

April 4, 2008

Mr. Francis Rush  
c/o Rush Property Group, LLC  
2200 Adeline Street, Suite 350  
Oakland, California 94607

RE: Revised Work Plan - Subsurface Investigation  
1549 32<sup>nd</sup> Street, Oakland, California  
*ACC Project No. 6875-001.01*

Dear Mr. Rush:

ACC Environmental Consultants, Inc., (ACC) presents this Revised Additional Subsurface Investigation Work Plan to perform soil and groundwater investigation at 1549 32<sup>nd</sup> Street, Oakland, California (Site). The Work Plan has been revised to incorporate decisions made during discussions held with the Regional Water Quality Control Board and Alameda County Health Care Services on April 2, 2008.

To facilitate Alameda County Health Care Services (ACHCSA) review, an electronic copy of this Work Plan will be uploaded to ACHCSA's database and one copy emailed directly to Mr. Steven Plunkett for review and comment.

If you have any questions concerning this Work Plan, please call me at (510) 638-8400, ext. 109 or email me at [ddement@accenv.com](mailto:ddement@accenv.com).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'David R. DeMent'.

David R. DeMent, PG, REA II  
Division Manager / Senior Geologist

/krb:drd

Attachments

cc: Mr. Stephen Plunkett, ACHCSA (1 copy)



**REVISED WORK PLAN  
ADDITIONAL SUBSURFACE SOIL AND  
GROUNDWATER INVESTIGATION**

**1549 32<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Oakland, California**

*ACC Project Number: 6875-001.01*

Prepared for:

Mr. Francis Rush  
c/o Rush Property Group, LLC  
2200 Adeline Street, Suite 350  
Oakland, California 94607


April 4, 2008

Prepared by:

Ken Blume  
Project Administrator

Reviewed by:

David R. DeMent, PG, REA II  
Division Manager / Senior Geologist



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
<b>2.0 BACKGROUND</b> .....	1
2.1 Previous Site Investigation .....	2
2.2 Verification Site Investigation .....	5
2.3 Remedial Soil Removal .....	9
2.4 Confirmation Sampling.....	10
2.5 Subsurface Conditions .....	12
<b>3.0 PROPOSED SCOPE OF WORK</b> .....	13
3.1 Project Scoping .....	13
3.2 Conceptual Site Model.....	16
3.3 Rationale for Sampling Strategy .....	17
3.4 Sampling Methods .....	18
3.5 Data Evaluation.....	21
3.6 Quality Assurance and Quality Control Measures.....	21
<b>4.0 HEALTH AND SAFETY PLAN</b> .....	21
<b>5.0 REPORT PREPARATION</b> .....	22

### FIGURES

Figure 1 – Site Location Map

Figure 2 – Proposed Soil Boring Location Map

### APPENDICES

1 – Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps

2 – Aerial Photographs

**REVISED WORK PLAN  
ADDITIONAL SUBSURFACE SOIL AND  
GROUNDWATER INVESTIGATION**

**1549 32<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Oakland, California**

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

ACC Environmental Consultants, Inc. (ACC) ACC Environmental Consultants, Inc., (ACC) has prepared this Work Plan to perform a subsurface investigation to address regulatory concerns for 1549 32<sup>nd</sup> Street, California (Site). The Site formerly operated as a steel foundry that heat-treated metal products, and the Client is pursuing full site closure from the Alameda County Health Care Services Agency (ACHCSA) as the lead regulatory agency.

ACC previously prepared and submitted a *Request for Regulatory Closure Summary* dated August 7, 2006 that summarized previous subsurface investigation and remediation work at the Site, and prepared an *Addendum to Request for Regulatory Closure Summary* dated December 14, 2006 that further elaborated on the issue of volatile organic compounds and perceived data gaps. ACHCSA subsequently responded with a request for additional investigation in a letter dated March 27, 2007 and a revised request dated July 17, 2007. In a meeting conducted April 2, 2007, Site concerns were discussed and the request for additional investigation modified. This Revised Work Plan incorporates decisions made during the April 2, 2008 meeting and is intended to obtain the data necessary to justify full regulatory closure.

The specific goals of the work summarized in this Work Plan are to: 1) collect representative soil samples of imported soil to further characterize the quality of material used to backfill the excavations; 2) collect representative soil and grab groundwater samples on private property to the east of confirmation sidewall soil samples reporting elevated concentrations of constituents of concern; 3) further characterize the property known as 2885 Hannah Street on which operated a business reported to be a “Putty” or “Paint” factory; 4) log subsurface soils and first-encountered water-bearing zones to better assess migration potential; 4) estimate the potential human health risk associated with any identified residual constituents of concern at the Site; and 5) prepare a report of findings for review by ACHCSA and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

## **2.0 BACKGROUND**

The approximate 135 feet wide by 300 feet long rectangular property is located at 1549 32<sup>nd</sup> Street at the southeast corner of the intersection of Hannah and 32<sup>nd</sup> Streets (Figure 1). According to a January 4, 2001 *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment* Report prepared by Lumina Technologies, the property was developed with the current building in 1946 and operated as metal heat treating facility. Oakland Fire Department records indicate the facility operated as Precision Cast, a steel foundry and heat-treating operation, from 1983 to 2002. Concurrently, a small putty/paint factory operated at 2885 Hannah Street but the actual years of operation are unknown.

## 2.1 Previous Site Investigation

In 1988, Property Contamination Control, Inc. (PCC) conducted a soil investigation consisting of four exploratory soil borings. PCC reported relatively minor concentrations of ethanol, methanol, 1,1-dichloroethene (1,1-DCE), and metals in soil. Soil sample locations and depths are unknown.

In March 2002, ERAS Environmental, Inc. (ERAS) advanced four soil borings with a hand auger and reported “elevated” concentrations of total recoverable petroleum hydrocarbons (TRPH) and relatively minor concentrations of benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene and total xylenes (BTEX) in soil at approximately 3.0 feet below ground surface (bgs) in three of the four soil borings. In November 2002, ERAS analyzed a sample of oil from an excavation pit located near the southeast corner of the building and reported the oil resembled mineral oil, foundry quenching oil, or similar material. ERAS soil sample analytical results are summarized in Tables 1.

**TABLE 1 – ERAS 2002 SOIL ANALYTICAL RESULTS**

Sample ID	TPH-mo (mg/kg)	TPH-g (mg/kg)	Benzene (mg/kg)	Toluene (mg/kg)	Ethyl-benzene (mg/kg)	Xylenes (mg/kg)	VOCs (mg/kg)
SB-1-2.5	8,300	11	0.053	0.065	0.046	0.17	NA
SB-2-2.5	<50	<1	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005	NA
SB-3-3	<50	17	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005	NA
SB-4-3	2,100	5.3	<0.005	0.0071	<0.005	0.020	NA

Note: mg/kg = milligrams per kilogram  
NA = Not Analyzed

In April 2002, Environmental Restoration Services (Enrest) advanced seven Geoprobe soil borings and reported observing free-floating oil in one soil boring (SB-6). In addition, Enrest determined that a pipe identified by ERAS was actually a waste percolation well. The percolation well was 7 feet deep, the casing was perforated from 5.5 to 7 feet, and drain rock surrounded the well from approximately 5 to 10 feet bgs. On April 26, Enrest demolished the concrete lining of Pit B and excavated soil to 12 feet bgs. Enrest also excavated casting sand backfill from Pit A and Pit C, and identified another suspect percolation well near the southeast corner of the building.

In May 2002, Enrest excavated soil in the vicinity of soil boring SB-6 and in the vicinity of the southeast corner suspect percolation well. Enrest also advanced three soil borings to collect grab groundwater samples north, west, and south of soil boring SB-6, designated as borings SP-1, SP-2, and SP-3. Grab groundwater sample analytical results reported elevated concentrations of motor oil-range petroleum hydrocarbons, relatively minor concentrations of BTEX, 1,2-dichlorobenzene, and naphthalene. Soil and grab groundwater sample analytical results are summarized in Tables 2 and 3.

