Monitoring Well Replacement Work Plan requested below.

2. **Monitoring Well MW-2 Replacement.** During a meeting on May 2, 2006 with Mr. Crispin Kraft from Bay Ship & Yacht Co. (BS&Y) and Mr. Stephen Osborne from Fugro West, ACEH was informed that BS&Y would like to reinstall MW-2 in the vicinity of former UST #133. ACEH agrees with the proposal to reinstall MW-2. ACEH has reviewed the proposal submitted by BS&Y to install MW-2R and we agree with the scope of work. ACEH has provided a separate approval letter for the installation of MW-2R.

3. **Groundwater Contamination and Groundwater Monitoring.** The most recent groundwater monitoring conducted at the site occurred in June 2001. Observations conducted during monitoring well sampling indicate the presence of free product sheen in MW-2; therefore no water sample was collected. In addition, field personnel were unable to locate monitoring well MW-3 during the sampling activities. Groundwater samples were collected in monitoring well MW-1 and analytical test data indicate TPHd concentrations of 120 µg/L, while BTEX, MtBE, TPHg and TPHmo were not recorded above laboratory detection limits.

   The contamination appears to be limited in extent at the location of MW-1 and releases of this type will attenuate naturally over time. In addition, there do not appear to be any sensitive receptors, particurlary since a recently installed sheet pile cutoff wall should act as a flow boundary for any potential plume migration toward the estuary. Therefore, ACEH recommends the implementation of a quarterly groundwater monitoring and sampling program, once monitoring wells MW-1A, MW-2A, and MW-3A are replaced and properly developed. In addition, ACEH request that you implement quarterly groundwater monitoring at this site and report your results according to the schedule below. In addition to sampling for TPHg, TPHd, TPHmo, BTEX and MtBE groundwater samples are to be analyzed for the following; TAME, ETBE, DIPE and EtOH.

4. **Soil Excavation and Confirmation Sampling**

   a. According to the UST Removal Report prepared by Mittlehauser in June 1990, over-excavation at former UST #85a/85b did not find a limit to the extent of contamination and a decision was made to return at a later time to determine the actual extent of contamination. Confirmation soil sampling conducted during the excavation indicated the presence of low levels of TPHg at maximum concentrations of 4.8 mg/kg, and soil sample results tested below laboratory detections limits for BTEX constituents. One grab groundwater sample collected from the tank pit tested 3,300 µg/L TPHg and 37µg/L for benzene.

   A limited site assessment with associated soil and groundwater sampling conducted in 2001 confirmed the presence petroleum hydrocarbons in the vicinity of the former UST #85a/85b. Chemical analytical data collected from one soil borings tested for TPHmo, TPHd, TPHg and benzene at maximum concentrations of 5,900 mg/kg, 5,200 mg/kg, 71 mg/kg, 0.53 mg/kg, respectively. Grab groundwater samples collected from soil borings tested maximum concentrations of TPHmo, TPHd, TPHg and benzene at 5,900 µg/L, 4,800 µg/L, 660 µg/L and 6.6 µg/L respectively.

   ACEH recommends that an investigation in the vicinity of former UST #85a/85b be conducted to determine the extent of pollution in both soil and groundwater. During previous investigations it appears that no soil samples were collected below 6 feet bgs. ACEH requests soil samples be collected at the capillary fringe, immediately above the zone where

first water is identified, any interval where stating, odor, or elevated PID readings occur and at 12 feet bgs. All soil samples are to be analyzed for TPHg, TPHd, TPHmo, BTEX and MtBE, respectively. Lastly, during the initial UST removal and over-excavation, soil removed during the excavation was stockpiled on site. ACEH has been unable to find any information or documentation related to either the sampling of the stockpile or possible offsite soil disposal. Please provide the appropriate documentation regarding the status of stockpiled soil. If excavated soil was used as backfill material, ACEH may require the re-excavation and off site disposal of the soil.

b. During tank removal and excavation activities at former UST #133, one soil sample was collected on the sidewall of the excavation and soil analytical data tested 1,100 mg/kg TPHd and 52 mg/kg TPHg. No groundwater sample was collected during tank removal activities. Results of soil screening conducted during the over-excavation indicated elevated concentrations of volitiles organic compounds (VOCs) in the soil. Consequently, a decision was made to return at a later date and determine the extent of soil contamination. However, no further investigation or over-excavation was completed at this location, as proposed during the original UST removal.

ACEH recommends that an investigation in the vicinity of former UST #133 be conducted to determine the extent of pollution in both soil and groundwater. During previous investigations it appears that no soil samples were collected below 5 feet bgs. ACEH requests soil samples be collected at the capillary fringe, immediately above the zone where first water is identified, any interval where stating, odor, or elevated PID readings occur and at 12 feet bgs. All soil samples are to be analyzed for TPHg, TPHd, TPHmo, BTEX and MtBE, respectively. Should the subsurface investigation conclude that additional soil contamination exists in the vicinity of former UST #133 over-excavation of contaminated soil may be needed. Lastly, during the initial UST removal and over-excavation, soil removed during the excavation was stockpiled on site. ACEH has been unable to find any information or documentation related to either the sampling of the stockpile or possible offsite soil disposal. Please provide the appropriate documentation regarding the status of stockpiled soil. If excavated soil was used as backfill material, ACEH may require the re-excavation and off site disposal of the soil.

c. Soil Samples collected during the tank removal at former UST #137 tested 38,000 mg/kg TPHd and 2.2 mg/kg benzene. No over-excavation at this location occurred during the original tank removal due to the close proximity of underground utilities. A limited site assessment with associated soil and groundwater sampling conducted in 2001 confirmed the presence petroleum hydrocarbons in the vicinity of the former UST #137. Chemical analytical data collected from the soil borings tested maximum concentrations of TPHmo and TPHd 4,900 mg/kg, 340 mg/kg. Benzene and MtBE were not detected above laboratory detection limits.

ACEH recommends that an investigation in the vicinity of former UST #137 be conducted to determine the extent of pollution in both soil and groundwater. During previous investigations it appears that no soil samples were collected below 5 feet bgs. ACEH requests soil samples be collected at the capillary fringe, immediately above the zone where first water is identified, any interval where stating, odor, or elevated PID readings occur and at 12 feet bgs. All soil samples are to be analyzed for TPHg, TPHd, TPHmo, BTEX and MtBE, respectively. Lastly, during the initial UST removal and over-excavation, soil removed during the excavation was stockpiled on site. ACEH has been unable to find any information or documentation related to

either the sampling of the stockpile or possible offsite soil disposal. Please provide the appropriate documentation regarding the status of stockpiled soil. If excavated soil was used as backfill material, ACEH may require the re-excavation and off site disposal of the soil.

5. **Preferential Pathway/Utility Corridor Survey.** We request that you complete the utility survey for the site and evaluate whether any underground utilities could potentially act as preferential pathways for contaminant migration. The purpose of the survey is to determine the potential of petroleum hydrocarbons encountering a preferential pathway, resulting in the dispersion of contamination in subsurface. Please show the location of utilities that may act as preferential pathways along with the high and low depths to groundwater elevation at the site. In particular, please focus on the sanitary sewer line adjacent to former UST #137. Please include graphics (plan view, cross-sections, etc.) to depict the results of your analysis along with your evaluation of whether contamination can encounter/migrate along preferential pathways at this site. Please present your results in the preferential pathway and utility study requested below.

