

ALAMEDA COUNTY
HEALTH CARE SERVICES
AGENCY
REBECCA GEBHART, Interim Director



DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
LOCAL OVERSIGHT PROGRAM (LOP)
For Hazardous Materials Releases
1131 HARBOR BAY PARKWAY, SUITE 250
ALAMEDA, CA 94502
(510) 567-6700
FAX (510) 337-9335

June 20, 2017

Mr. Jacob Levy
Palm Peninsula, LLC and 7200 Bancroft, LLC
201 Wilshire Boulevard
Santa Monica, CA 90401
(Sent via E-mail to: jacob@levyaffiliated.com)

Subject: Site Cleanup Program (SCP) Case RO0002942 and GeoTracker Global ID SLT19735483, Sparkle Cleaners, 7200 Bancroft Avenue, Oakland, CA 94605 – Request for Technical Reports

Dear Mr. Levy:

Alameda County Department of Environmental Health (ACDEH) staff has reviewed the SCP case file for the above-referenced site, including the documents entitled *Soil Vapor Sampling Report, Sparkle Cleaners, 7000 Bancroft Avenue, Oakland, California*, dated 12 December 2016, and *Groundwater Monitoring Report, First Semi-Annual 2015 Event*, dated 5 June 2015. These reports were prepared by PES Environmental (PES) on your behalf. The Soil Vapor Sampling Report describes the installation and sampling results from eight soil vapor probes within and in the vicinity of the Sparkle Cleaners Suite. The Groundwater Monitoring Report presents the results of the March 2015 groundwater monitoring event. This letter summarizes our understanding of the site and the case status. We request that you conduct additional investigation and submit technical reports to the ACDEH as discussed in the 6 June 2017 meeting with you and your consultant, Mr. William Mast of PES.

Sparkle Cleaners is an active dry-cleaning facility located within the northwest portion of the Eastmont Town Center. Tetrachloroethene (PCE) was used as the dry-cleaning solvent until December 2008, at which time the PCE-based equipment was decommissioned, removed from the property and replaced with new clothes cleaning equipment, reportedly utilizing a soy-based cleaner. In 2007, remedial actions were implemented at the facility to remove soil with elevated concentrations of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) related to dry-cleaning operations, and approximately 37 cubic yards of soil containing concentrations of PCE above the target soil cleanup concentration of 240 micrograms per kilogram ($\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$) were excavated, in accordance with the Remedial Action Workplan (RAW) dated 5 January 2007. The excavation was backfilled using controlled density fill and four monitoring wells (MW-1 through MW-04) were installed to assess and monitor VOC concentrations in groundwater. To date, 13 groundwater monitoring events have been conducted on a quarterly or semi-annual basis with the last event conducted in March 2015. To assess the potential for residual contamination at the site to pose a risk of vapor intrusion to occupants of the cleaner facility and adjacent tenant spaces, eight temporary soil vapor probes (PSV-1 through PSV-8) were installed and sampled in September 2016 within the source area and downgradient from the source area.

Based on our review of the case file, our discussion during the meeting and data presented in the Soil Vapor Sampling Report and the Groundwater Monitoring Report, ACDEH requests that you address the technical comments listed below and submit the requested technical documents to ACDEH for review and approval.

TECHNICAL COMMENTS

- 1. Soil Vapor Sampling.** PCE, trichloroethene (TCE), benzene, toluene and chloroform were detected in the soil vapor samples collected in September 2016, and detected PCE concentrations exceeded the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) commercial/industrial Environmental Screening Level (ESL - Soil Gas Vapor Intrusion: Human Health Risk Levels, Table SG-1) of 2,100 micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$). PCE was detected in all 8 samples at concentrations ranging from 162 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (probe PSV-5) to 85,300 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (probe PSV-1) with concentrations exceeding the ESL in soil vapor probes (PSV-1, -2, -4, -6 and -7). The highest soil vapor concentrations were detected in the two probes (PSV-1 and PSV-12) installed in the hallway adjacent to the location of the former PCE dry cleaner equipment.

Further investigation of the potential for vapor intrusion at the Sparkle Cleaner's Suite and adjacent suites/areas is required. We recommend using the step by step approach in the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) guidance document *Guidance for the Evaluation and Mitigation of Subsurface Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air*, dated October 2011. We request that you resample soil vapor probes PSV-1 through PSV-8 to evaluate current conditions and soil gas concentration trends. Additionally, based on the concentrations of PCE above ESLs detected in soil gas samples collected in September 2016, we request that you conduct sub-slab soil gas and indoor air sampling to assess the potential for vapor intrusion to be occurring at the site.

