

ALAMEDA COUNTY
HEALTH CARE SERVICES



AGENCY

DAVID J. KEARS, Agency Director
October 29, 1996

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

STID 539

REMEDIAL ACTION COMPLETION CERTIFICATION

Mr. Kevin Gordon
24 Scitico Road
Somersville, CT 06072

RE: Eagle Machinery, 948 88th Avenue, Oakland, CA - 94621

Dear Mr. Gordon:

This letter confirms the completion of site investigation and remedial action for the above referenced property. Enclosed is a case closure summary that includes an approval of closure from the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Based upon the available information, including current land use, and with provision that the information provided to this agency was accurate and representative of site conditions, no further action is required. However, the risk management document, dated October 23, 1996 should be placed into the deed and proof of recording the deed restrictions should be submitted to this Department no later than 30 days from the date of this letter.

If you have any questions, you can reach me at (510) 567-6764.

Sincerely,

Madhulla Logan
Hazardous Material Specialist

c: Gordon Coleman, Acting Chief, Environmental Protection Division--files
Sum Arigala, RWQCB

ALAMEDA COUNTY CASE CLOSURE SUMMARY

I. AGENCY INFORMATION Date: October 29, 1996
Agency name: Alameda County-HazMat Address: 1131 Harbor Bay Pkwy
City/State/Zip: Alameda, CA Phone: (510) 271-4320
Responsible staff person: Madhulla Logan, Hazardous Materials Spec.

II. CASE INFORMATION
Site facility name: Former Eagle Packaging
Site facility address: 948 88th Avenue, Oakland, CA - 94621
RB LUSTIS Case No: N/A Local Case #: 539
URF filing date: 10/22/96 SWEEPS No: N/A

Responsible Parties: Addresses:
Kevin Gordon 24 Scitico Road
Package Machinery Somersville
Connecticut - 06072

III. RELEASE AND SITE CHARACTERIZATION INFORMATION

Cause and type of release: Solvent, mainly Perchloroethylene (PCE) and Trichloroethylene (TCE)

Site characterization complete? YES

Monitoring Wells installed? YES Number: 3

Proper screened interval? Yes

Highest GW depth below ground surface: 9.45 Lowest depth: 8.70

Flow direction: south west based on topography and gw elevations

Most sensitive current use: None

Are drinking water wells affected? No (based on well study)

Is surface water affected? NO Nearest affected SW name:

Treatment and Disposal of Affected Material:

No soil excavated from site

III. RELEASE AND SITE CHARACTERIZATION INFORMATION (Continued)

Maximum Documented Contaminant Concentrations - - Before and After Cleanup
Contaminant Soil (ppm) Water (ppb)

	Before and After	Before and After	Before and After
Perchloroethylene	.063 at B-10 at 5'	1520	29
Trichloroethylene	.0092 at B-10 at 20	940	3.3
Cis 1,2 Dichloroethylene	.047 at B-7 at 13'	1930	0.9
Freon	.046 at B-6 at 10.5'	1830	ND
Acetone	.024 at B-9 at 5'	23	ND
1,1,1 TCA		16	0.9
Vinyl Chloride		24	

Notes:

The soil concentrations noted above are the highest concentrations found in the soil borings, B-1 to B-10. The groundwater concentrations in the [before column] are from grab groundwater samples taken from borings B-6 to B-10. The groundwater concentrations mentioned in the [After column] are from samples collected from monitoring wells.

IV. CLOSURE

Does completed corrective action protect existing beneficial uses per the Regional Board Basin Plan? Undetermined

Does completed corrective action protect potential beneficial uses per the Regional Board Basin Plan? Undetermined

Does corrective action protect public health for current land use? Yes

Site management requirements: Yes. Site should be remain capped as concentrations of solvents above MCL have been found in groundwater and a cap could be an additional barrier for solvents volatalizing from groundwater and for any remaining solvents leaching into groundwater.

Should corrective action be reviewed if land use changes? No, but during any construction activities, health and safety precautions should be taken to protect workers and if pertinent, other personnel and public. } this should

Monitoring wells Decommissioned: No (wells should be closed w/ appropriate permits this could be stated in the closure) Number Retained: letter. } be one of the risk management measures and should include

List enforcement actions taken: N/A

List enforcement actions rescinded: N/A

not just construction activities but any activities that could lead to exposure to site pollutants

V. LOCAL AGENCY REPRESENTATIVE DATA

Name: Madhulla Logan

Signature: Madhulla Logan

Title: Hazardous Material Specialist
Date: 9/29/96

VI. RWQCB NOTIFICATION

Date Submitted to RB:

RWQCB Staff Name: Sum Arigala

RB Response: Concur w/ changes

Title: Sanitary Engineer

date:

10/17/96

VII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS, DATA, ETC.