TECHNICAL REPORT REQUEST

Please submit technical reports to Alameda County Environmental Health (Attention: Mr. Steven Plunkett), according to the following schedule:

- **July 1, 2006** – Soil and Groundwater Investigation and Monitoring Well Replacement Work Plan
- **June 15, 2006** – Preferential Pathway and Utilitiy Corridor Study
- **August 15, 2006** – Quarterly Groundwater Monitoring Reports Third Quarter 2006
- **November 15, 2006** – Quarterly Groundwater Monitoring Reports Fourth Quarter 2006
- **February 15, 2006** – Quarterly Groundwater Monitoring Reports First Quarter 2007
- **May 15, 2006** – Quarterly Groundwater Monitoring Reports Second Quarter 2007

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

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. Instructions for submission of electronic documents to the Alameda County Environmental Cleanup Oversight Program ftp site are provided on the attached "Electronic Report Upload (ftp) Instructions." Please do not submit reports as attachments to electronic mail.

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. Submission of reports to the Geotracker website does not fulfill the

requirement to submit documents to the Alameda County ftp site. In September 2004, the SWRCB adopted regulations that require electronic submittal of information for 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 monitor wells, and other data to the Geotracker database over the Internet. Beginning July 1, 2005, electronic submittal of a complete copy of all necessary reports was required in Geotracker (in PDF format). Please visit the SWRCB website for more information on these requirements (http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/ust/cleanup/electronic_reporting).

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.

If you have any questions, please call me at (510) 383-1767.

Sincerely,

Steven Plunkett
Hazardous Materials Specialist

cc: Mr. Crispin Kraft
Bay Ship & Yacht Co.
2900 Main Street
Alameda, CA 94501

Mr. Stephen Osborne
Fugro West
1000 Broadway, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94607-4099

Ms. D. Heinze,
Port of Oakland
530 Water Street
Oakland, CA 94604-2064

Mr. Roger Greensfelder
1548 Jacob Avenue
San Jose, CA 95118

Donna Drogos, ACEH
Steven Plunkett, ACEH
File

ALAMEDA COUNTY
HEALTH CARE SERVICES
AGENCY
DAVID J. KEARS, Agency Director

SENT
05-18-06

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

May 3, 2006

Mr. John Berry
Alameda Gateway LTD.
2900 Main Street, Suite 100
Alameda, CA 94501

Subject: Fuel Leak Case No. RO0000483, Alameda Gateway LTD, 2900 Main Street, Alameda, CA 94501

Dear Mr. Berry:

Please be advised that I have taken over the above referenced site from Mr. Amir Ghloami. Alameda County Environmental Health Department (ACEH) staff has reviewed the case file for the above referenced site. ACEH has determined the need for additional investigation to characterize the contamination in the vicinity of former UST #133 and the potential migration of petroleum hydrocarbons along the preferential pathway that may be associated with the underground utilities adjacent to former UST #137.

Based on ACEH staff review of the case file, we request that you address the following technical comments and prepare a work plan detailing work to be performed, and send us the reports described below. Please provide 72-hour advance written notification to this office (e-mail preferred to steven.plunkett@acgov.org) prior to the start of field activities.

TECHNICAL COMMENTS

1. **Location and Reinstallation of Monitoring Wells MW-1 and MW-3.** Currently, the status of groundwater monitoring wells MW-1, and MW-3 are unknown. Due to the possibility of vertical migration of contamination in improperly decommissioned wells every effort should be made to locate the monitoring wells, including using underground location techniques. If the monitoring wells are located and still in operable condition they should be redeveloped and included in future groundwater monitoring activities at the site. However, if the monitoring wells are located and determined to be inoperable the monitoring wells are to be decommissioned in accordance with Alameda County Public Works guidelines.

   However, in the likelihood that monitoring wells MW-1 and MW-3 cannot be located ACEH recommends new monitoring wells MW-1A and MW-3A be installed in their place. It is important to ensure that the replacement wells be constructed in a manner that is consistent with Alameda County Public Works guidelines for monitoring well installation, and the proper permits are obtained prior to well installation. Please present your proposal for monitoring well replacement in the Site Investigation and Monitoring Well Replacement Work Plan requested below.

2. **Monitoring Well MW-2 Replacement.** During a meeting on May 2, 2006 with Mr. Crispin Kraft from Bay Ship & Yacht Co. (BS&Y) and Mr. Stephen Osborne from Fugro West, ACEH was informed that BS&Y would like to reinstall MW-2 in the vicinity of former UST #133. ACEH agrees with the proposal to reinstall MW-2. ACEH has reviewed the proposal submitted by BS&Y to install MW-2R and we agree with the scope of work. ACEH has provided a separate approval letter for the installation of MW-2R.

3. **Groundwater Contamination and Groundwater Monitoring.** The most recent groundwater monitoring conducted at the site occurred in June 2001. Observations conducted during monitoring well sampling indicate the presence of free product sheen in MW-2; therefore no water sample was collected. In addition, field personnel were unable to locate monitoring well MW-3 during the sampling activities. Groundwater samples were collected in monitoring well MW-1 and analytical test data indicate TPHd concentrations of 120 µg/L, while BTEX, MtBE, TPHg and TPHmo were not recorded above laboratory detection limits.

   The contamination appears to be limited in extent at the location of MW-1 and releases of this type will attenuate naturally over time. In addition, there do not appear to be any sensitive receptors, particurlary since a recently installed sheet pile cutoff wall should act as a flow boundary for any potential plume migration toward the estuary. Therefore, ACEH recommends the implementation of a quarterly groundwater monitoring and sampling program, once monitoring wells MW-1A, MW-2A, and MW-3A are replaced and properly developed. In addition, ACEH request that you implement quarterly groundwater monitoring at this site and report your results according to the schedule below. In addition to sampling for TPHg, TPHd, TPHmo, BTEX and MtBE groundwater samples are to be analyzed for the following; TAME, ETBE, DIPE and EtOH.

4. **Soil Excavation and Confirmation Sampling –**

   a. According to the UST Removal Report prepared by Mittlehauser in June 1990, over-excavation at former UST #85a/85b did not find a limit to the extent of contamination and a decision was made to return at a later time to determine the actual extent of contamination. Confirmation soil sampling conducted during the excavation indicated the presence of low levels of TPHg at maximum concentrations of 4.8 mg/kg, and soil sample results tested below laboratory detections limits for BTEX constituents. One grab groundwater sample collected from the tank pit tested 3,300 µg/L TPHg and 37µg/L for benzene.

   A limited site assessment with associated soil and groundwater sampling conducted in 2001 confirmed the presence petroleum hydrocarbons in the vicinity of the former UST #85a/85b. Chemical analytical data collected from one soil borings tested for TPHmo, TPHd, TPHg and benzene at maximum concentrations of 5,900 mg/kg, 5,200 mg/kg, 71 mg/kg, 0.53 mg/kg, respectively. Grab groundwater samples collected from soil borings tested maximum concentrations of TPHmo, TPHd, TPHg and benzene at 5,900 µg/L, 4,800 µg/L, 660 µg/L and 6.6 µg/L respectively.