**TABLE 2 – Enrest 2002 SOIL ANALYTICAL RESULTS**

Sample ID	TPH-mo (mg/kg)	TPH-g (mg/kg)	Benzene (mg/kg)	Toluene (mg/kg)	Ethyl-benzene (mg/kg)	Xylenes (mg/kg)	VOCs (mg/kg)
SS-N	3,300	NA	<0.005	0.065	<0.005	<0.015	(1)
SS-P/A	NA	NA	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005	<0.015	(2)
Source Pt	20,800	NA	<0.005	0.0071	<0.005	<0.015	(3)

Note: NA = Not Analyzed  
 (1) 0.13 mg/kg 1,2-dichlorobenzene, 0.025 mg/kg naphthalene  
 (2) 0.14 mg/kg 1,2-dichlorobenzene  
 (3) Sample contained gasoline constituents

**TABLE 3 – Enrest 2002 WATER ANALYTICAL RESULTS**

Sample ID	TPH-mo (µg/L)	TPH-g (µg/L)	Benzene (µg/L)	Toluene (µg/L)	Ethyl-benzene (µg/L)	Xylenes (µg/L)	VOCs (µg/L)
SB-1	<500	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SB-2	<500	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SB-3	<500	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SB-4	<500	NA	<1	<1	<1	<2	ND
SB-5	NA	NA	<1	<1	<1	2	(1)
SP-1	77,000	NA	<1	<1	<1	<1	(2)
SP-2	74,000	NA	<1	<1	2	3	(3)
SP-3	FP	NA	87	94	9	82	(4)
Source	NA	NA	<1	<1	1	2	(5)

Note: NA = Not Analyzed  
 (1) 15 µg/l Chloroform  
 (2) 3 µg/l Chloroform  
 (3) 375 µg/l Acetone, 6 µg/l 1,2-dichlorobenzene  
 (4) 17 µg/l 1,2-dichlorobenzene, 139 µg/l Naphthalene  
 (5) 2 µg/l 1,2-dichlorobenzene, 2 µg/l Naphthalene

In May 2003, ERAS advanced eleven continuously-cored, Geoprobe soil borings to depths of approximately 16 to 20 feet bgs, collected soil and grab groundwater samples, and converted three of the soil borings to temporary piezometers. Soil samples were analyzed for volatile organic compounds (VOCs), total petroleum hydrocarbons as gasoline (TPH-g), total extractable petroleum hydrocarbons (TEPH, ERAS used TPH), and chromium, copper, and nickel metals. Grab groundwater samples were analyzed for VOCs, TPHg, TPH, and chromium, copper, and nickel metals. The piezometers were surveyed and the calculated groundwater flow direction and gradient were west to northwest at 0.03

foot per foot. Soil sample analysis generally reported minor to elevated TPH concentrations, varying minor VOC concentrations, and varying concentrations of chromium, copper, and nickel metals typical of background, naturally-occurring concentrations. Grab groundwater sample analysis reported relatively low TPH concentrations in soil borings E-6, E-9, and E-10, no VOCs above laboratory reporting limits, and minor to low concentrations of dissolved metals. ERAS soil and grab groundwater sample analytical results are summarized in Tables 4 and 5.

Concurrently, ERAS sampled the contents of six subsurface concrete vaults. Vault contents were described as poorly-graded sand. These soil samples were analyzed for VOCs, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and TPH. Laboratory analysis reported that the sandy contents of the concrete vaults contained TPH concentrations only.

**TABLE 4 – ERAS 2003 SOIL ANALYTICAL RESULTS**

Sample ID	Depth (Feet)	TPH-g (mg/kg)	TPH-d (mg/kg)	TPH-ho (mg/kg)	Naphthalene (mg/kg)	Toluene (mg/kg)	Xylenes (mg/kg)
PZ-1	3.0-3.5	<0.5	8.1	<13	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005
	11.0-12.0	<0.5	12	<13	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005
PZ-2	1.0-2.0	<0.5	<1	80	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005
	11.5-12.0	<0.5	<1	20	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005
E-5	2.5-3.5	0.310	<100	3,400	0.150	<0.0125	0.023
	11.0-12.0	<0.5	3.8	<13	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005
E-6	4.0-5.0	<0.5	<20	640	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005
	8.5-9.0	<0.5	<20	2,000	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005
E-7	4.0-5.0	0.068	4.8	<13	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005
	11.0-12.0	<0.5	<1	<13	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005
E-8	4.0-5.0	0.05	<25	<312.5	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005
	11.0-12.0	<0.5	9.6	<13	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005
E-9	1.0-2.0	<0.5	<50	1,500	0.023	<0.005	<0.005
	11.0-12.0	<0.5	<1	<13	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005
E-10	3.0-4.0	0.280	<100	3,700	0.084	0.015	0.013
	11.0-12.0	<0.5	<1	26	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005
E-11	4.0-4.5	0.120	<10	220	0.0059	<0.005	<0.005
	10.0-11.0	<0.5	9.0	<13	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005
E-12	2.0-3.0	<0.5	<1	<13	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005

Sample ID	Depth (Feet)	TPH-g (mg/kg)	TPH-d (mg/kg)	TPH-ho (mg/kg)	Naphthalene (mg/kg)	Toluene (mg/kg)	Xylenes (mg/kg)
	11.0-12.0	<0.5	<1	<13	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005
E-13	2.0-3.0	<0.5	2.6	<13	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005
	11.0-12.0	<0.5	<1	<13	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005

Notes: mg/kg = milligrams per kilogram  
\*TEPH as kerosene (k), diesel (d), motor oil (mo, and hydraulic oil (ho))  
< = less than the laboratory reporting limit indicated

**TABLE 5 – ERAS 2003 WATER ANALYTICAL RESULTS**

Sample ID	Date	TPH-d (µg/L)	TPH-ho (µg/L)
PZ-1	04/01/03	<50	<250
PZ-2	04/03/03	<50	<556
E-5	04/02/03	<570	5,300
E-6	04/01/03	130	<338
E-7	04/01/03	<50	<250
E-8	04/01/03	<77	<385
E-9	04/02/03	<58	890
E-10	04/01/03	<63	670
E-11	04/02/03	<118	890
E-12	04/02/03	<50	<250
E-13	04/02/03	<67	<333

Notes: (µg/L) = micrograms per Liter

## 2.2 Verification Site Investigation

In April 2005, Enrest conducted verification site investigation and advanced 15 exploratory soil borings primarily around the perimeter of the building. Soil boring locations are shown on Enrest Figure 2. The purpose was to collect representative verification soil and groundwater samples at the perimeter of the property to evaluate the effectiveness of remedial soil excavation performed in September 2003 to January 2004. Soil samples were generally collected at 4 and 9 feet bgs and grab groundwater samples were collected in each soil boring at approximately 15 and 25 feet bgs (with the exception of 25 feet in soil borings B-2 and B-12). In addition, Enrest collected representative soil samples from imported material to be used to backfill the remedial soil excavations and analyzed the samples for constituents of concern. Imported soil samples are designated with “IMP” in the sample identification. The Enrest April 2005 verification soil sample analytical results are summarized in Tables 6 through 8 and verification grab groundwater sample analytical results are summarized in Tables 9 and 10.