The figures submitted to the ACDEH in PES' 31 October 2016 Soil Vapor Sampling Report are stamped, "DRAFT," and the site outline shown in Figure 1 of the report is incorrect. The report needs to be corrected and re-submitted.

- 2. Groundwater Monitoring.** Groundwater monitoring wells MW-01 through MW-04 need to be gauged and sampled to evaluate current conditions. Groundwater elevations and contaminant concentrations in each of the groundwater monitoring wells should be monitored concurrent with resampling of the existing soil gas probes (i.e., within approximately two weeks of each other). Groundwater elevations at other monitored sites in the vicinity of the site have increased by approximately 2 to 10 feet between 2016 and 2017, so ACDEH anticipates that water levels at the site have increased over the past year. Samples should be analyzed for VOCs, including PCE and its potential degradation products. Dissolved oxygen (DO) concentrations, oxidation reduction potential (ORP), temperature, pH, electrical conductivity (eC), and turbidity should also be measured in each of the wells. ACDEH recommends that groundwater sampling be performed using low-flow methods and that water quality parameters be measured using a flow-through cell, to minimize the effects of sample collection. The well water was highly turbid during the 31 March 2015 sampling event, so ACDEH recommends that the wells be re-developed prior to sampling. ACDEH requests that the wells be resampled during June 2017.

Additionally, please evaluate the adequacy of the existing groundwater monitoring well network (including screen interval, depth and location) to delineate the vertical and horizontal extent of the impacted groundwater. Monitoring well MW-1 is screened from 31.5 feet below ground surface (bgs) to 46.5 feet bgs. PES logged sands from 38.5 feet bgs to 47 feet bgs

(the total explored depth) in this location. PES states that the screen interval for well MW-02 is at least 9 feet shallower. The screened interval of well MW-02 does not include the sand unit identified by PES in well MW-01. An additional well that is screened to monitor deeper groundwater (i.e., the sand unit observed in well MW-01) is needed adjacent to well MW-02. We suggest installing well MW-2B as a well pair that might also provide information indicative of the potential vertical gradient at the site; ACDEH does not require a workplan prior to installation of this well. An additional well in this location would provide data to further assess the current monitoring well network. Additionally, please evaluate whether additional wells are needed downgradient of the former PCE dry cleaning machine (between wells MW-02 and MW-04). ACDEH recommends that monitoring well screen length not exceed 10 feet.

3. **Soil Investigation.** As discussed in the meeting, a figure in the Phase II report shows the locations of drums of spent PCE in the hallway where soil vapor concentrations are the highest. Please propose additional borings and sample collection in the hallway to evaluate soil and groundwater conditions in this area.

4. **Work Plan and Site Conceptual Model (SCM).** As discussed during the meeting and in the technical comments above, additional measures are necessary to adequately address human health and groundwater resource concerns resulting from the PCE release at the site. ACDEH anticipates that additional VOC removal will be warranted. To assess threats from PCE in soil, soil gas, and groundwater at the site, and to develop a cost-effective path to closure approach, please prepare a work plan for additional field investigation activities to further assess soil, groundwater and vapor intrusion risk at the site. The work plan must be supported by a SCM that synthesizes all the analytical data and evaluates all potential exposure pathways and potential receptors that may exist at the site. At a minimum, the SCM should include:
 - a. Local and regional plan view maps that illustrate the location of sources (former facilities, piping, tanks, etc.) extent of contamination, direction and rate of groundwater flow, potential preferential pathways, and locations of receptors;
 - b. Geologic cross section maps that illustrate subsurface features, man-made conduits, and lateral and vertical extent of contamination;
 - c. Plots of chemical concentrations versus time;
 - d. Plots of chemical concentrations versus distance from the source;
 - e. Summary tables of chemical concentrations in different media (i.e. soil, groundwater, and soil vapor); and
 - f. Well logs, boring logs, and well survey maps;
 - g. Discussion of likely contaminant fate and transport.

We request that you prepare the SCM in a tabular format to facilitate review and updating as additional data is collected. If data gaps are identified in the SCM, please include a proposed scope of work to address those data gaps in the work plan. Included for your reference is ACDEH guidance for preparation of an initial SCM and proposed data gap investigation in

table format which highlights the major SCM elements and their associated data gaps, if any, which need to be addressed to progress the site to case closure (Attachment A).