   ACEH recommends that an investigation in the vicinity of former UST #85a/85b be conducted to determine the extent of pollution in both soil and groundwater. During previous investigations it appears that no soil samples were collected below 6 feet bgs. ACEH requests soil samples be collected at the capillary fringe, immediately above the zone where

first water is identified, any interval where stating, odor, or elevated PID readings occur and at 12 feet bgs. All soil samples are to be analyzed for TPHg, TPHd, TPHmo, BTEX and MtBE, respectively. Lastly, during the initial UST removal and over-excavation, soil removed during the excavation was stockpiled on site. ACEH has been unable to find any information or documentation related to either the sampling of the stockpile or possible offsite soil disposal. Please provide the appropriate documentation regarding the status of stockpiled soil. If excavated soil was used as backfill material, ACEH may require the re-excavation and off site disposal of the soil.

b. During tank removal and excavation activities at former UST #133, one soil sample was collected on the sidewall of the excavation and soil analytical data tested 1,100 mg/kg TPHd and 52 mg/kg TPHg. No groundwater sample was collected during tank removal activities. Results of soil screening conducted during the over-excavation indicated elevated concentrations of volitiles organic compounds (VOCs) in the soil. Consequently, a decision was made to return at a later date and determine the extent of soil contamination. However, no further investigation or over-excavation was completed at this location, as proposed during the original UST removal.

ACEH recommends that an investigation in the vicinity of former UST #133 be conducted to determine the extent of pollution in both soil and groundwater. During previous investigations it appears that no soil samples were collected below 5 feet bgs. ACEH requests soil samples be collected at the capillary fringe, immediately above the zone where first water is identified, any interval where stating, odor, or elevated PID readings occur and at 12 feet bgs. All soil samples are to be analyzed for TPHg, TPHd, TPHmo, BTEX and MtBE, respectively. Should the subsurface investigation conclude that additional soil contamination exists in the vicinity of former UST #133 over-excavation of contaminated soil may be needed. Lastly, during the initial UST removal and over-excavation, soil removed during the excavation was stockpiled on site. ACEH has been unable to find any information or documentation related to either the sampling of the stockpile or possible offsite soil disposal. Please provide the appropriate documentation regarding the status of stockpiled soil. If excavated soil was used as backfill material, ACEH may require the re-excavation and off site disposal of the soil.

c. Soil Samples collected during the tank removal at former UST #137 tested 38,000 mg/kg TPHd and 2.2 mg/kg benzene. No over-excavation at this location occurred during the original tank removal due to the close proximity of underground utilities. A limited site assessment with associated soil and groundwater sampling conducted in 2001 confirmed the presence petroleum hydrocarbons in the vicinity of the former UST #137. Chemical analytical data collected from the soil borings tested maximum concentrations of TPHmo and TPHd 4,900 mg/kg, 340 mg/kg. Benzene and MtBE were not detected above laboratory detection limits.

ACEH recommends that an investigation in the vicinity of former UST #137 be conducted to determine the extent of pollution in both soil and groundwater. During previous investigations it appears that no soil samples were collected below 5 feet bgs. ACEH requests soil samples be collected at the capillary fringe, immediately above the zone where first water is identified, any interval where stating, odor, or elevated PID readings occur and at 12 feet bgs. All soil samples are to be analyzed for TPHg, TPHd, TPHmo, BTEX and MtBE, respectively. Lastly, during the initial UST removal and over-excavation, soil removed during the excavation was stockpiled on site. ACEH has been unable to find any information or documentation related to

either the sampling of the stockpile or possible offsite soil disposal. Please provide the appropriate documentation regarding the status of stockpiled soil. If excavated soil was used as backfill material, ACEH may require the re-excavation and off site disposal of the soil.

Preferential Pathway/Utility Corridor Survey. We request that you complete the utility survey for the site and evaluate whether any underground utilities could potentially act as preferential pathways for contaminant migration. The purpose of the survey is to determine the potential of petroleum hydrocarbons encountering a preferential pathway, resulting in the dispersion of contamination in subsurface. Please show the location of utilities that may act as preferential pathways along with the high and low depths to groundwater elevation at the site. In particular, please focus on the sanitary sewer line adjacent to former UST #137. Please include graphics (plan view, cross-sections, etc.) to depict the results of your analysis along with your evaluation of whether contamination can encounter/migrate along preferential pathways at this site. Please present your results in the preferential pathway and utility study requested below.

TECHNICAL REPORT REQUEST

Please submit technical reports to Alameda County Environmental Health (Attention: Mr. Steven Plunkett), according to the following schedule:

- **July 1, 2006** – Soil and Groundwater Investigation and Monitoring Well Replacement Work Plan
- **June 15, 2006** – Preferential Pathway and Utilitiy Corridor Study
- **August 15, 2006** – Quarterly Groundwater Monitoring Reports Third Quarter 2006
- **November 15, 2006** – Quarterly Groundwater Monitoring Reports Fourth Quarter 2006
- **February 15, 2006** – Quarterly Groundwater Monitoring Reports First Quarter 2007
- **May 15, 2006** – Quarterly Groundwater Monitoring Reports Second Quarter 2007

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

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. Instructions for submission of electronic documents to the Alameda County Environmental Cleanup Oversight Program ftp site are provided on the attached "Electronic Report Upload (ftp) Instructions." Please do not submit reports as attachments to electronic mail.

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. Submission of reports to the Geotracker website does not fulfill the

requirement to submit documents to the Alameda County ftp site. In September 2004, the SWRCB adopted regulations that require electronic submittal of information for 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 monitor wells, and other data to the Geotracker database over the Internet. Beginning July 1, 2005, electronic submittal of a complete copy of all necessary reports was required in Geotracker (in PDF format). Please visit the SWRCB website for more information on these requirements (http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/ust/cleanup/electronic_reporting).

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.

If you have any questions, please call me at (510) 383-1767.

Sincerely,

Steven Plunkett
Hazardous Materials Specialist

cc: Mr. Crispin Kraft
Bay Ship & Yacht Co.
2900 Main Street
Alameda, CA 94501

Mr. Stephen Osborne
Fugro West
1000 Broadway, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94607-4099

Ms. D. Heinze,
Port of Oakland
530 Water Street
Oakland, CA 94604-2064

Mr. Roger Greensfelder
1548 Jacob Avenue
San Jose, CA 95118

Donna Drogos, ACEH
Steven Plunkett, ACEH
File

11-14-01

ALAMEDA COUNTY
HEALTH CARE SERVICES
AGENCY
DAVID J. KEARS, Agency Director

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

November 13, 2001
StID 2765/RO0000483

Mr. John Berry
2900 Main St., Suite 100
Alameda, CA 94501

Re: Subsurface Investigations at 2900 Main St., Alameda CA 94501

Dear Mr. Berry:

Our office has received and reviewed the October 2001 Limited Site Assessment report for the above site prepared by Greensfelder and Associates. This report summarizes the past investigations of the three former underground tank areas and provides the results of the May 2001 soil and groundwater investigation of the tank areas near buildings 137 and 85. Previously, our office received the June 2001 monitoring report for MW-1, the well adjacent to the former building 137 tank. As you may be aware, MW-3, near the former building 85 tanks could not be found for sampling and MW-2, near building 133 contained free product and was not sampled. Some difficulty arose in the investigation of this area (near building 133) since the Port of Oakland was interested in widening the estuary in this area and this could impact this area.