In September 1993, a Phase 1 Environmental Assessment was conducted for the property. Based on the information submitted in this reports, the site was previously used for assembling packaging machinery, sheet metal fabrication (cutting and bending of metal sheets), shipping dock, engineering, drafting and designing, degreasing area, painting (in a paint booth), cutting and polishing finished product, and storing hazardous waste. The report mentions of surface markings that indicate the presence of an underground storage tank (UST) in the northwest corner of the facility. Also, the remains of a pump island are still present on the site.

In April/May 1994, 10 soil samples were collected at 5 ft and 10 ft from 5 soil borings and the soil analytical results indicated concentrations of tetrachloroethylene (PCE), up to 29 ppb. Also, in boring B-5 which was located in the northwestern corner, a suspect area for a UST, Total petroleum hydrocarbon and oil and grease was found in concentrations of 60 ppm and 80 ppm respectively.

In December 1994 and May 1995, 6 additional borings B-6 through B-8 were located upgradient. The laboratory results of soil samples indicates concentrations of PCE up to 63 ppb at 5 ft and 28 ppb at 20 ft. Also, 1 grab groundwater sample was collected from each of the 6 borings. In the up gradient wells, there was 1 hit of PCE at 16 ppb, 2 hits of trichloroethylene (TCE) with concentrations of up to 40 ppb, 1 hit of cis-1, 2, dichloroethylene (DCE) at 2.3 ppb and 1 hit of 1,1 DCE at 22 ppb. In the remaining wells, the laboratory results indicated PCE up to 1520 ppb, TCE up to 940 ppb, Cis, 1,2 DCE up to 1930 ppb and vinyl chloride up to 25 ppb.

In February 1996, 2 soil borings B12 and B13 and 3 monitoring wells, MW-1 to MW-3 were installed. Borings B-12 and B-13 were installed in areas suspected of once containing an Underground storage tank. Monitoring well, MW-1 was installed as the up gradient well, while monitoring well, MW-2 and MW-3 were installed near Boring B-7 (where high concentrations of PCE was found in the grab groundwater sample) and near Boring B-8 (where the UST was suspected to have existed) respectively.

In Boring B-12, only oil and grease was detected at 36 ppm and no BTEX or diesel was found. In boring B-11, no concentrations of contaminant above the detection limit was found. The laboratory results of the soil samples indicated concentrations of PCE of up to .0053 ppm and .0111 in monitoring well, MW-2 and MW-3 respectively. No solvents were found in the soil samples collected from boring MW-1. Significant concentrations of solvents were found in the groundwater samples collected from monitoring wells, MW-2 The up gradient well, MW-1 and monitoring well, MW-3 had concentrations of solvents within 1 order of magnitude less than the concentrations found in monitoring well, MW-2.

Since the concentrations of PCE found in the samples collected from the monitoring wells exceeded the maximum contaminant levels, and since monitoring well MW-2 was not really placed down gradient to boring B-7 (where highest concentrations of PCE was found in a grab groundwater sample), this Department requested that an additional boring be placed down gradient to boring B-7. In July 1996, an additional boring was placed down gradient to boring B-7 location. Laboratory results of grab groundwater samples collected from this additional boring indicated concentrations of PCE and TCE up to 80 ppb and 33 ppb respectively. These concentrations were more consistent with the concentrations found in monitoring well, MW-2 and were found to be an order of magnitude less than the concentrations found in boring B-7.

Also, a risk management document, dated, August 28, 1996 mentions the following required restrictions and notification which are to be included as part of the property deed:

- Any risk to workers/public health will be re-evaluated during any construction or other activities that may involve the disturbance of subsurface soils.
- No lateral or vertical conduits will be added to the site to enhance cross contamination
- The groundwater at the site will not be utilized for potable or industrial usage
- Any future activities at the site that require the utilization of hazardous chemicals, or the generation of hazardous waste will require the development of a business plan and a waste management plan.
- The site will remain capped with concrete or asphalt to the extent that this material is currently present.

Rationale for Closure:

1. Solvent concentrations in soil were found to be less than the EPA Region 9's Preliminary Remediation Goals (PRGs), and hence no threat to public health exists.
2. Even if concentrations are greater than MCL, water in the pertaining area is not used for drinking and there are no plan to use the water as a drinking water source in future.
3. The area is zoned for industrial use and the background concentrations of solvents could be significant as evidenced by concentrations found in the up gradient well, MW-1 in February 1996.
4. There appears to be degradation occurring as evidenced by the decreasing concentrations in the monitoring wells and also due to the disappearance of some of the solvents.