**TABLE 6 – Enrest 2005 SOIL ANALYTICAL RESULTS – Petroleum Hydrocarbons**

Sample ID	Depth (Feet)	TPH-g (mg/kg)	TPH-d (mg/kg)	TPH-k (mg/kg)	TPH-mo (mg/kg)	TPH-ho (mg/kg)	TEPH (mg/kg)
B-1	4	<0.5	---	---	---	---	<50
B-1	9	<0.5	---	---	---	---	120
B-2	4	<0.5	---	---	---	---	---
B-2	9	<0.5	---	---	---	---	---
B-4	4	---	---	---	---	---	<50
B-4	9	<0.5	---	---	---	---	<50
B-5	4	<0.5	---	---	---	---	<50
B-5	9	<0.5	---	---	---	---	<50
B-7	4	<0.5	---	---	---	---	<50
B-7	9	3.44	---	---	---	---	70
B-8	4	<0.5	---	---	---	---	<50
B-8	9	<0.5	---	---	---	---	<50
B-10	4	---	---	---	---	---	<50
B-10	9	---	---	---	---	---	60
B-11	4	1.01	---	---	---	---	---
B-11	9	<0.5	---	---	---	---	---
B-14	4	<0.5	---	---	---	---	<50
B-14	9	<0.5	---	---	---	---	<50
B-18	4	<0.5	---	---	---	---	<50
B-18	9	<0.5	---	---	---	---	<50
<b>Imported Soil Analysis</b>							
IMP-1	8	<0.5	<1	<1	<10	19	---
IMP-2	4	<0.5	<1	<1	25	<10	---
IMP-2	8	<0.5	<1	<1	<10	13	---
IMP-3	4	<0.5	<1	<1	25	<10	---
IMP-3	8	<0.5	<1	<1	24	24	---
IMP-4	3	<0.5	11	<1	14	29	---
IMP-4	6	<0.5	<1	<1	20	<10	---
IMP-5	4	0.682	<1	<1	65	<10	---

Notes: mg/kg = milligrams per kilogram, < = less than the laboratory reporting limit indicated  
\* TEPH as kerosene (k), diesel (d), motor oil (mo), and hydraulic oil (ho)

**TABLE 7 – Enrest 2005 SOIL ANALYTICAL RESULTS – Volatile Halocarbons**

Sample ID	Depth (Feet)	VHCs (mg/kg)
B-1	4	ND
B-1	9	0.005 1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene 0.014 Naphthalene
B-2	4	ND
B-4	9	ND
B-5	4	ND
B-5	9	ND
B-10	4	ND
B-10	9	ND
Imported Soil Analysis		
IMP-2	8	ND
IMP-4	3	ND

Notes: ND = no constituents detected above laboratory reporting limits  
VHC = volatile halocarbons (VOCs)

**TABLE 8 – IMPORTED SOIL ANALYTICAL RESULTS – Metals**

Sample ID	Depth (Feet)	Cadmium (mg/kg)	Chromium (mg/kg)	Lead (mg/kg)	Nickel (mg/kg)	Zinc (mg/kg)
IMP-2	4	2.4	39.4	50.6	20.4	36.9
IMP-2	8	ND	44.8	12.8	30.2	40.0
IMP-3	8	1.2	39.0	27.0	23.4	39.1
IMP-4	3	ND	38.6	51.2	33.7	76.6
IMP-4	6	0.8	31.9	18.6	24.0	36.9
IMP-5	4	4.4	35.2	84.8	20.5	52.0

Notes: ND = no constituents detected above laboratory reporting limits

**TABLE 9 – GRAB WATER ANALYTICAL RESULTS – Petroleum Hydrocarbons**

Sample ID	Depth	TPHg (µg/L)	TEPH (µg/L)
B-1	15	<50	<10,000
B-1	25	<50	<10,000
B-2	16	---	<10,000
B-2	25	<50	<10,000
B-3	25	<50	<10,000
B-4	16	<50	<10,000
B-4	25	853*	<10,000
B-5	25	<50	<10,000
B-6	16	<50	<10,000
B-6	25	<50	<10,000
B-7	16	<50	<20,000
B-7	25	<50	<19,000
B-8	16	<50	<10,000
B-8	25	62	<17,000
B-9	16	<50	<10,000
B-9	25	<50	<10,000
B-10	16	<50	<10,000
B-10	25	<50	<10,000
B-11	16	<50	<10,000
B-11	25	<50	<10,000
B-12	16	<50	---
B-13	16	<50	<10,000
B-13	25	<50	<10,000
B-14	16	<50	---
B-14	25	<50	<10,000
B-18	16	1,640**	<10,000
B-18	25	285**	<10,000

Notes: \* = Chromatogram does not match pattern  
\*\* = Result due to single peak

**TABLE 10 – GRAB WATER ANALYTICAL RESULTS – Metals**

Sample ID	Copper (µg/L)	Cadmium (µg/L)	Chromium (µg/L)	Lead (µg/L)	Nickel (µg/L)	Zinc (µg/L)
B-1	1.4	---	2.0	---	1.5	---
B-4	6.53	---	0.89	---	8.65	---
B-5	3.00	---	1.69	---	33.9	---
B-14	112	---	51.3	---	212	---

Enrest also collected two representative soil gas samples for chemical analysis. Sample B-1SV was collected at the north end of the Site adjacent to the “north” excavation and sample B-5SV was collected at the south end of the Site adjacent to the “south” excavation. Soil gas sample locations are shown on Enrest Figure 2. Soil gas sample analytical results generally reported various minor VOC constituent concentrations just above their respective laboratory reporting limits.

None of the reported VOC concentrations reported in the two soil gas samples indicate that a significant source of residual VOCs or TPH with VOC components exist in the subsurface.

### 2.3 Remedial Soil Removal

In April 2002, Enrest demolished the concrete lining of Pit B and excavated soil to 12 feet bgs. An oil sheen was noted on groundwater that entered the excavation pit. Enrest also excavated sand backfill from Pit A and Pit C. The volume of removed soil is unknown. In or before May 2002, Enrest excavated soil in the vicinity of soil boring SB-6 and around the second 4-inch diameter pipe identified as a waste percolation well.

In September 2003 to January 2004, ERAS oversaw remedial soil excavation designed to remove soil containing TPH-ho above 500 mg/kg. The limits of soil excavation are shown on ERAS Figure 2. Soil was removed in three locations: 1) inside the northeast corner of the building (designated “north”); 2) inside the southeast portion of the building to the building perimeter (designated “middle”); and 3) outside the building on the south side (designated “south”). Approximately 845 cubic yards of soil were removed from the “north” excavation, approximately 1,950 cubic yards of soil were removed from the “middle” excavation, and approximately 407 cubic yards of soil were removed from the “south” excavation, for a total of approximately 3,202 cubic yards (4,800 tons). Following remedial soil excavation, confirmation sidewall and excavation bottom soil samples were collected and analyzed for TPH-ho and select confirmation soil samples were collected and analyzed for VOCs. Confirmation sidewall and excavation bottom soil sample analytical results are summarized in Table 11.

Excavated soil was properly profiled and disposed at Forward Landfill, Manteca, California, under profile No. 3786.

## 2.4 Confirmation Sampling

### North Excavation

Detectable TPH-ho concentrations were reported in two of four sidewall samples ranging from 130 to 160 mg/kg, and no detectable TPH-ho was reported in the two excavation bottom samples. Naphthalene was reported in two of two analyzed soil samples at 0.093 and 0.099 mg/kg and 1,2-Dichlorobenzene was reported in two of two analyzed soil samples at 0.022 and 0.032 mg/kg.