Temporary borings were advanced around the former tanks near buildings 137 and 85. Both soil and grab groundwater samples were collected for analysis. The results, in general, indicate residual petroleum contamination in soil immediately below the former tanks has impacted the shallow groundwater. The contamination appears to be limited in lateral extent. Releases of this type typically are expected to bio-remediate over time. No immediate receptors are in jeopardy, therefore, groundwater monitoring is the recommended approach. It will be necessary to either locate or reinstall MW-3 to continue this approach. You may also want to consider some type of enhanced bio-remediation technique to enhance natural attenuation.

In regards to the former underground tank area near building 133, it appears that we can no longer wait until you reach some type of agreement with the Port of Oakland. Because the well in this area, MW-2, has observed free product on it and this area is on the estuary borderline there is a high likelihood that the release from the former tank is impacting the estuary. This area must be characterized and remediated as soon as possible. Please have your consultant provide a work plan to determine the lateral extent of petroleum contamination to soil and groundwater. In the meanwhile, please install an absorbent "sock" into MW-2. You should arrange to have this sock inspected and replaced on a regular basis until free product and hydrocarbon sheen are no longer observed in this well.

Please submit your characterization work plan and any plan to reinstall or bio-remediate from existing wells to our office within 30 days or no later than December 14, 2001.

Sincerely,

Barney M Chan

Barney M. Chan
Hazardous Materials Specialist

C: B. Chan, files
Ms. H. Mawhinney, 1548 Jacob Ave., San Jose, CA 95118
Ms. D. Heinze, Port of Oakland, 530 Water St., CA 94604-2064
Ms. S. Knieriem, SWRCB Cleanup Fund, 1001 I St., 17th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814-2828

3-2900MainSt

ALAMEDA COUNTY
HEALTH CARE SERVICES
AGENCY
DAVID J. KEARS, Agency Director

05-16-01

R0483

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

May 15, 2001
StID # 2765

Mr. John Berry
2900 Main St., Suite 100
Alameda, CA 94501

Re: Subsurface Investigation Near Building 133, 2900 Main St., Alameda CA 94501

Dear Mr. Berry:

It appears that you may have been waiting to proceed with your investigation in the area of Building 133 because you were in negotiation with the Port of Oakland. I have spoke with Ms. Diane Heinze of the Port and understand that their widening of the Inner Harbor project in this area will not impact the area near the former underground tank near Building 133. In fact a new bulkhead and additional fill will be brought in to enlarge the current waterfront boundary after the building is demolished. It appears that the previous Environmental Control Associates, Inc. (ECA) April 1, 1997 work plan should be revised to reflect the "new " shoreline available once the Port of Oakland project is complete. Ms. Heinze of the Port will be able to send you and your consultant a copy of their projected plans.

Please submit a new work plan to investigate the petroleum release near MW-2, Buildings 133 and 72, to our office within 30 days or no later than June 18, 2001. You are encouraged to seek reimbursement for this work with the Underground Tank Cleanup Fund.

You may contact me at (510) 567-6765 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Barney M Chan

Barney M. Chan
Hazardous Materials Specialist

C: B. Chan, files

WprqBld133-2900MainSt

05-10-01

ALAMEDA COUNTY
HEALTH CARE SERVICES
AGENCY
DAVID J. KEARS, Agency Director

R0483

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

May 9, 2001
StID # 2765

Mr. John Berry
2900 Main St., Suite 100
Alameda, CA 94501

Re: Subsurface Investigation Near Buildings 85 and 137, 2900 Main St., Alameda CA 94501

Dear Mr. Berry:

Our office received a facsimile from Greensfelder & Associates dated May 7, 2001 clarifying the amendment to their original August 1999 work plan. As you may recall, their April 1, 2000 initial clarification letter of this work plan added one additional boring within the two former tank pit areas for a total of twelve (12) borings. This additional sampling was approved conditionally by Mr. Larry Seto of this office in his May 5, 2000 letter. The May 7, 2001 transmittal clarifies the specific drilling, sampling and analytical methods.

Please be aware that in accordance with my February 2, 2001 letter, you should observe the following analytical requirements:

Samples taken near former tanks 85A/85B should be run for TPHg, BTEX, MTBE (EPA 8020) and EPA 8260 for confirmation if present, TPHd with silica gel cleanup, TPHmo in place of TOG and PNAs on the highest TPHd or TPHmo soil and groundwater sample.

Samples taken near former tank 137 should be run for TPHd with silica gel cleanup, TPHg, MTBE (EPA 8020) and EPA 8260 for confirmation if present, BTEX and TPHmo.

I understand this work is tentatively scheduled for Friday, May 18, 2001.

In regards to the investigation of the area near former 600 gallon diesel tank between Buildings 133 and 72, we are still waiting for a status report on when you will proceed with this investigation. Please be aware that you remain the responsible party for this investigation regardless of whether some settlement has been made with the Port of Oakland. My February 2, 2001 letter requested written clarification on the status of this area's investigaiton. You may recall, Environmental Control Associates, ECA, submitted an April 1, 1997 work plan for additional investigation of this area. Please provide a map of this area as it currently exists to see where additional sampling can occur. You should also have your current consultant provide a work plan for additional characterization of this area.

Lastly, you were requested to start monitoring of the three wells. This should start immediately and a monitoring report and the work plan for Building 133/72 area should be submitted within 45 days or no later than June 22, 2001. The State Clean-up Fund will be notified if you do not comply by this date. (Claim number 2367)

You may contact me at (510) 567-6765 if you have any comments or questions.

Sincerely,

Barney M Chan

Barney M. Chan
Hazardous Materials Specialist

C: B. Chan, files
Mr. Roger Greensfelder, 1548 Jacob Ave., San Jose, CA 95118
Ms. D. Heinze, Port of Oakland, 530 Water St., CA 94604-2064
Ms. S. Knieriem, SWRCB Cleanup Fund, 1001 I St., 17th Floor, Sacramento CA 95814-2828

2-2900MainSt

02-05-01

ALAMEDA COUNTY
HEALTH CARE SERVICES
AGENCY
DAVID J. KEARS, Agency Director

R0483

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

February 2, 2001
StID # 2765

Mr. John Berry
2900 Main St., Suite 100
Alameda, CA 94501

Re: Subsurface Investigation at Alameda Gateway, 2900 Main St., Alameda CA 94501

Dear Mr. Berry:

Please be advised that I have taken over the oversight of the above referenced site. I have discussed the status of the site with the former case worker, Mr. Larry Seto, Ms. Helen Mawhinney of Greensfelder and Associates (your consultant) and Ms. Diane Heinze of the Port of Oakland. This letter serves to clarify my understanding of the site and outline site requirements for you to remain in regulatory compliance.

A work plan for additional investigation in two of the three former underground tank areas, near Buildings 137 and 85, was approved by Mr. Seto in his May 5, 2000 letter. A total of twelve (12) shallow borings (six at each tank area) will be advanced around and within the former tank pits. A soil sample just above groundwater and one groundwater sample will be collected and tested from each boring. The samples collected near Building 85 will be analyzed for Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons as diesel and as gas, benzene, toluene, ethyl benzene and xylenes (BTEX), methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), total oil and grease and polynuclear aromatics (PNAs). The samples collected near Building 137 will be analyzed for Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons as diesel and as gasoline, BTEX and total oil and grease.