5. **Site Management Plan.** As discussed in the meeting, the site and adjacent units are occupied and used for commercial purposes. Due to the concentrations of PCE and TCE in soil gas beneath the former Sparkle Cleaners, we request that you prepare a Site Management Plan (SMP) to guide tenant improvements and protect occupants and site workers in the area of soil, groundwater and soil vapor impacts, while investigation and remediation are ongoing. The SMP should document the current configuration of Sparkle Cleaners and adjacent tenant spaces and other essential site features and construction details (slab type, thickness and age; existing soil vapor/groundwater/other monitoring wells/sumps, underground utility layout; areas of previous remedial excavations and depths, etc.). The SMP should also include protocols for ACDEH notification of proposed subsurface work prior to implementation for ACDEH review and approval.
6. **Geotracker Compliance.** As discussed at the meeting, the site needs to be brought into compliance with State requirements for electronic submittal of analytical data. All subsurface data must be uploaded in EDF format.
7. **Site Identification.** Please note, ACDEH has updated the responsible party contact information in the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker and County databases to reflect a 2015 change of property ownership and transfer of responsibility for cleanup of the site from Eastmont Oakland Associates, LLC to Palm Peninsula, LLC and 7200 Bancroft LLC. ACDEH has also updated the project identification information (Alameda County Assessor's Parcel (APN) and site address) by removing APN 39-3291-23 owned by the previous property owner to accurately reflect the parcel where the Sparkle Cleaners facility is located and where the release of PCE into the environment occurred. The updated site address is 7200 Bancroft Avenue and the associated APN is 39-3291-22.

TECHNICAL REPORT REQUEST

Please upload technical reports to the ACDEH ftp site (Attention: Robert Schultz), and to the State Water Resources Control Board's GeoTracker website according to the following schedule and file-naming convention:

- 17 July 2017 – Results from the Resampling of Existing Soil Vapor Probes and Groundwater Monitoring Wells; Electronic Submittal to Geotracker of water level data and analytical laboratory results (EDF). Additionally, the site must be in compliance with State electronic submittal requirements (Geotracker) by 17 July 2017.
- 28 July 2017 – Work Plan for Vapor Intrusion Investigation at and in Adjacent Areas of Sparkle Cleaners;

File to be named: RO2942_WP_R_yyyy-mm-dd.

- 8 September 2017 – Site Management Plan;

File to be named: RO2942_SMP_YYYY-MM-DD

- 8 September 2017 – Work Plan for Additional Soil, Groundwater and Soil Vapor Investigation at and in Adjacent Areas of Sparkle Cleaners; the Work Plan should include a section describing the installation methods, well construction details, and analytical results from sampling of well MW-2B.

File to be named: RO2942_WP_R_YYYY-MM-DD

- 8 December 2017 – Soil, Groundwater and Vapor Intrusion Investigation Report and Updated Site Conceptual Model;

File to be named: RO2942_SWI_SCM_YYYY-MM-DD

ACDEH responsible party requirements and detailed instructions pertaining to this request are summarized in Attachment 1. If you have any questions, please contact me at robert.schultz@acgov.org. Online case files are available for review at the following website: <http://www.acgov.org/aceh/index.htm>.

Sincerely,



Robert W. Schultz, CHG
Senior Hazardous Materials Specialist

Attachments:

Attachment A – SCM Guidance

Attachment 1 - Responsible Party(ies) Legal Requirements / Obligations

cc: William Mast, PES Environmental, Inc., 1682 Novato Boulevard, Suite 100, Novato, CA 94947
(Sent via E-mail to: wmast@pesenv.com)
Dilan Roe, ACDEH (Sent via E-mail to: dilan.roe@acgov.org)
Paresh Khatri, ACDEH (Sent via E-mail to: paresh.khatri@acgov.org)
Robert Schultz, ACDEH (Sent via E-mail to: robert.schultz@acgov.org)
GeoTracker, eFile

ATTACHMENT A

Site Conceptual Model Requisite Elements

The site conceptual model (SCM) is an essential decision-making and communication tool for all interested parties during the site characterization, remediation planning and implementation, and closure process. A SCM is a set of working hypotheses pertaining to all aspects of the contaminant release, including site geology, hydrogeology, release history, residual and dissolved contamination, attenuation mechanisms, pathways to nearby receptors, and likely magnitude of potential impacts to receptors.