### Middle Excavation

Detectable TPH-ho concentrations were reported in five of seven sidewall samples ranging from 32 to 3,400 mg/kg, and detectable TPH-ho was reported in six of seven excavation bottom samples ranging from 61 to 1,900 mg/kg. Methylene Chloride was reported in one of two analyzed soil samples at 0.130 mg/kg, 0.670 mg/kg 1,2-Dichlorobenzene was reported in one of two analyzed soil samples, and 0.082 mg/kg 1,4-Dichlorobenzene was reported in one of two analyzed soil samples. The middle excavation was physically limited by the east building perimeter wall, and additional soil excavation was not possible. Enrest soil borings B-9 and B-10 were advanced approximately 10 feet east of ERAS soil samples SWJ-7' and SWB-7', respectively. Enrest did not analyze soil samples from soil boring B-9 but did not report any odor or soil discoloration in its B-9 soil boring log. Enrest soil boring B-10 reported nondetect TPH at 4 feet bgs and 60 mg/kg TPH at 9 feet bgs.

### South Excavation

Detectable TPH-ho concentrations were reported in three of six sidewall samples ranging from 15 to 830 mg/kg, and detectable TPH-ho was reported in two of two excavation bottom samples at 24 and 26 mg/kg. No VOCs were reported in the two analyzed soil samples.

Final sidewall and excavation bottom confirmation soil sample TPH-ho analytical results are summarized in Table 11.

**TABLE 11– ERAS CONFIRMATION SOIL ANALYTICAL RESULTS**

Excavation	Sample ID	Depth (Feet)	Sidewall / Bottom Sample	TPH-ho (mg/kg)	VOCs (mg/kg)
North	NSW3-7'	7	Sidewall	160	
	SE-2-7'	7	Sidewall	<13	
	SS-1-7'	7	Sidewall	130	
	SW4-7'	7	Sidewall	<13	
	WB2-9'	9	Bottom	<13	
	SC-5-8'	8	Bottom	<13	
Middle	SW-E-7A	7	Sidewall	<13	
	SWC@4'	4	Sidewall		ND
	SW-D-7A	7	Sidewall	66	
	SWA-1@4'	4	Sidewall		0.022 <sup>(1)</sup> , 0.099 <sup>(3)</sup>
	SWJ-7'	7	Sidewall	3,400	
	SWB@4'	4	Sidewall		0.032 <sup>(1)</sup> , 0.093 <sup>(3)</sup>
	SWH@4'	4	Sidewall		0.670 <sup>(1)</sup> , 0.082 <sup>(2)</sup> ,0.130 <sup>(4)</sup>
	SWB-7'	7	Sidewall	1,300	
	YY-7'	7	Sidewall	32	
	XX-7'	7	Sidewall	300	
	SW-F-7A	7	Sidewall	<13	
	B7	9.5	Bottom	<13	
	B6	9.5	Bottom	98	
	B5	9	Bottom	1,900	
	BH2-9'	9	Bottom	61	
	BH3-9'	9	Bottom	470	
	BH4-10'	10	Bottom	160	
BH1-9'	9	Bottom	440		
South	OT2-7'	7	Sidewall	830	ND
	OT1-7'	7	Sidewall	440	ND
	OT6-7'	7	Sidewall	<13	
	OT5-7'	7	Sidewall	<13	
	OT4-7'	7	Sidewall	15	
	OT3-7'	7	Sidewall	<13	
	OTB1-10'	10	Bottom	24	
	OTB2-10'	10	Bottom	26	

Notes: mg/kg = milligrams per kilogram  
(1) = 1,2-DCB, (2) = 1,4-DCB, (3) = Naphthalene, (4) = Methylene Chloride

## **2.5 Subsurface Conditions**

According to ERAS, soils at the Site consisted primarily of silt (ML) to 15 to 19 feet bgs. At 15 to 19 feet, sand and gravel stringers were encountered in a number of soil borings. According to Enrest, soils at the Site primarily consisted of medium plasticity silty clays (CL) and low plasticity sandy silts (ML) to 16 feet bgs.

During remedial soil excavation activities, native soils encountered beneath the vaults consisted of brown silty clays to approximately 10 feet bgs. Sand lenses were noted from 9 to 11 feet bgs and groundwater was generally encountered at 10 feet bgs. Some soils exhibited a characteristic blue-green color and mild to strong petroleum hydrocarbon odor. These field indications of TPH impact were used to help determine the limits of remedial soil excavation.

Groundwater was generally observed at approximately 10 to 15 feet bgs and at 20 to 25 feet bgs.

### **2.5.1 Evidence of Petroleum Hydrocarbon Impact in Groundwater**

As summarized in Tables 5 and 9, TPH impacts in groundwater are generally low to nondetect. Groundwater sample analytical results do not indicate any significant source of TPH impact to groundwater and identified TPH impacts in groundwater are generally from motor oil-range or mineral oil-based petroleum hydrocarbons.

### **2.5.2 Evidence of VOC Impact in Groundwater**

As summarized in Tables 3 and 9, VOC impacts in groundwater are generally low to nondetect. Chlorinated solvents were not used at the facility but minor concentrations of chlorinated solvents have been reported in water samples. The most likely conclusion is that minor amounts of various chlorinated solvents were present in quenching oils or other petroleum hydrocarbons used at the facility. The TPHg reported in the water sample in soil boring B-18 was most likely a solvent or specific chemical, but it should be noted that similar impacts were not reported in adjacent soil borings B-5, 8, or 11.

The source of suspect VOC impact in groundwater at soil boring B-18 is unknown.

### **2.5.3 Evidence of Petroleum Hydrocarbon Impact in Soil**

Petroleum hydrocarbon impacts in soil at the Site are minimal with the exception of the eastern boundary of the middle excavation. Along this sidewall, excavation was limited by the property boundary. As summarized in Table 11, sidewall and bottom soil samples generally indicate that the majority of TPH-impacted soil was successfully removed. Remaining TPH impacts, primarily motor oil-range and/or mineral oil-based petroleum hydrocarbons, are found between 7 to 9 feet bgs in silty/clayey soils.

## **2.5.4 Evidence of VOC Impact in Soil**

As summarized in Tables 2, 7, and 11, VOC impacts in soil at the Site are minimal and generally insignificant. Significant VOC impacts in soil are not indicated by site history, soil sample analytical results, and groundwater sample analytical results.

## **3.0 PROPOSED SCOPE OF WORK**

ACC reviewed its August 7, 2006 *Request for Regulatory Closure Summary*, its December 14, 2006 *Addendum to Request for Regulatory Closure Summary*, and the technical comments summarized in the March 27, 2007 and July 17, 2007 ACHCSA letters. ACC believes that any additional subsurface investigation work should be performed in a logical, progressive fashion based on previously obtained data and the significance of the perceived “data gap.” Using “direct push” sampling technology, ACC can cost-effectively obtain the necessary representative media samples, determine current residual concentrations of constituents of concern, and confirm previous subsurface investigation. This proposed scope of work also addresses concerns discussed in the April 2, 2008 meeting with the RWQCB.

### **3.1 Project Scoping**

#### ***Technical Comment 1 – Fill Material Characterization***

RESPONSE: ERAS reported that soil backfill material came from a residential source in Berkeley, California. While the exact source of the soil is unknown, bulk soil (approximately 3,200 cubic yards) generated in a residential setting can be confidently assumed to have been generated at depth and suitable for use as backfill. Environmental Restoration Services reported that they advanced soil borings in five random locations within the backfilled excavations and analyzed representative soil samples for constituents of concern as TPH, VOCs, and 5 LUFT metals (Tables 6, 7, and 8). Backfill material sample analytical results demonstrated typical TPH and metal concentrations for this geographic region and suggest that the soil was suitable for reuse. Soil boring locations within the excavations were not illustrated on the Site Plan but since the five soil borings were reported as “random” locations, and the report stamped by a Professional Engineer, ACC believes the sample analytical results are representative of the soil used as backfill material. Since a reported 3,202 cubic yards of soil were excavated and disposed offsite, it is safe to assume that a similar but larger volume of soil were needed to properly backfill the three excavations.