The following additional conditions should also be observed:

- Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons as motor oil should be substituted for Total Oil and Grease since this method is more reproducible and quantitative than Total Oil and Grease.
- Prior to running the samples (water or soil) for diesel and motor oil, please treat the sample with silica gel prior to analysis. This will tend to remove the polar non-hydrocarbon material that might tend to bias the results. Please have the laboratory run a spiked sample to verify no recovery problems would be expected from this treatment.
- The samples from near Building 137 should also be run for MTBE since gasoline was reported in the initial soil sample from the excavation. You may run the samples for BTEX and MTBE by EPA Method 8020 and confirm any reported MTBE using EPA Method 8260 or an equivalent.
- To minimize analytical costs, you may run only the highest reported TPHd/TPHmo sample in soil and groundwater for PNAs. This assumes any PNA found would be associated with these petroleum hydrocarbons.
- The borings may be advanced using "geoprobe" technology, a cost effective method.

I understand that this work was put on hold due a tenant's wine-making activity. Ms. Mawhinney stated that this work can now be scheduled and will inform me prior to this work.

The investigation near monitoring well MW-2 (Building133) has been put on-hold pending your legal resolution with the Port of Oakland et al. Please provide written clarification as to the status of your negotiation and a schedule for its resolution. Because of the presence of free product in this well, as soon as the liability for this area is resolved, a work plan for additional investigation of this area must be provided. Please copy Ms. Diane Heinze of the Port of Oakland on your correspondence regarding this matter.

Please resume groundwater monitoring at this site. It appears that the last monitoring event occurred in March of 1996. The exception to this is the recent monitoring of MW-2 in August 2000 performed by Subsurface Consultants for the Port of Oakland. Groundwater samples should be tested for TPH as motor oil, as diesel, as gasoline, BTEX and MTBE. The sample from MW-2 should also be tested for PNAs but can omit MTBE since it was non-detectable in the August 2000 sampling event. If your additional subsurface investigation can be done within this month (February), you may hold off monitoring until after this work is done and submit a combined monitoring and investigation report, otherwise, you should schedule a monitoring event no later than 30 days after receipt of this letter.

You are reminded that your eligibility to the State Clean-up Fund depends on your continual compliance with our office and the failure to comply may jeopardize future reimbursement.

You may contact me at (510) 567-6765 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Barney M Chan

Barney M. Chan
Hazardous Materials Specialist

C: B. Chan, files
Ms. H. Mawhinney, Greensfelder and Associates, 1548 Jacob Ave., San Jose, CA 95118
Ms. D. Heinze, Port of Oakland, 530 Water St., Oakland CA 94604-2064
Ms. S. Knieriem, SWRCB Cleanup Fund, 1001 I St., 17th Floor, Sacramento CA 95814-2828

2900MainSt

ALAMEDA COUNTY
HEALTH CARE SERVICES
AGENCY
DAVID J. KEARS, Agency Director

11-17-00

R0483

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

November 16, 2000

Mr. John Beery
2900 Main Street, Suite 100
Alameda, CA 94501
STID 2765

RE: Alameda Gateway, 2900 Main Street, Alameda, CA 94501

Dear Mr. Beery:

I spoke to you on October 18, 2000 concerning the submittal of a subsurface workplan to delineate the extent of hydrocarbon contamination in the area near monitoring well MW-2. I was informed your consultant was preparing this workplan. As of this date, I have not received this workplan. Please contact me within 5 days of the receipt of this letter and inform me when this workplan will be available for my review.

I am being transferred to another position within my Department. Effective January 2, 2000, Mr. Barney Chan @ 567-6765 will be the new caseworker overseeing this site

If you have any questions, please contact me at (510) 567-6774.

Sincerely,

Larry Seto
Sr. Hazardous Materials Specialist

Cc: Barney Chan, Alameda County Environmental Health
Diane Heinze, Port of Oakland, 530 Water Street, Oakland, CA 94607
Files

SENT 9-15-2000

ALAMEDA COUNTY
HEALTH CARE SERVICES
AGENCY
DAVID J. KEARS, Agency Director

R0483

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

September 14, 2000

Mr. John Beery
2900 Main Street, Suite 100
Alameda, CA 94501
STID 2765

RE: Alameda Gateway, 2900 Main Street, Alameda, CA 94501

Dear Mr. Beery:

In my letter dated May 5, 2000, I approved the Work Plan for Limited Site Assessment dated April 1, 2000 near Buildings 85 and 137. As of this date, I have not received a final report on your investigation results. Please submit this report within ten days of the receipt of this letter.

I met recently with Ms. Diane Heinze with the Port of Oakland (Port). The Port and The Army Corps of Engineers are involved with excavating the shoreline to widen the inner harbor turning basin. The Regional Water Quality Control Board, one of the permitting agencies for this project is concerned about existing contaminates at the above site. A groundwater sample (slight sheen observed on purged groundwater) collected by the Port from MW-2 (adjacent to Building 133) in August 2000 and analyzed by Curtis & Tompkins, a State Certified Laboratory, contained 140,000 ppb TPH(diesel) and 660 ppb TPH(gas) and 43 ppb Polyaromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs).

The Underground Storage Tank Removal Report dated June 1990 prepared by Mittelhauser Corporation identified after a 600 gallon diesel tank was removed (4/90) near Building 133, a sidewall soil sample was taken from the excavation. 1,100 ppm of TPH(diesel) was detected. The pit was therefore over-excavated approximately two feet to the east and four feet to the west. During the over-excavation activities, a vapor sniffer was utilized to estimate the level of contamination by collecting samples of the soil in glass jars and allowing the material to heat in the sun prior to testing. Using this approach, the concentration of vapors failed to decrease as the excavation was extended, and it was decided to return at a later date to investigate the full extent of the contaminated soil.

The site file identified monitoring well MW-2 was installed in August 1992. The most recent water sample collected from MW-2 by your consultant was on March 29, 1996 that contained 130,000 ppb total oil & grease, 130,000 ppb TPH(diesel) and 1,800 ppb TPH(gas). **A NOTICE OF VIOLATION dated May 28, 1996 was sent to you requesting a workplan to further characterize the elevated contaminant level in MW-2** (copy enclosed). **As of this date, this workplan has not been received. Please submit this workplan within 30 days of the receipt of this letter.** In addition, include in your workplan your propose monitoring and sampling schedule for monitoring wells MW-1, MW-2 and MW-3 that should start immediately.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (510) 567-6774.