The SCM is initially used to characterize the site and identify data gaps. As the investigation proceeds and the data gaps are filled, the working hypotheses are modified, and the overall SCM is refined and strengthened until it is said to be "validated". At this point, the focus of the SCM shifts from site characterization towards remedial technology evaluation and selection, and later remedy optimization, and forms the foundation for developing the most cost-effective corrective action plan to protect existing and potential receptors.

For ease of review, Alameda County Environmental Health (ACEH) requests utilization of tabular formats to (1) highlight the major SCM elements and their associated data gaps which need to be addressed to progress the site to case closure (see Table 4-1 of attached example), and (2) highlight the identified data gaps and proposed investigation activities (see Table 5-1 of the attached example). ACEH requests that the tables presenting the SCM elements, data gaps, and proposed investigation activities be updated as appropriate at each stage of the project and submitted with work plans, feasibility studies, corrective action plans, and requests for closures to support proposed work, conclusions, and/or recommendations.

The SCM should incorporate, but is not limited to, the topics listed below. Please support the SCM with the use of large-scaled maps and graphics, tables, and conceptual diagrams to illustrate key points. Please include an extended site map(s) utilizing an aerial photographic base map with sufficient resolution to show the facility, delineation of streets and property boundaries within the adjacent neighborhood, downgradient irrigation wells, and proposed locations of transects, monitoring wells, and soil vapor probes.

- a. Regional and local (on-site and off-site) geology and hydrogeology. Include a discussion of the surface geology (e.g., soil types, soil parameters, outcrops, faulting), subsurface geology (e.g., stratigraphy, continuity, and connectivity), and hydrogeology (e.g., water-bearing zones, hydrologic parameters, impermeable strata). Please include a structural contour map (top of unit) and isopach map for the aquitard that is presumed to separate your release from the deeper aquifer(s), cross sections, soil boring and monitoring well logs and locations, and copies of regional geologic maps.
- b. Analysis of the hydraulic flow system in the vicinity of the site. Include rose diagrams for depicting groundwater gradients. The rose diagram shall be plotted on groundwater elevation contour maps and updated in all future reports submitted for your site. Please address changes due to seasonal precipitation and groundwater pumping, and evaluate the potential interconnection between shallow and deep aquifers. Please include an analysis of vertical hydraulic gradients, and effects of pumping rates on hydraulic head from nearby water supply wells, if appropriate. Include hydraulic head in the different water bearing zones and hydrographs of all monitoring wells.
- c. Release history, including potential source(s) of releases, potential contaminants of concern (COC) associated with each potential release, confirmed source locations, confirmed release locations, and existing delineation of release areas. Address primary leak source(s) (e.g., a tank, sump, pipeline, etc.) and secondary sources (e.g., high-

Site Conceptual Model Requisite Elements (continued)

concentration contaminants in low-permeability lithologic soil units that sustain groundwater or vapor plumes). Include local and regional plan view maps that illustrate the location of sources (former facilities, piping, tanks, etc.).

- d. Plume (soil gas and groundwater) development and dynamics including aging of source(s), phase distribution (NAPL, dissolved, vapor, residual), diving plumes, attenuation mechanisms, migration routes, preferential pathways (geologic and anthropogenic), magnitude of chemicals of concern and spatial and temporal changes in concentrations, and contaminant fate and transport. Please refer to the *Preferential Pathway and Sensitive Preceptor Study* description on the next page. Please include three-dimensional plume maps for groundwater and two-dimensional soil vapor plume plan view maps to provide an accurate depiction of the contaminant distribution of each COC.
- e. Summary tables of chemical concentrations in different media (i.e., soil, groundwater, and soil vapor). Please include applicable environmental screening levels on all tables. Include graphs of contaminant concentrations versus time.
- f. Current and historic facility structures (e.g., buildings, drain systems, sewer systems, underground utilities, etc.) and physical features including topographical features (e.g., hills, gradients, surface vegetation, or pavement) and surface water features (e.g. routes of drainage ditches, links to water bodies). Please include current and historic site maps.
- g. Current and historic site operations/processes (e.g., parts cleaning, chemical storage areas, manufacturing, etc.).
- h. Other contaminant release sites in the vicinity of the site. Hydrogeologic and contaminant data from those sites may prove helpful in testing certain hypotheses for the SCM. Include a summary of work and technical findings from nearby release sites, including the two adjacent closed LUFT sites, (i.e., Montgomery Ward site and the Quest Laboratory site).
- i. Land uses and exposure scenarios on the facility and adjacent properties. Include beneficial resources (e.g., groundwater classification, wetlands, natural resources, etc.), resource use locations (e.g., water supply wells, surface water intakes), subpopulation types and locations (e.g., schools, hospitals, day care centers, etc.), exposure scenarios (e.g. residential, industrial, recreational, farming), and exposure pathways, and potential threat to sensitive receptors. Include an analysis of the contaminant volatilization from the subsurface to indoor/outdoor air exposure route (i.e., vapor pathway). Please include copies of Sanborn maps and aerial photographs, as appropriate. Please refer to the *Preferential Pathway and Sensitive Preceptor Study* description on the next page.
- j. Identification and listing of specific data gaps that require further investigation during subsequent phases of work. Proposed activities to investigate and fill data gaps identified.