ACC proposes to advance one continuously-cored soil boring (EB1) within the former north excavation and one continuously-cored soil boring (EB2) within the former middle excavation, log the soil borings to a minimum depth of 12 feet bgs, and collect one discrete soil sample from 4 feet and one from 8 feet bgs in each soil boring for analysis of TEPH, 5 LUFT metals, and VOCs. If odor or elevated PID readings are encountered, the soil samples will also be analyzed for TPHg and BTEX. The primary goal of the soil boring is to directly observe the soil type used to backfill the excavations and collect one representative soil sample to compare analytical results with those reported by Environmental Restoration Services.



### ***Technical Comment 2 – Off-Site Characterization***

RESPONSE: As reported by ERAS, impacted soil exists in the vicinity of soil samples SWJ-7' and SWB-7' at the approximate middle of the property at the eastern border. Environmental Restoration Services advanced soil boring B-10 approximately 10 feet directly east of ERAS soil sample SWB-7' and collected soil samples at 4 and 9 feet bgs and grab groundwater samples at 16 and 25 feet bgs. Soil boring B-10 should be considered an ideal "step out" soil boring from an excavation sidewall soil sample reporting elevated concentrations of TPH. TEPH was reported in soil boring B-10 in soil at 9 feet bgs at 60 mg/kg. The TEPH reporting limit in the soil boring B-10 grab groundwater samples was high; however, the lack of TPHg-range petroleum hydrocarbons (an expected degradation product of degraded motor oil-range petroleum hydrocarbons) in the grab groundwater samples, and the lack of odor or field indications of petroleum hydrocarbon impact in the log of soil boring B-10, suggest that no significant petroleum hydrocarbon impacts exist in soil much beyond the extent of remedial soil excavation. Soil samples were not analyzed in soil borings B-9 and B-12, advanced approximately 10 and 33 feet east of ERAS soil sample SWJ-7' but grab groundwater samples collected in the borings were nondetect (less than 50 µg/L TPHg-range petroleum hydrocarbons, an expected degradation product of motor oil-range petroleum hydrocarbons).

ACC proposes to advance three continuously-cored soil boring (EB3 through EB5) adjacent to the middle excavation in the vicinity of soil samples "B5", "SWJ-7", and "SWB-7", log the continuously cored soil borings to a minimum depth of 12 feet bgs, and collect one to two soil samples in each soil boring for analysis of TEPH and VOCs. Soil samples prepared for analysis will either be collected at representative depths or chosen based on characteristic petroleum hydrocarbon odor or elevated PID reading. Soil borings EB3 through EB5 will be continuously logged and screened to directly observe the soil type, characterize soil for suspect constituents of concern and compare soil and groundwater analytical results with those reported by ERAS and Environmental Restoration Services. Proposed soil boring locations are shown on Figure 2.

### ***Technical Comment 3 – Characterization of 2885 Hannah Street***

RESPONSE: ACC interviewed Mr. Don Torkington, owner and operator of Precision Cast from approximately 1983 to 2002. Mr. Torkington stated that Precision Cast did not use "solvents" other than petroleum hydrocarbon-based materials such as kerosene, and the southern portion of the Site, actually 2885 Hannah Street, was only used for parking, raw material storage, containers, and miscellaneous equipment. The January 4, 2001 Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prepared for the Site included both 1549 32<sup>nd</sup> Street and 2668 Hannah Street and did not report any significant recognized environmental concerns on 2668 Hannah Street. This information was likely the basis for so little recommended investigation at 2885 Hannah over the years.

ERAS advanced soil borings E-12 and E-13 in the southwest and southeast corners of the property at 2885 Hannah Street respectively, and did not report any constituents of concern in soil or groundwater. A grab groundwater sample in soil boring B-18 reported 1,640 µg/L gasoline-range petroleum hydrocarbons that were flagged as being a single peak on the chromatogram. No significant concentrations of TPH were reported in grab groundwater samples collected in adjacent soil borings B-5, B-8, and B-11.

A small building identified as a “Putty” and “Paint” factory was shown at 2885 Hannah Street on Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps and aerial photographs from 1951 to 2003. The single-story, 8 foot tall building was constructed of wood and clay tile walls and was demolished in 2003. Associated with the putty/paint factory was a small structure identified as a “Dist” tank. These structures have been illustrated on Figure 2 and Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps and aerial photographs are included in Appendices 1 and 2.

ACC proposes to advance one continuously-cored soil boring (EB6) in the immediate vicinity of soil boring B-18 and one soil boring (EB7) in the approximate center of the former putty/paint factory footprint at 2885 Hannah Street, log and screen the soil borings for volatile constituents to a minimum depth of 12 feet bgs with a PID, and collect one soil sample and one grab groundwater sample in each soil boring for analysis of TEPH and VOCs. The primary goal of these two soil borings is to directly observe the soil type, characterize soil for suspect constituents of concern and address potential subsurface impacts from historical site practices at 2885 Hannah Street.

#### *Technical Comment 4 – Soil Vapor Sampling*

RESPONSE: There is no data that indicates that VOCs are constituents of concern at the Site and warrant soil gas characterization. With only a few relatively minor exceptions, reported VOC concentrations in soil and grab groundwater samples have been low and generally one to three orders of magnitude below applicable Environmental Screening Levels (ESLs) as summarized in the RWQCB document *Screening For Environmental Concerns at Sites With Contaminated Soil and Groundwater, Interim Final – 2005, Table B*.

According to RWQCB Table E-1a, *Groundwater Screening Levels For Evaluation of Potential Vapor Intrusion Concerns*, residual VOC concentrations groundwater are generally three to five orders of magnitude below their applicable ESL.

Investigation findings that support dropping VOCs as constituents of concern include: 1) low residual concentrations of reported VOCs in soil and groundwater; 2) the lack of reportable VOC concentrations in vault content samples (suspect “source” areas); 3) site history and interviews with the former facility operator that indicate VOCs were not specifically used at Precision Cast; 4) fine-grain soils with relatively low permeability that hinder or prevent vertical VOC migration in soil gas; 5) two analyzed soil gas samples collected in native soil in the vicinity of two of the remedial soil excavations reported only low residual VOC concentrations well below their applicable ESLs; and 6) the general consensus that more soil versus less soil was eventually removed during remedial activities. Soil gas sampling is not warranted and ACC understands that additional soil gas sampling is no longer being requested.

#### *Technical Comment 5 – Data Tables*

RESPONSE: Summary data tables were included with the August 7, 2006 *Request for Regulatory Closure Summary* and December 14, 2006 *Addendum to Request for Regulatory Closure Summary*. These tables, including revised Table 11, have also been included in the background section of this Work Plan. ACC generated Figure 2 to illustrate previous soil and grab groundwater sample locations and soil samples analytical results which exceeded applicable ESLs.

Since soil sample depths are typically estimated, and ultimately analyzing specific soil samples may be justified based on field indications of impact such as characteristic odor, discoloration, or elevated PID reading, ACC requests some latitude to choose specific soil samples estimated to provide the optimum data regarding soil conditions while minimizing analytical costs to the extent practical.

#### *Technical Comment 6 – Risk Assessment*

RESPONSE: A Tier 1 Risk Evaluation will be provided in the technical report of findings summarizing the scope of work proposed in this Work Plan. Human health risk will primarily be estimated by comparing concentrations of constituents of concern to their respective environmental screening levels (ESLs) for different media.

### **3.2 Conceptual Site Model**

Based on known Site conditions and extensive subsurface investigation, the conceptual site model (CSM) is relatively simple. For purposes of this proposed investigation, the CSM is designed to provide a three-dimensional picture or representation of site conditions, assist in organizing “first impressions”, summarize known subsurface data, and help focus on the recently obtained data filling perceived data gaps and support future decision making.