Sincerely,

Larry Seto
Sr. Hazardous Materials Specialist

Enclosure(1) Notice of Violation dated May 28, 1996

Cc: Diane Heinze, Port of Oakland, 530 Water Street, Oakland, CA 94607
Beth Christian, Regional Water Quality Control Board, 1515 Clay Street, Suite 1400, Oakland, CA 94612
Files

ALAMEDA COUNTY
HEALTH CARE SERVICES
AGENCY
DAVID J. KEARS, Agency Director

G
Sent 5-8-
including CC's

PO 483

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

May 5, 2000

Ms. Robin Bezanson
Greensfelder and Associates
1548 Jacob Avenue
San Jose, CA 95118
STID 2765

RE: Alameda Gateway, 2900 Main Street, Alameda, CA 94501

Dear Ms. Bezanson:

I have reviewed the Maps for Boring Locations for the above site that was faxed to my office today. The drilling of these twelve (12) borings as identified in your Clarification of Work Plan for Limited Site Assessment dated April 1,2000 prepared by Greensfelder & Associates is acceptable with the following conditions:

1. Soil and groundwater samples collected near Building 85, former location of the gas and diesel tank must be tested for the presence of TPH(d), TPH(g), BTEX, MTBE, TOG and PNA's.

2. Soil and groundwater samples collected near Building 137, former location of the fuel oil tank must be analyzed for the presence of TPH(d), TPH(g), BTEX, and TOG.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (510) 567-6774.

Sincerely,

Larry Seto
Sr. Hazardous Materials Specialist

Cc: John Berry, Mariner Square & Associates, 2900 Main Street, Suite 100, Alameda, CA 94601
Files

Sent 4-18-2000
mailed 4/18/00

ALAMEDA COUNTY
HEALTH CARE SERVICES
AGENCY
DAVID J. KEARS, Agency Director

P0483

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

April 17, 2000

Ms. Helen Mawhinney
Greensfelder & Associates
1548 Jacob Avenue
San Jose, CA 95118
STID 2765

RE: Alameda Gateway, 2900 Main Street, Alameda, CA 94501

Dear Ms. Mawhinney:

A letter from this office dated September 29,1999 requested clarification for the Workplan for Limited Site Assessment dated August 1999 for the above site. As of this date, we have not received a response. This workplan has not been approved. Before work commences, this workplan must be approved.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (510) 567-6774.

Sincerely,

Larry Seto
Sr. Hazardous Materials Specialist

Cc: John Beery, Mariner Square & Associates, 2900 Main Street, Suite 100, Alameda, CA 94601
Files

ALAMEDA COUNTY
HEALTH CARE SERVICES
AGENCY
DAVID J. KEARS, Agency Director

RO483

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

September 29, 1999

Ms. Helen Mawhinney
Greensfelder & Associates
1548 Jacob Avenue
San Jose, CA 95118

RE: Alameda Gateway, 2900 Main Street, Alameda, CA 94501

Dear Ms. Mawhinney:

I have reviewed the Workplan for Limited Site Assessment for the above site dated August 1999 that was prepared by your office. I have left a couple of messages on your office answering machine, but have not received a return call. Please amend your workplan to address my concerns listed below:

1) Identify the suspected contaminates in each soil sample that will be submitted to the laboratory for analysis.

2) Soil samples B-1 through B-5 near Building 85 (tank 85B, 7,000 gallon gas tank) must be tested for TPH(gas), BTEX and MTBE

If you have any questions, please contact me at (510) 567-6774.

Sincerely,

Larry Seto
Sr. Hazardous Materials Specialist

Cc: John Beery, Mariner Square & Associates, 2900 Main Street, Suite 100, Alameda, CA 94601
Files

ALAMEDA COUNTY
HEALTH CARE SERVICES
AGENCY
DAVID J. KEARS, Agency Director

RO#483

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

April 8, 1997

Mr. John Beery
2236 Mariner Square
Alameda, CA 94501

STID 2765

Re: Work plan for investigations at 2900 Main Street, Alameda, California

Dear Mr. Beery,

This office has reviewed Environmental Control Associates, Inc.'s work plan, dated April 1, 1997, for investigations at the above site. This work plan is acceptable to this office. This work plan should be implemented within 45 days of the date of this letter. Please notify this office at least one week in advance of implementing the work plan. Per the work plan, a letter report will be submitted following the field work summarizing Phase I of the proposed investigations. This letter report should be submitted to this office within 45 days after completing field activities.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at (510) 567-6763.

Sincerely,

Juliet Shin
Senior Hazardous Materials Specialist

cc: Timothy B. Tyler
Environmental Control Associates, Inc.
P.O. Box 52
Tahoe City, CA 96145

Chief

ALAMEDA COUNTY
HEALTH CARE SERVICES
AGENCY
DAVID J. KEARS, Agency Director

RO# 483

Alameda County CC4580
Environmental Health Services
1131 Harbor Bay Pkwy., #250
Alameda CA 94502-6577
(510)567-6700 FAX(510)337-9335

May 28, 1996

Mr. John Beery
2236 Mariner Square
Alameda, CA 94501

STID 2765

Re: Required investigations at Alameda Gateway, located at 2900 Main St., Alameda, CA

NOTICE OF VIOLATION

Dear Mr. Beery,

On January 29, 1996, this office sent you a letter requiring the submittal of a work plan addressing further characterization of the elevated contaminant levels identified in Well MW-2 (please refer to attached copy of letter). This work plan was due to this office by May 10, 1996. To date, this office has not received this work plan or any correspondence regarding the status of this work plan.

Per Article 11 Title 22 California Code of Regulations, you are required to submit a work plan, addressing the concerns outlined in the January 29, 1996 letter, to this office **within 45 days of the date of this letter (i.e., by July 9, 1996)**. Any extensions, or modifications of the required task, shall be requested in writing and approved by this agency.

Finally, the last quarterly monitoring report in our files documents the December 1995 sampling event at the site. The monitoring report documenting the March 1996 sampling event is currently due to this office.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me at (510) 567-6763.

Sincerely,

Juliet Shin
Senior Hazardous Materials Specialist

cc: Cheryl Gordon
SWRCB
Division of Clean Water Programs
Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Fund
P.O. Box 944212
Sacramento, CA 94244-2120

Acting Chief-File

ALAMEDA COUNTY
HEALTH CARE SERVICES
AGENCY
DAVID J. KEARS, Agency Director

RO# 483

ARNOLD PERKINS, DIRECTOR
RAFAT A. SHAHID, DEPUTY DIRECTOR

March 22, 1996

Alameda County Environmental Health
1131 Harbor Bay Parkway, Suite 250
Alameda, CA 94502-6577
(510)567-6700 FAX (510)337-9335 cc:458

Mr. John Beery
2236 Mariner Square
Alameda, CA 94501

STID 2765

Re: Investigations at the Alameda Gateway site, located at 2900 Main St., Alameda, California

Dear Mr. Beery,

This office has completed review of Smith Environmental Technologies' Groundwater Sampling Report, dated January 29, 1996. Elevated levels of Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons as diesel (TPHd) at 20,000 parts per billion (ppb), TPH as gasoline (TPHg) at 23,000 ppb, and Total Oil & Grease (O&G) at 30,000 ppb were identified in the groundwater sample collected from Well MW-2. Lower levels of these contaminants have been identified in Wells MW-1 and MW-3.

According to a tidal influence study conducted at the site by Subsurface Consultants in September 1992, the groundwater level in Well MW-2 was shown to vary up to 2 feet between high and low tides while the groundwater levels in Wells MW-1 and MW-3 were not affected by the tidal changes. This office is concerned about potential impacts to surface water based on the close proximity of Well MW-2 to the shoreline (100 to 200-feet), the elevated contaminant levels observed in this well, and the fact that Well MW-2 is tidally influenced. Additionally, there appears to be an on-going source for the observed TPHd contamination, due to the fact that TPHd concentrations in Well MW-2 have steadily increased since monitoring began in 1992 (from 820ppb to 20,000ppb).