Preferential Pathway and Sensitive Receptor Study

Please conduct a study as a part of the SCM requested in order to (1) locate potential anthropogenic migration pathways on and in the vicinity of the site that could spread contamination through vertical and lateral migration, and (2) identify exposure scenarios and sensitive receptors that are linked to site contamination through these preferential pathways. The results of your study shall contain all information required by California Code of Regulations, Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 16, §2654(b) including but not limited to the following components, as applicable to the site:

- a. **Utility Survey** - An evaluation of all existing subsurface utility lines, laterals, and trenches including sewers, electrical, fiber optic cable, cable, water, storm drains, trench backfill, etc. within and near the site and plume area(s). Please include an evaluation of shallow utilities associated with current and historical site operations/processes including UST systems, remediation systems, parts cleaning, sumps, etc.
- b. **Updated Well Survey** – ACEH requests that well data sources (Alameda County Public Works Agency [ACPWA] and Department of Water Resources [DWR]) be reviewed for more recently installed vicinity water supply wells. ACEH requests the identification of all active, inactive, standby, decommissioned (sealed with concrete), unrecorded, and abandoned (improperly decommissioned or lost) wells including monitoring, remediation, irrigation, water supply, industrial, livestock, dewatering, and cathodic protection wells within a ¼-mile radius of the subject site. Please inspect all available Well Completion Reports filed with the DWR and ACPWA in your survey, and perform a background study of the historical land uses of the site and properties in the vicinity of the site. Use the results of your background study to determine the existence of unrecorded/unknown (abandoned) wells, which can act as contaminant migration pathways at or from your site.
- c. **Land Uses and Exposure Scenarios on the Facility and Adjacent Properties** – The surrounding land use appears to be predominately agricultural; however, redevelopment of the site as a service station has been planned. Consequently, the identification of existing and future land use on and in the vicinity of the site is requested, including:
 - o Beneficial resources (e.g., groundwater classification, wetlands, surface water bodies, natural resources, etc.)
 - o Subpopulation types and locations (e.g., schools, hospitals, day care centers, elder care facilities, etc.)
 - o Exposure scenarios (e.g. residential, industrial, recreational, farming) and exposure pathways including those identified in the Low Threat Underground Storage Tank Case Closure Policy General Criteria h – Nuisance Conditions, and Media-Specific Criteria for Groundwater, Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air, and Direct Contact and Outdoor Air Exposure
- d. **Planned Development** – Future development activities are planned in the vicinity of the site. Please include an analysis of new utility corridors, building foundations, wells, and/or development activities that could significantly alter contaminant migration (i.e., covering of large areas of the site with pavement, etc.).

Please synthesize this information and discuss your analysis and interpretation of the results of the preferential pathway and sensitive receptor study and incorporate into the requested SCM. Please provide the following supporting documentation and data as applicable:

- Copies of current and historical maps, such as site maps, Sanborn maps, aerial photographs, etc., used when conducting the background study.
- DWR well logs, marked as confidential, uploaded to Alameda County Environmental Health's ftp site. For confidentiality purposes do not upload the DWR well logs to Geotracker. The well logs will be placed in our confidential file and will be available only to internal staff for review.
- Table with details of the well search findings including Map ID corresponding to well location on map, State Well ID, Well Owner ID, approximate distance from the site, direction from the site, use, installation date, depth (feet below ground surface [bgs]), screened interval (feet bgs), sealed interval (feet bgs), diameter (inches), and well location address.
- Maps and geologic cross-sections illustrating historical groundwater elevations and flow directions (rose diagram) at the site. Synthesize the data requested above and include the location and depth of all utility lines, trenches, UST pits and piping trenches, wells, surface water bodies, foundational elements, surface covering types (pavement, landscaped, etc.) within and near the site and plume area(s), and the location of potential receptors.