#### **3.2.1 Subsurface Conditions**

According to ERAS, soils at the Site consisted primarily of silt (ML) to 15 to 19 feet bgs. At 15 to 19 feet, sand and gravel stringers were encountered in a number of soil borings. According to Enrest, soils at the Site primarily consisted of medium plasticity silty clays (CL) and low plasticity sandy silts (ML) to 16 feet bgs.

During remedial soil excavation activities, native soils encountered beneath the vaults consisted of brown silty clays to approximately 10 feet bgs. Sand lenses were noted from 9 to 11 feet bgs and groundwater was generally encountered at 10 feet bgs. Some soils exhibited a characteristic blue-green color and mild to strong petroleum hydrocarbon odor. These field indications of TPH impact were used to help determine the limits of remedial soil excavation.

Groundwater was generally observed at approximately 10 to 15 feet bgs and at 20 to 25 feet bgs.

#### **3.2.2 Risk Evaluation**

ACC proposes to evaluate estimated human health risk by preparing a Tier 1 Risk Evaluation using RWQCB ESLs and comparing them to high and average concentrations of constituents of concern. Based on previously obtained data and the amount of soil remediation performed at the Site, this comparison should be adequate to assess the health risk associated with residual soil and groundwater impacts.

### **3.2.3 Data Gaps**

ACC believes the following items represent data gaps that could be addressed through additional subsurface investigation and media sampling: 1) the lack of additional TEPH and VOC groundwater data in the vicinity of soil boring B-18; 2) the lack of groundwater TEPH and VOC data with an appropriate laboratory reporting limit in the vicinity of soil samples B5, SWJ-7', and SWB-7'; and 3) the lack of soil and groundwater data at 2885 Hannah Street. Legal access is necessary in order to advance "step-out" soil borings EB3 through EB5.

### **3.3 Rationale for Sampling Strategy**

The primary goals of this investigation are to confirm suspect TEPH and/or VOC impacts in soil or groundwater at select locations to address the data gaps summarized in Section 3.2.3. ACC proposes to collect soil samples at five locations and grab groundwater samples at four locations. Proposed sample media and depths are summarized in Table 12. Proposed soil boring locations are shown on Figure 2. The proposed soil sample locations have been specifically selected for proximity to previously obtained elevated analytical results or in areas representing data gaps. A soil boring permit will be obtained from Alameda County Public Works prior to field work.

All encountered or cored soil will be screened for volatile constituents and selected representative soil samples will be prepared for analysis. Soil screening will be done with a calibrated ppbRAE photoionization detector (PID). The ppbRAE PID measures volatile constituents in air in the ppb range and is highly effective at screening soil for volatile constituents (if encountered). Soil borings EB1 through EB5 constitute one full day of limited access Geoprobe® work with the contingency of potentially advancing one to two additional soil borings based on observations and field indications of impact. All Geoprobe® sample locations will be continuously cored to a minimum depth of 12 feet bgs to visually log and screen every foot of encountered soil, identify potential saturated sand stringers, and better estimate migration potential in the subsurface.

Minor deviations to these proposed sampling locations and/or depths may be required based on conditions encountered in the field and indications of petroleum hydrocarbon impact noted in the field. All samples will be immediately capped, labeled, placed in resealable plastic bags in a pre-chilled insulated container, and prepared for transport and analysis using standard chain of custody protocol.

**TABLE 12 – PROPOSED ANALYSES**

Soil Boring	Depth	Matrix	Constituent Analysis	Comment
EB1	3.5-4.0	Soil	TEPH, 5 LUFT Metals, VOCs	Representative Soil (TPHg if high PID or odor)
	7.5-8.0	Soil	TEPH, 5 LUFT Metals, VOCs	Representative Soil (TPHg if high PID or odor)
EB2	3.5-4.0	Soil	TEPH, 5 LUFT Metals, VOCs	Representative Soil (TPHg if high PID or odor)
	7.5-8.0	Soil	TEPH, 5 LUFT Metals, VOCs	Representative Soil (TPHg if high PID or odor)
EB3	7.5-9.0	Soil	VOCs, TEPH	Highest PID reading analyzed First-encountered groundwater
	12.0-16.0	Groundwater	VOCs, TEPH	
EB4	7.5-9.0	Soil	VOCs, TEPH	Highest PID reading analyzed First-encountered groundwater
	12.0-16.0	Groundwater	VOCs, TEPH	
EB5	7.5-9.0	Soil	VOCs, TEPH	Highest PID reading analyzed First-encountered groundwater
	12.0-16.0	Groundwater	VOCs, TEPH	
EB6	6.0-8.0	Soil	VOCs, TEPH	Highest PID reading analyzed First-encountered groundwater
	12.0-16.0	Groundwater	VOCs, TEPH, TPHg	
EB7	6.0-8.0	Soil	VOCs, TEPH	Highest PID reading analyzed First-encountered groundwater
	12.0-16.0	Groundwater	VOCs, TEPH, TPHg	
EB8	6.0-8.0	Soil	VOCs, TEPH	Highest PID reading analyzed First-encountered groundwater
	12.0-16.0	Groundwater	VOCs, TEPH, TPHg	
Trip Blank		DI Water	VOCs	

### 3.4 Sampling Methods

#### Soil Sampling

Soil samples collected with a limited access track-driven Geoprobe® rig and will be collected in Geoprobe® stainless steel macro cores equipped with Geoprobe®-supplied, 2.0 inch by 48.0 inch disposable clear acetate liners. Select depth intervals will be cut from the 4-foot-long acetate liners and logged, checked with the ppbRAE PID, or prepared for analysis. Soil intervals saved for analysis will be immediately covered with polyethylene sheeting and tight-fitting plastic caps, labeled, placed in resealable plastic bags, and placed in a pre-chilled insulated container. Soil samples collected for analysis will be sealed and cooled as soon as feasible to minimize potential volatilization. All samples will be in a locked vehicle or in direct observation at all times.

At each sample location, representative soil samples will be screened for volatile constituents using the ppbRAE PID approximately every 1.0 to 2.0 feet. Soil screening with the PID will be performed by placing approximately 1.0 inch of sample core in a resealable bag, sealing it, crushing the soil sample to the extent feasible, and inserting the PID inlet hose into the headspace of the bag after approximately 5 minutes have elapsed. Soil screening for volatiles will be performed as consistently as possible to minimize the variation due to methodology. Soil samples will be collected for analysis when characteristic odor and elevated PID readings are observed, or at select representative depths in each soil boring approximately every 4.0 to 8.0 feet.

### Grab Groundwater Sampling

Grab groundwater samples will either be collected directly through the drilling rods with a pre-cleaned stainless steel bailer or with the use of a HydroPunch™ sampling probe equipped with a temporary stainless-steel screen. The pre-cleaned HydroPunch™ tool will be hydraulically driven to the respective depth of interest plus one foot, retracted one foot to remove the disposable driving tip, and the 4-foot long screen will be exposed to the formation as the external probe component is raised 4.0 feet. Undisturbed water samples will then be collected using disposable polyethylene tubing equipped with a disposable check valve or slowly bailed with a new polyethylene bailer inserted into the HydroPunch™ tool. Grab groundwater samples collected for analysis will be carefully decanted into laboratory-supplied amber liter bottles or 40-milliliter sample vials without headspace, and immediately sealed, placed in resealable plastic bags, and cooled as soon as feasible to minimize potential volatilization.

Grab groundwater samples will be stored in a pre-chilled, pre-cleaned insulated container pending ACC transport to TestAmerica, a state-certified analytical laboratory. Every effort will be made to minimize disturbance of the groundwater samples prior to placement in the sample containers and maintaining the samples at the four degrees Celsius prior to analysis.