Based on the above information, this office is requesting that further investigations be conducted to delineate the extent of the contamination observed in Well MW-2. If a release to the adjacent surface waters is identified, you will be required to abate further impact to the surface waters and/or prepare a risk assessment showing that the quantity/concentrations being released to the surface waters will not pose a threat to human health or the environment.

A work plan addressing the above concerns should be submitted in conjunction with the next quarterly groundwater monitoring report, due to this office by May 10, 1996.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at (510) 567-6763.

RO# 483

Sincerely,

Juliet Shin
Senior Hazardous Materials Specialist

cc: Cheryl Gordon
SWRCB
Division of Clean Water Programs
Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Fund
P.O. Box 944212
Sacramento, CA 94244-2120

Acting Chief-File

ALAMEDA COUNTY
HEALTH CARE SERVICES
AGENCY
DAVID J. KEARS, Agency Director

R0483

RAFAT A. SHAHID, DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
1131 Harbor Bay Parkway
Alameda, CA 94502-6577
(510) 567-6777

October 11, 1995

Mr. John Beery
2236 Mariner Square
Alameda, CA 94501

STID 2765

Re: Investigations at the Alameda Gateway site, located at 2900 Main Street, Alameda, California

NOTICE OF VIOLATION

Dear Mr. Beery,

On December 9, 1994 and June 20, 1995, this office sent you a letter requiring continued groundwater monitoring at the above site (Please refer to the attached copies). Since these letters were issued, no correspondence was provided to this office indicating that additional groundwater monitoring had been conducted at the site.

Four underground storage tanks (USTs), one gasoline, one fuel oil, and two diesel USTs, were removed from the above site on April 11, 1990. Holes were noted in one of the diesel USTs and the fuel oil UST. Due to the elevated levels of diesel and gas identified in soil and "grab" groundwater samples, three monitoring wells were installed at the site. Our records show that these wells were sampled on 8/13/92, 11/25/92, and 2/19/93. The analysis results from these quarterly groundwater sampling events identified elevated levels of Total Extractable Hydrocarbons (TEH) consistently in all three wells, and elevated levels of Oil & Grease in Well MW-2.

Based on the results of the previously conducted monitoring events, this office is currently requesting that one additional round of groundwater samples be collected from all three of the on-site monitoring wells. These groundwater samples shall be analyzed for Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons as diesel (TPHd), TPH as gasoline, kerosene, motor oil, Oil & Grease, BTEX, and Polynuclear Aromatics. Additionally, a Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) analysis should be conducted on one of the water samples to confirm whether the groundwater is potentially potable. After reviewing the laboratory results of this additional sampling event, this Department, in conjunction with your office, will try and establish what additional work, if any, will be required at the site after attempting to answer the following questions:

- Are the elevated levels of Oil & Grease, observed adjacent to one of the former diesel USTs, and elevated levels of TEH resulting from an on-site source, or could it be a regional problem?

- If the site is a contributing source to the observed groundwater contaminant plume, is this plume significantly migrating off site and into the Harbor, and could the contaminant concentrations adversely impact aquatic life or human health?

- Well MW-3 appears to be screening from approximately 3- to 12-feet below ground surface (bgs), however, the water table in this well was observed to be as shallow as 0.15-feet bgs in the last sampling event. Would the discrepancy in the water table and screened interval of this well create a problem in accurately assessing the contaminant concentrations in the vicinity of Well MW-3?

This office is requesting that the next quarterly groundwater sampling event be conducted within 30 days of the date of this letter, i.e., by November 8, 1995, and that a report documenting this sampling event be submitted to this office within 30 days after completing field activities.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at (510) 567-6763.

Sincerely,

Juliet Shin
Senior Hazardous Materials Specialist

cc: Cheryl Gordon
State Water Resources Control Board
Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Fund
P.O. Box 944212
Sacramento, CA 94244-2120

Gil Jensen, Alameda County District Attorney's Office

Acting Chief-File

ALAMEDA COUNTY
HEALTH CARE SERVICES
AGENCY
DAVID J. KEARS, Agency Director

RAFAT A. SHAHID, Assistant Agency Director

R0483

ALAMEDA COUNTY-ENV. HEALTH DEPT.
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DIV.
1131 HARBOR BAY PKWY., #250
ALAMEDA CA 94502-6577
(510)567-6700

June 20, 1995

Mr. John Beery
2236 Mariner Square
Alameda, CA 94501

STID 2765

Re: Required investigations for Alameda Gateway, located at 2900 Main Street, Alameda, California

Dear Mr. Beery,

Based on a financial review of your State Trust Fund claim by the State Board, you may be eligible to receive a "Letter of Commitment" for this fund. However, during a recent file review, the State determined that you are not currently in compliance with the requirements for investigations and cleanup at your site.

Four underground storage tanks (USTs), one gasoline, one fuel oil, and two diesel tanks, were removed from the above site. Due to elevated levels of diesel identified in soil samples and elevated levels of gasoline identified in the tank water sample, three monitoring wells were installed at the site. Our records show that these wells were monitored on 8/13/92, 11/25/92, and 2/19/93. Elevated levels of diesel were identified in each of these sampling events. It appears that the identified contamination is attributable to your former tanks.

On December 9, 1994, a letter from this Department formally required you to continue quarterly ground water monitoring, water level measurements, and reporting for the site. Since that letter was issued, this office has not received any additional quarterly groundwater monitoring reports. You are required to resume quarterly ground water monitoring and submit a report to this office **within 90 days of the date of this letter**, or by September 12, 1995. **If you do not comply with our request within the given timeframe, the State Board cannot provide you with a "Letter of Commitment" for funding, and steps may be taken to remove your claim from the underground storage tank cleanup fund priority list.**

If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at (510) 567-6763.

Sincerely,

Juliet Shin
Senior Hazardous Materials Specialist

cc: File

ALAMEDA COUNTY
HEALTH CARE SERVICES
AGENCY
DAVID J. KEARS, Agency Director

RAFAT A. SHAHID, ASST. AGENCY DIRECTOR

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
State Water Resources Control Board
Division of Clean Water Programs
UST Local Oversight Program
80 Swan Way, Rm 200
Oakland, CA 94621
(510) 271-4530

R0483

November 8, 1992

John Berry
Alameda Gateway, Ltd.
2900 Main St.
Alameda, CA 94501

STID 2765

RE: Ground water investigations at 2900 Main Street, Alameda, California

Dear Mr. Berry,

This office received the Ground Water Investigation Report, dated November 4, 1992, for the above site. Analysis of both soil and ground water samples collected from all three wells identified elevated levels of Total Extractable Hydrocarbons (TEH) and Total Oil and Grease (TOG). Additionally, lead was identified in the ground water samples collected from Well MW-3 at 360 ppb, which exceeds both state and federal drinking water standards.

Per Section 2652, Title 23, California Code of Regulations, quarterly ground water monitoring reports, which include water level measurements, shall continue to be submitted until this site qualifies for final RWQCB "sign-off". The ground water samples should continue to be analyzed for TOG, TEH as diesel, Total Volatile Hydrocarbons as gasoline, benzene, toluene, xylene, ethyl benzene, and lead.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at (510) 271-4530.