**Table 4-1
Site Conceptual Model**

CSM Element	CSM Sub-Element	Description	Data Gap Item #	Resolution
Geology and Hydrogeology	Regional	<p>As described by URS (2004), the lithology encountered in the subsurface beneath the Site during drilling activities consisted predominantly of a brown to greenish-gray silty clay with sand and gravel. The primary stratigraphic units at the Site are listed below, with the approximate ranges of depth (bgs) each unit was encountered across the Site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 to 5 feet bgs: The surface soil typically consisted of very dark-brown clay to dark-gray gravel fill, depending on whether the boring was in the vacant vegetated parcel (dark-brown clay), at 3860 MLK Jr. Way; or beneath the asphalt and concrete surfaces at the Lucky's Auto Body parcel at 3884 MLK Jr. Way (gravel fill). • 5 to 20 feet bgs: very dark-brown silty clay grades to a greenish-gray silty clay and brown silty clay and gravelly clay. <p>Groundwater was encountered in direct-push boreholes at an average depth of 17.2 feet bgs, with depths ranging from 16.2 to 19.6 feet bgs. This groundwater depth is not considered a stabilized groundwater depth, because it was not measured from appropriately constructed monitoring wells.</p>	None	NA

**Table 4-1
Site Conceptual Model (Continued)**

CSM Element	CSM Sub-Element	Description	Data Gap Item #	Resolution
Geology and Hydrogeology	Site	Regional groundwater in the Oakland area generally follows topography, from areas of higher elevation in the east toward lower elevation in the west and southwest. The groundwater flow direction in the vicinity of the Site is to the west towards San Francisco Bay (Arcadis, 2012). URS reviewed groundwater investigation reports from the ARCO #4931 station at 731 West MacArthur Boulevard, approximately 1,000 feet southwest of the Site (Arcadis, 2012). The depth to water in the groundwater monitoring wells at the ARCO site ranged from approximately 3.2 to 10.8 feet bgs (approximately 52.2 to 43 feet elevation).	1. There are no monitoring wells on site so that the local groundwater flow direction and gradient is not known.	Five groundwater wells are to be installed at the site.
Surface Water Bodies		The closest surface water body is the San Francisco Bay, which is 1.5 miles west of the site.		
Nearby Wells		The State Water Resource Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Geotracker GAMA website provides the locations of water supply wells proximal to the site. The nearest supply well is located approximately 2 miles southwest of the site. There are multiple monitoring wells in the vicinity of the site including those at the Arco services station at 781 West MacArthur Blvd., and Dollar Cleaners, 4860 – 4868 Telegraph Avenue, Oakland.	2.	NA
Release Source and Volume		The three prior gasoline USTs (two 650-gallon and one 500-gallon) are considered the main source of the release of fuel hydrocarbons that have been detected in soil and groundwater beneath the Site. Tanks #1 and #2 were both observed to have one or more holes from corrosion at the time of removal. Although no holes were observed in Tank #3 during removal, the integrity of the tank was questionable as it split into two pieces along the weld during removal. Soil surrounding the tanks was stained green and was noted to have strong petroleum hydrocarbon odors. The release from the Tanks at the Site was discovered on January 5, 1995 during tank removal activities. The volume of the release is not known.	5. & 6. Additional soil and groundwater data is required in the source areas.	See data gaps table. Additional soil borings will be advanced in the source areas. Groundwater monitoring wells will be installed.