Standard turnaround time for analytical results is 5 working days. Following drilling and sample collection, each soil boring will be abandoned with neat cement to just below the surface (3 to 6 inches). The soil boring will then be completed with concrete to grade and colored to match the surrounding surface material.

### Sample Containers and Preservation

Soil samples collected with the Geoprobe® rig will be collected in new Geoprobe®-supplied, 2.0 inch by 48.0 inch disposable clear acetate liners. Selected sample intervals will be cut, covered with polyethylene sheeting and tight-fitting plastic caps, and placed in resealable plastic bags. Grab groundwater samples will be collected in laboratory-supplied new amber liter bottles or 40 milliliter glass vials. Samples will be labeled with pre-printed laboratory-supplied labels, placed in new resealable plastic bags, and immediately placed in a pre-chilled, insulated container maintained at four degrees Celsius pending transport to the analytical laboratory. Each sample cooler will be pre-cleaned and chilled with ice and no blue ice containers will be used.

### Sample Packaging and Shipment

All samples will be handled according to ACC sampling protocols. Soil samples will be covered at each open end with new polyethylene (Teflon®) sheeting, fitted with tight-fitting plastic caps, labeled, placed in resealable plastic bags, placed in a pre-chilled, insulated container pending transport to ACC's Oakland office. ACC will properly refrigerate the samples until they are picked up by the analytical laboratory courier. Standard chain of custody documentation will be maintained at all times. Samples will be couriered to either TestAmerica in Pleasanton, California.

### Sample Documentation

ACC will utilize a unique sample numbering system to identify sample locations and depths. Each sample will be designated with the following: 1) Unique boring number – “B1”; 2) matrix type – “S for soil and SG for soil gas – “B1-S”; and 3) maximum depth – “B1-S-7.5”. A sample designated B1-S-7.5 is therefore a soil sample collected at soil boring location B1 at 7.0-7.5 feet bgs. Each respective sample designation will be placed at the top of the sample label and on each line of the chain of custody form.

Soil samples will be logged and fully described on pre-printed ACC log forms. These log forms are designed to facilitate preparing boring logs for the final report of findings and prompt the ACC field geologist to obtain and document specific types of information.

ACC proposes to analyze one trip blank quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) sample only.

### Analytical Methods and Detection Limits

All samples will be analyzed by TestAmerica in Pleasanton, California. TestAmerica is State-certified, certified with the Army Corps of Engineers, and certified with the United States Navy. ACC has used TestAmerica almost exclusively for 15 years and receives superior service.

Select samples will be analyzed for 5 LUFT Metals by EPA Method 6010, VOCs (8010 list) by EPA Method 8260, TEPH by EPA Method 8015, and TPHg/BTEX by EPA Method 8260B.

Laboratory reporting limits are set by the laboratory. Reporting limits may be increased due to interference effects and required laboratory dilution.

VOCs in soil	200 µg/kg or 0.20 mg/kg, some analytes higher
VOCs in groundwater	0.5 µg/Liter (µg/L), some analytes higher
TEPH in soil	1.0 mg/kg or 0.50 mg/kg
TEPH in groundwater	50 µg/L
TPHg in soil	1.0 mg/kg
TPHg in groundwater	1.0 µg/L

### Decontamination

All sampling equipment will be either new disposable equipment or pre-cleaned, stainless steel sampling equipment. Decontamination of the Geoprobe® sampling probes, hand auger, and slide-hammer sampler will be performed between sample locations by washing the equipment with a tap water and Alconox cleaning solution, rinsing the equipment with clean tap water, and a final rinse with deionized water.

New clean nitrile surgical gloves will be worn at each new sample location and at each new depth at each sample location. Gloves will be replaced before the collection and/or handling of every sample.

### Waste Management

Soil removed from the soil borings will be containerized in a 55-gallon steel drum, labeled, sampled, and profiled for appropriate disposal at an accepting, permitted landfill.

### Backfilling Soil Borings

The soil borings will be backfilled with cement slurry consisting of approximately six gallons of water mixed with 94 pounds of Portland cement. The cement slurry will be prepared with an electric mixing rod to minimize cement lumps in the slurry mix. The surface of the soil boring will be covered with approximately 4 inches of concrete and colored to match the existing surface.

### **3.5 Data Evaluation**

Data obtained during this investigation is confirmatory in nature. Therefore, analytical results will be initially compared to applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board ESLs to estimate human health risk, and in select instances may be compared to previously obtained soil and grab groundwater data.

### **3.6 Quality Assurance and Quality Control Measures**

Samples will be collected in an accurate and consistent manner to eliminate variability associated with sample collection. Samples will be immediately sealed and placed in resealable plastic bags to eliminate potential contamination during sample handling and transportation.

TestAmerica employs extensive internal QA/QC procedures consistent with the respective laboratory method. To minimize laboratory variability, ACC will specifically request that any samples submitted for analysis be analyzed within a respective calibrated sample run. Based on sample handling procedures and adequate decontamination procedures, one laboratory-supplied travel blank will be analyzed for VOCs.

## **4.0 HEALTH AND SAFETY PLAN**


A site-specific Site Safety Plan (SSP) which encompasses the proposed work at the Site and complies with the requirements of 29 CFR Part 1910.120 will be prepared and present during field activities. All personnel involved with sample collection will be 40 hour trained according to requirements of 29 CFR Part 1910.120, will review and sign the SSP, and are presently in medical surveillance programs administered by their employer. All supervisory personnel involved with sample collection will be 8 hour supervisory trained according to requirements of 29 CFR Part 1910.120, and all field personnel have 24 hours of supervised field training.



## **5.0 REPORT PREPARATION**

A technical report discussing field work, observations and findings, analytical results, conclusions, and recommendations will be prepared for submission to ACHCSA. The technical report of findings will generally follow applicable report criteria specified in the *Preliminary Endangerment Assessment Guidance Manual* prepared by the California EPA DTSC, January 1994.

The technical report will present a Conceptual Site Model, findings and conclusions of the initial subsurface investigation, and discuss identified data gaps and their significance. The main goal of the report will be to fill identified data gaps and document the data needed to justify full regulatory case closure.



Source: The Thomas Guide, Bay Area Metro 2004

Title: **Location Map**  
**1549 32nd Street**  
**Oakland, California**

Figure Number: 1

Scale: None


Project Number: 6875-001.01

Drawn By: KRB

Date: 06/13/07



7977 Capwell Drive, Suite 100  
 Oakland, California 94621  
 (510) 638-8400 Fax: (510) 638-8404



32nd Street

Sidewalk

### LEGEND



Area of Excavation



Footprint of former "Putty" and "Paint" Factory

EB1 ○

ACC Proposed Soil Boring Location

B6 ●

ERAS Soil Boring Locations that exceeded ESLs

B18 ⊙

Environmental Restoration Services Soil Boring Locations that exceeded ESLs

North Excavation

EB1

Hannah Street

Sidewalk

Middle Excavation

EB2

SWJ-7' (3,400 TPH-ho)

B5 (1,900 TPH-ho)

EB3

EB4

EB5

SWB-7' (1,300 TPH-ho)

Residential Surrounding Property

Footprint of former "Putty" & "Paint" Factory

South Excavation

(1,640 TPHg)

EB7



EB6

Former "Dist" tank

EB8

Outside Yard

Scale



Property Line

Site Plan:

1549 32nd Street  
Oakland, California

Figure Number: 2

Scale: 1" - 40'


Project Number: 6875-001.01

Drawn By: KRB

Date: 04/03/08



7977 Capwell Drive, Suite 100  
Oakland, California 94621  
(510) 638-8400 Fax (510) 638-8404



# Certified Sanborn® Map Report



Sanborn® Library search results  
Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC

**6875-001-01**  
**1532 32nd Street**  
**Oakland, CA 94608**

**Inquiry Number 1987629.1S**

**July 26, 2007**



## **The Standard in Environmental Risk Information**

440 Wheelers Farms Rd  
Milford, Connecticut 06461

### **Nationwide Customer Service**

Telephone: 1-800-352-0050  
Fax: 1-800-231-6802  
Internet: [www.edrnet.com](http://www.edrnet.com)

# Certified Sanborn® Map Report

7/26/07

**Site Name:**

6875-001-01  
1532 32nd Street  
Oakland, CA 94608

**Client Name:**

ACC Environmental Cons.  
7977 Capwell Drive  
Oakland, CA 94621



EDR® Environmental  
Data Resources Inc

EDR Inquiry # 1987629.1S

Contact: Trevor Bausman

The complete Sanborn Library collection has been searched by EDR, and fire insurance maps covering the target property location provided by ACC Environmental Cons. were identified for the years listed below. The certified Sanborn Library search results in this report can be authenticated by visiting [www.edrnet.com/sanborn](http://www.edrnet.com/sanborn) and entering the certification number. Only Environmental Data Resources Inc. (EDR) is authorized to grant rights for commercial reproduction of maps by Sanborn Library LLC, the copyright holder for the collection.

## Certified Sanborn Results:

**Site Name:** 6875-001-01  
**Address:** 1532 32nd Street  
**City, State, Zip:** Oakland, CA 94608  
**Cross Street:**  
**P.O. #** 6875-001-01  
**Project:** 6875-001-01  
**Certification #** 2213-4371-8CCC



Sanborn® Library search results  
Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC

### Maps Identified - Number of maps indicated within "( )"

1970 (1) 1951 (1)  
1967 (1) 1912 (1)  
1962 (1) 1902 (1)  
1959 (1)  
1954 (1)  
1952 (1)

Total Maps: 9

The Sanborn Library includes more than 1.2 million Sanborn fire insurance maps, which track historical property usage in approximately 12,000 American cities and towns. Collections searched:

- Library of Congress
- University Publications of America
- EDR Private Collection

### Limited Permission To Make Copies

ACC Environmental Cons. (the client) is permitted to make up to THREE photocopies of this Sanborn Map transmittal and each fire insurance map accompanying this report solely for the limited use of its customer. No one other than the client is authorized to make copies. Upon request made directly to an EDR Account Executive, the client may be permitted to make a limited number of additional photocopies. This permission is conditioned upon compliance by the client, its customer and their agents with EDR's copyright policy; a copy of which is available upon request.


### Disclaimer - Copyright and Trademark notice

This Report contains certain information obtained from a variety of public and other sources reasonably available to Environmental Data Resources, Inc. It cannot be concluded from this Report that coverage information for the target and surrounding properties does not exist from other sources. NO WARRANTY EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, IS MADE WHATSOEVER IN CONNECTION WITH THIS REPORT. ENVIRONMENTAL DATA RESOURCES, INC. SPECIFICALLY DISCLAIMS THE MAKING OF ANY SUCH WARRANTIES, INCLUDING WITHOUT LIMITATION, MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR USE OR PURPOSE. ALL RISK IS ASSUMED BY THE USER. IN NO EVENT SHALL ENVIRONMENTAL DATA RESOURCES, INC. BE LIABLE TO ANYONE, WHETHER ARISING OUT OF ERRORS OR OMISSIONS, NEGLIGENCE, ACCIDENT OR ANY OTHER CAUSE, FOR ANY LOSS OF DAMAGE, INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, SPECIAL, INCIDENTAL CONSEQUENTIAL, OR EXEMPLARY DAMAGES. ANY LIABILITY ON THE PART OF ENVIRONMENTAL DATA RESOURCES, INC. IS STRICTLY LIMITED TO A REFUND OF THE AMOUNT PAID FOR THIS REPORT. Purchaser accepts this Report "AS IS". Any analyses, estimates, ratings, environmental risk levels or risk codes provided in this Report are provided for illustrative purposes only, and are not intended to provide, nor should they be interpreted as providing any facts regarding, or prediction or forecast of, any environmental risk for any property. Only a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment performed by an environmental professional can provide information regarding the environmental risk for any property. Additionally, the information provided in this Report is not to be construed as legal advice.

Copyright 2007 by Environmental Data Resources, Inc. All rights reserved. Reproduction in any media or format, in whole or in part, of any report or map of Environmental Data Resources, Inc., or its affiliates, is prohibited without prior written permission.

EDR and its logos (including Sanborn and Sanborn Map) are trademarks of Environmental Data Resources, Inc. or its affiliates. All other trademarks used herein are the property of their respective owners.






Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC

Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC

Date: 7/26/2007 11:36:40 AM  
 EDR Inquiry: 1987629.1S  
 Client: ACC Environmental Cons.  
 Site Name: 6875-001-01  
 Address: 1532 32nd Street  
 City, ST, ZIP: Oakland CA 94608  
 Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC

Research Associate: RAS Copyright: 1970





Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC


Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC

Date: 7/26/2007 11:36:40 AM  
 EDR Inquiry: 1987629.1S  
 Client: ACC Environmental Cons.  
 Site Name: 6875-001-01  
 Address: 1532 32nd Street  
 City, ST, ZIP: Oakland CA 94608  
 Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC



Research Associate: RAS Copyright: 1967






Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC

Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC

Date: 7/26/2007 11:36:40 AM  
 EDR Inquiry: 1987629.1S  
 Client: ACC Environmental Cons.  
 Site Name: 6875-001-01  
 Address: 1532 32nd Street  
 City, ST, ZIP: Oakland CA 94608  
 Certification #: 2213-4371-8CCC








Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC

Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC

Date: 7/26/2007 11:36:40 AM  
EDR Inquiry: 1987629.1S  
Client: ACC Environmental Cons.  
Site Name: 6875-001-01  
Address: 1532 32nd Street  
City, ST, ZIP: Oakland CA 94608  
Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC



Research Associate: RAS Copyright: 1959



Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC

Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC


Date: 7/26/2007 11:36:40 AM  
 EDR Inquiry: 1987629.1S  
 Client: ACC Environmental Cons.  
 Site Name: 6875-001-01  
 Address: 1532 32nd Street  
 City, ST, ZIP: Oakland CA 94608  
 Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC



Research Associate: RAS Copyright: 1954




7A  
60'




Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC

34TH ST. (B. ST.)




4




Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC

32ND ST. (A. ST.)




HANNAH



HELEN

Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC




CORR TO  
0 50 100 150

Date: 7/26/2007 11:36:40 AM  
EDR Inquiry: 1987629.1S  
Client: ACC Environmental Cons.  
Site Name: 6875-001-01  
Address: 1532 32nd Street  
City, ST, ZIP: Oakland CA 94608  
Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC








Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC

Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC

Date: 7/26/2007 11:36:40 AM  
 EDR Inquiry: 1987629.1S  
 Client: ACC Environmental Cons.  
 Site Name: 6875-001-01  
 Address: 1532 32nd Street  
 City, ST, ZIP: Oakland CA 94608  
 Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC








Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC

Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC

Date: 7/26/2007 11:36:40 AM  
 EDR Inquiry: 1987629.1S  
 Client: ACC Environmental Cons.  
 Site Name: 6875-001-01  
 Address: 1532 32nd Street  
 City, ST, ZIP: Oakland CA 94608  
 Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC

Research Associate: RAS Copyright: 1912





Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC

2213-4371-8CCC

Certification #

Date: 7/26/2007 11:36:40 AM  
 EDR Inquiry: 1987629.1S  
 Client: ACC Environmental Cons.  
 Site Name: 6875-001-01  
 Address: 1532 32nd Street  
 City, ST, ZIP: Oakland CA 94608  
 Certification # 2213-4371-8CCC

Research Associate: RAS Copyright: 1902