Sincerely,

Juliet Shin

Juliet Shin
Hazardous Materials Specialist

cc: Richard Hiett, RWQCB

Robert La Grone, Alameda Fire Dept.

Sean O. Carson
Subsurface Consultants, Inc.
171-12th St., Ste. 201
Oakland, CA 94607

Edgar Howell-File (JS)

ALAMEDA COUNTY
HEALTH CARE SERVICES
AGENCY
DAVID J. KEARS, Agency Director

R0483

RAFAT A. SHAHID, ASST. AGENCY DIRECTOR

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
State Water Resources Control Board
Division of Clean Water Programs
UST Local Oversight Program
80 Swan Way, Rm 200
Oakland, CA 94621
(510) 271-4530

August 17, 1992

John Berry
Alameda Gateway, Ltd.
2900 Main St.
Alameda, CA 94501

STID 2765

RE: Work plan for Alameda Gateway, Ltd., located at 2900 Main St., Alameda, California

Dear Mr. Berry,

This office reviewed the work plan, dated July 1, 1992, for the soil and ground water investigations at the above site.

Per the conversation between Ms. Juliet Shin, Alameda County Hazardous Materials Specialist, and Sean Carson, Subsurface Consultants, on July 7, 1992, analysis for total lead should be included in the initial soil and ground water testing for the former tanks 85A and 85B.

Please be reminded that the monitoring wells are required to be surveyed to 0.01 foot accuracy. Additionally, water level measurements are to be collected monthly for 3 consecutive months, and then quarterly thereafter, if no widely varying gradients are observed.

With the inclusion and implementation of the above requirements, this office approves of the work plan.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact Ms. Juliet Shin at (510) 271-4530.

Sincerely,

Scott O. Seery, CHMM
Senior Hazardous Materials Specialist

cc: Richard Hiett, RWQCB

Robert La Grone, Alameda Fire Dept.

Sean O. Carson
Subsurface Consultants, Inc.
171 12th Street, Std 201
Oakland, California 94607

Edgar Howell-File (JS)

ALAMEDA COUNTY
HEALTH CARE SERVICES
AGENCY
DAVID J. KEARS, Agency Director

R0483

RAFAT A. SHAHID, Assistant Agency Director

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
Hazardous Materials Division
80 Swan Way, Rm. 200
Oakland, CA 94621
(510) 271-4320

May 26, 1992

John Berry
Alameda Gateway, Ltd.
2900 Main St.
Alameda, CA 94501

STID 2765

RE: Required investigations at Alameda Gateway, Ltd., located at 2900 Main St., Alameda, California

Dear Mr. Berry,

Four underground storage tanks (two 600-gallon diesel tanks (Tanks 85A and 133), one 7,000-gallon gasoline tank (Tank 85B), and one 1,100-gallon fuel oil tank (Tank 137)) were removed from the above site on April 11, 1990. Analysis of soil samples collected from the sidewalls of tank pits 133 and 137 identified concentrations of Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH) as diesel up to 1,100 parts per million (ppm) and 38,000 ppm. Additionally, a groundwater sample collected from tank pit 85A and 85B exhibited 3,300 parts per billion (ppb) TPH as gasoline and 37 ppb benzene.

Guidelines established by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) require that a groundwater investigation be conducted whenever an unauthorized release of product is suspected from an underground storage tank. The levels of soil contamination associated with the above tanks and the shallow groundwater beneath the site (observed to be approximately 3 feet below ground surface) would indicate that such an event has occurred.

You are required to conduct a Preliminary Site Assessment (PSA) to determine the lateral and vertical extent and severity of latent soil and groundwater contamination which may have resulted from the release at the site. The information gathered by the PSA will be used to determine an appropriate course of action to remediate the site, if deemed necessary. The PSA must be conducted in accordance with the RWQCB Staff Recommendations for the Initial Evaluation and Investigation of Underground Tanks. The major elements of such an investigation are summarized in the attached **Appendix A.** The major elements of the guidelines include, but are not limited to, the following:

John Berry
RE: Alameda Gateway, 2900 Main St.
May 26, 1992

- At least one groundwater monitoring well must be installed within 10 feet of each of the tank pits, oriented in the confirmed downgradient direction relative to groundwater flow. The groundwater gradient for a given site is to be determined by data derived from three wells placed in a triangular form. During the installation of these wells soil samples are to be collected at five foot depth intervals and any significant changes in lithology until groundwater is reached.

- Subsequent to the installation of the monitoring wells, these wells must be surveyed to an established benchmark, with an accuracy of 0.01 foot. Additionally, groundwater elevations are to be measured monthly for 12 consecutive months and then quarterly thereafter. Groundwater samples are to be collected and analyzed quarterly. Both soil and groundwater samples must be analyzed for the appropriate fuel contaminants listed in Table 2 of the RWQCB's Staff Recommendations for the Initial Evaluation and Investigation of Underground Tanks.

In order to proceed with a site investigation, you should obtain professional services of a reputable environmental consultant. Your responsibility is to have the consultant submit for review a PSA proposal outlining planned activities pertinent to meeting the criteria broadly outlined in this letter and the attached Appendix A.

This Department will oversee the assessment and remediation of your site. Our oversight will include the review of and comment on work proposals and technical guidance on appropriate investigative approaches and monitoring schedules. The issuance of well drilling permits, however, will be through the Alameda County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Zone 7, in Pleasanton. The RWQCB may choose to take over as lead agency if it is determined following the completion of the initial assessment that there has been a substantial impact to groundwater.

The PSA proposal is due within 45 days of the date of this letter. Once the proposal is approved, field work should commence within 60 days. A report must be submitted within 45 days after the completion of this phase of work at the site. Subsequent reports

John Berry
RE: Alameda Gateway, 2900 Main St.
May 26, 1992

are to be submitted quarterly until this site qualifies for final RWQCB "sign-off". Such quarterly reports are due the first day of the second month of each subsequent quarter.

The referenced initial and quarterly reports must describe the status of the investigation and must include, among others, the following elements:

- Details and results of all work performed during the designated period of time: records of field observations and data, boring and well construction logs, water level data, chain-of-custody forms, laboratory results for all samples collected and analyzed, tabulations of free product thicknesses and dissolved fractions, etc.
- Status of groundwater contamination characterization
- Interpretation of results: water level contour maps showing gradients, free and dissolved product plume definition maps for each target component, geologic cross sections, etc.
- Recommendations or plans for additional investigative work of remediation

All reports and proposals must be submitted under seal of a California-Registered Geologist, -Certified Engineering Geologist, or -Registered Civil Engineer. Please include a statement of qualifications for each lead professional involved with this project.

Please be advised that this is a formal request for technical reports pursuant to California Water Code Section 13267 (b). Any extensions of the stated deadlines, or modifications of the required tasks, must be confirmed in writing by either this agency or RWQCB.

The need for any follow-up investigative or remedial actions at this site will be based upon the data derived from the initial investigations.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact Juliet Shin at (510) 271-4320.

Sincerely,

Scott O. Seery, CHMM
Senior Hazardous Materials Specialist

Attachment

cc: Richard Hiett, RWQCB

Richard Quarante, Alameda Fire Dept.

File (JS)