**Table 4-1
Site Conceptual Model (Continued)**

CSM Element	CSM Sub-Element	Description	Data Gap Item #	Resolution
LNAPL		<p>The area around the ramps and pit in the southern area of the site is considered a potential source area.</p> <p>There are currently no groundwater monitoring wells located at the Site. Although light non-aqueous phase liquids were not observed during grab groundwater sampling activities, concentrations of TPH-g in sample G2 (22,000 µg/L), located near former Tank #3, and sample GP3 (79,800 µg/L), located adjacent to former Tank #1 may indicate the potential for the presence of light non-aqueous phase liquid (LNAPL) to be present.</p>	<p>1. Need monitoring wells at the site.</p>	<p>Monitoring wells (5) to be installed.</p>
Source Removal Activities		<p>Soil that was excavated from the UST pits during tank removal activities was returned to the excavation after the collection of soil samples for chemical analysis. There is no information regarding the quality of the soil that was placed back in the UST excavations. As such, with the exception of the removal of the USTs themselves, there have been no other source removal activities conducted at the Site.</p>	<p>2., 5., 6. Soil contamination at depth (12-foot bgs and deeper) is not well characterized. Since the site is to be excavated to approximately 12 feet bgs for the construction of a parking garage, additional shallow soil sampling is not required.</p>	<p>Ten soil borings are proposed, as discussed in the data gaps table.</p>
Contaminants of Concern		<p>Based on the historical investigations conducted at the Site, BTEX, cis-1,2-dichloroethene (cis-1,2-DCE), 1,2-dichloroethane (1,2-DCA) and TPH-g are present in groundwater above their respective MCLs and/or ESLs. However, based on correspondence from the ACEHSD, the contaminants of concern (COCs) for the site are BTEX, and TPH-g. These COCs are present above the screening levels primarily in the northern corner of the Site, near the location of the former USTs. Benzene and TPH-g are also present in groundwater above their MCLs and ESLs in the southern portion of the Site in the vicinity of the truck ramp and pit adjacent to the</p>	<p>4.</p>	

**Table 4-1
Site Conceptual Model (Continued)**

CSM Element	CSM Sub-Element	Description	Data Gap Item #	Resolution
Petroleum Hydrocarbons in Soil		<p>former shop building, and in the northwestern area of the Site.</p> <p>Of the 58 samples analyzed from the two investigations, eight samples from seven borings exceeded their respective screening criteria. These samples were typically the deepest sample from the boring, ranging from 8.0 to 14.0 feet bgs. This is consistent with releases from a UST as opposed to a surface spill or release. Based on the historical investigation data, BTEX and TPH-g are the contaminants present in soil at concentrations exceeding their respective screening criteria. The contaminants are present mainly in soil at the location of former Tanks #1 through #3, and to a lesser extent, near the former fuel pump island in the northern corner of the Site.</p> <p>The lateral extent of contamination exceeding the screening criteria appears to be limited to the area around the former USTs. Soil concentration in all the samples from boring GP3 and S10, located in the sidewalk by Martin Luther King Jr. Way near former Tank #1 and Tank #2 are below their respective screening criteria. There is no additional data from around former Tank #3. Given the nature of the petroleum hydrocarbon (mainly light fraction gasoline), the vertical extent of contamination beneath and in close proximity to the former tanks is likely limited to the lowest level of groundwater fluctuation.</p>	<p>4. & 7. Additional soil sampling is required to better define the vertical extent of contamination. Redevelopment will include excavation of the entire site to a depth of 12 feet bgs for the construction of an underground parking garage.</p>	<p>Additional soil borings to be advanced, as described in the data gaps table.</p>
Petroleum Hydrocarbons in Groundwater		<p>During the two subsurface investigations conducted at the Site, a total of 15 grab groundwater samples were collected and analyzed for TPH-g and BTEX. The results of the analyses are summarized in Table 2-2. Concentration of TPH-g and/or BTEX exceeded their respective screening criteria in ten of the 15 samples analyzed. Similar to the soil sampling results, the highest concentrations were detected beneath or in close proximity to the former USTs. However, TPH-g and benzene were detected in one Site boring (G7) exceeding their respective screening criteria near the southern corner of the Site. There are no permanent monitoring wells located at the Site. As such, the groundwater flow direction across</p>	<p>8. There are no monitoring wells on site.</p>	<p>Five monitoring wells will be installed, as described in the data gaps table and in the work plan.</p>

