PAFAT A SHAFID, Assistant Agency Director

ALAMEDA COUNTY CC4580
DEPT. OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DIVISION
1131 HARBOR BAY PKWY., #250
ALAMEDA CA 94502-6577

REMEDIAL ACTION COMPLETION CERTIFICATION

StID 1123 - 1401 E. 14th Street, Oakland 94606

September 16, 1994

Mr. David Deruiter P.O.Box 2308 Berkeley, CA 94702

Mr. Lun H. Wong 234 Balboa St San Francisco, CA 94118

Dear Sirs:

This letter confirms the completion of site investigation and remedial action for the four former underground storage tanks (two 6K, and two 100 gallon mineral spirit tanks) removed from the above site on October 3, 1989.

Based upon the available information and with the provision that the information provided to this agency was accurate and representative of site conditions, no further action related to the underground tank release is required.

This notice is issued pursuant to a regulation contained in Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 16, Section 2721(e) of the California Code of Regulations. Please contact Ms. Eva Chu at (510) 567-6700 if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Very truly yours,

Pfes. Shul

Rafat A. Shahid, Director

cc: Edgar B. Howell, Chief, Hazardous Materials Division Kevin Graves, RWQCB Mike Harper, SWRCB (with attachment)

files (davlin2)

CAUFORNIA REGIONAL WATER

SEP 0 1. 1994 VS GRADITY COMIROL BOARD

CASE CLOSURE SUMMARY Leaking Underground Fuel Storage Tank Program

AGENCY INFORMATION I.

August 29, 1994:

Agency name:

Alameda County-HazMat Address: 80 Swan Wy., Rm 200

City/State/Zip: Oakland

Phone: (510) 567-6700

Responsible staff person: Eva Chu

Title: Hazardous Materials Spec.

CASE INFORMATION II.

Site facility name: Davlin Paint Co.

Site facility address: 1401 E. 14th St, Oakland 94606

RB LUSTIS Case No: N/A Local Case No./LOP Case No.: 1123 URF filing date: 11/30/89 SWEEPS No: N/A

Responsible Parties:

Addresses:

Phone Numbers:

1. David Deruiter

P.O. Box 2308, Berkeley 94702

2. Lun H & Sonia Wong 234 Balboa St, San Francisco 94118

Tank No:	Size in gal.:	<u>Contents:</u>	<pre>Closed in-place or removed?:</pre>	<u>Date:</u>	
1 2 3	6,000 6,000 100 100	Mineral Spirit Mineral Spirit Mineral Spirit Mineral Spirit	Removed Removed Removed Removed	10/3/89 10/3/89 10/3/89 10/3/89	

RELEASE AND SITE CHARACTERIZATION INFORMATION III.

Cause and type of release: Possibly overfilling of UST

Site characterization complete? YES

Date approved by oversight agency: 7/22/94

Number: 4 YES Monitoring Wells installed?

Proper screened interval? YES

Highest GW depth below ground surface: 13.41 Lowest depth: 14.74

Flow direction: Assumed westerly, toward S.F. Bay

Most sensitive current use: Unknown

Aquifer name: Are drinking water wells affected? NO Is surface water affected? NO Nearest affected SW name: Off-site beneficial use impacts (addresses/locations): None

Report(s) on file? YES Where is report(s) filed? Alameda County 1131 Harbor Bay Pkwy Alameda, CA 94502

Treatment and Disposal of Affected Material:

<u>Material</u>	<u>Amount</u> (include units)	Action (Treatment or Disposal w/destination)	<u>Date</u>
Tank Piping	4 USTs	H & H Shipping	10/3/89
Free Product Soil Groundwater Barrels	1,200 gal. rinsea 40 <i>cy</i>	te H & H Shipping Forward L.F.	10/3/89 2/13/90

Maximum Documented Contaminant	Contaminant Concentrati Soil (ppm) Before After	Water (•
TPH (Gas) TPH (Diesel)	NA	850	ИD
Benzene Toluene Ethylbenzene Xylenes	30 ND ND 120	1.2 1.0 .79 2.6	ND ND ND
Oil & Grease Heavy metals Pb Other Mineral Spir VOCs	.76 Pits 410 ND		

Comments (Depth of Remediation, etc.):

Both tank pits were overexcavated up to 3 feet in depth, but confirmatory soil samples were not collected.

IV. CLOSURE

Does completed corrective action protect existing beneficial uses per the Regional Board Basin Plan? Yes
Does completed corrective action protect potential beneficial uses per the Regional Board Basin Plan? Yes
Does corrective action protect public health for current land use? YES
Site management requirements: None

Should corrective action be reviewed if land use changes? YES
Monitoring wells Decommissioned: No
Number Decommissioned: None, pending site closure Number Retained: 4
List enforcement actions taken: None

List enforcement actions rescinded: None

V. LOCAL AGENCY REPRESENTATIVE DATA

Name: Eva Chu

Title: Haz Mat Specialist

Signature: Joule

Date: 8/29/94

Reviewed by

Name:

Tom Peacock

Signature: Mund Jean

Name: Jennifer Eberle

Signature:

5

RWQC# NOTIFICATION

Date Submitted to RB: 8/3/(q+

RWQCB Staff Name; Kevin Graves

Signature: Where

Title: Supervising HMS

Date: 8/29/94

Title: Haz Mat Specialist

Date: 8-30-94

RB Response: Approved

Title: AWRCE

Date: 9/7/94

VII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS, DATA, ETC.

Four mineral spirit USTs were removed in October 1989, two 6K tanks in a large pit, and two 100 gallon USTs in a smaller pit. Initial soil samples revealed up to 410 ppm and 340 ppm TPH as mineral spirit in the large and small pit, respectively. The Traverse Group Inc reported that the large pit was overexcavated an additional 3' in depth, and immediately backfilled with "clean" overburden and with clean sand fill. The small pit was also overexcavated to remove obviously contaminated soil and backfilled with clean sand. No confirmatory pit samples were collected after either overexcavation.

In June 1991 three monitoring wells were installed at the site. After four consecutive quarterly sampling events, low levels of TPH-G and BTEX were detected (in June and September 1991). Because the three wells were installed in an approximate straight line, a fourth well was installed in May 1994 to verify groundwater flow direction. All four wells were advanced through fill material, from the surface to 15' depth, resulting in possible anomolies in groundwater elevation measurements. That is, exact groundwater flow direction may be imposible to verify. However, regional flow direction is westerly, toward the Bay.

With the proximity of wells MW-1 and MW-2 to the pits, and with depth to water at 13.41 - 14.74', and within fill material, any significant release of fuel to groundwater should have been detected in these wells. It appears source removal was adequate and groundwater does not appear to be significantly impacted by the fuel release at this site.