**Table 4-1
Site Conceptual Model (Continued)**

CSM Element	CSM Sub-Element	Description	Data Gap Item #	Resolution
Risk Evaluation		<p>the Site cannot be evaluated. This has been defined as a significant data gap. The scope of work presented in this work plan includes the installation of four groundwater monitoring wells at the Site.</p> <p>The Site is a former auto body and car wash facility. The Site is currently vacant, and with the exception of a billboard located in the northwest corner of the Site, has no structures and is covered with either asphalt or concrete foundations from former buildings located at the Site. The Site is zoned for residential and current plans are to redevelop the Site for residential use. However, there may be some commercial use on the ground level. This preliminary CSM assumes that development would consist of an underground parking garage; store fronts and residential units at ground level; and second story residential units.</p> <p>The CSM identifies the primary source; impacted media; release mechanism(s); secondary source(s); exposure route; potential receptors (residential, commercial/industrial worker, and construction worker), and an assessment of whether the exposure route/pathway is potentially complete, incomplete, or insignificant. Potential exposure routes that have been evaluated include incidental ingestion, dermal contact, dust inhalation, and vapor inhalation.</p> <p>For direct contact with contaminated soil, the exposure route for incidental ingestion, dermal contact, and dust inhalation for a residential and commercial/industrial worker are considered incomplete. These exposure routes for the construction worker are considered a potentially complete pathway, depending on the nature of the work. For volatilization from soil to outdoor air, vapor inhalation is the potential exposure pathway. Given dilution effects that take place outdoors, this exposure pathway is considered incomplete for all three potential receptors. For indoor air, this exposure pathway is considered potentially complete for all three potential receptors.</p>		

**Table 4-1
Site Conceptual Model (Continued)**

CSM Element	CSM Sub-Element	Description	Data Gap Item #	Resolution
		<p>For leaching of contaminants from soil to groundwater, the ingestion and dermal pathways for groundwater are considered incomplete, except for the construction worker, as shallow groundwater is not utilized as a drinking water source at the Site. For the construction worker, incidental ingestion and dermal contact is a potentially complete pathway. For volatilization from groundwater to outdoor air, the exposure pathway is considered insignificant due to dilution effects that take place outdoors. For indoor air, volatilization from groundwater to indoor air is considered a potentially complete pathway.</p>		

**Table 5-1
Data Gaps Summary and Proposed Investigation (Continued)**

Item	Data Gap Item #	Proposed Investigation	Rationale	Analyses
2	<p>The soil data set does not adequately characterize the contamination (if any) that may remain on site after the excavation to approximately 11 to 12 feet bgs for the underground parking structure. The current soil data sets are 7 and 9 years old and may not be representative of current site conditions. Lithology below is not adequately characterized.</p>	<p>Ten soil borings will be drilled to a total depth of 20 feet bgs. Soil samples will be collected at 12 feet, 15 feet, and 20 feet bgs from soil borings SB-4 through SB-10. Soil samples will not be collected from soil borings SB-1, SB-2, and SB-3 which are located across MLK north of the site, as there is no reason to suspect an off-site soil contamination source in this area. Borings will be logged using the Unified Soil Classification System. Grab groundwater samples will be collected from the first encountered groundwater at each soil boring.</p>	<p>Soil samples will be collected starting at 12 feet bgs. Shallow soil on site is to be excavated for disposal during the construction of the underground parking garage. Excavation will be conducted to a depth of about 12 feet bgs. Soil borings will be located as shown in the work plan figure: Source area borings: At the former locations of USTs 1, 2 and 3. One boring north of the site on the side walk of MLK Way. One boring between USTs 1 and 2 and the pump island (potential leakage from conveyance piping). One boring at the approximate location of UST 3 (in addition to the soil samples to be collected from the monitoring well to be installed at this location). One boring in the vicinity of the ramps and pit in the southern portion of the site (in addition to soil samples to be collected from the monitoring well in this area). Step out borings: Step out boring SB-5 to be completed proximal to the UST #3 source area. GP4 Area: Benzene was previously detected at 25,000 µg/kg at location GP4 (Carver, 2006). Two step-out borings will be completed in this area to further characterize soils at depth.</p>	<p>TPH-g, BTEX, EDB, EDC.</p> <p>Boring SB-4 (on sidewalk of MLK near UST 1): PAHs</p>

**Table 5-1
Data Gaps Summary and Proposed Investigation (Continued)**

Item	Data Gap Item #	Proposed Investigation	Rationale	Analyses
3	There is no data on the presence and usage of wells in the vicinity of the site.	Obtain a well survey.	Identify irrigation and other wells in the site vicinity.	N/A
4	PAHs are potential COCs at the northern boundary of the site.	See soil borings – Item 2. PAHs will be analyzed at select locations as described in Item 2.	Item 2	Item 2
5	There is a potential source area in the vicinity of the ramps and pit.	A monitoring well will be installed in this area. It will also serve as the upgradient well for the site. See Item 2. A soil boring will also be completed in this area.	Item 2	Item 2
6	Determine size and contents of the three USTs that were removed from the site	Review prior reports.	Tanks #1 and #2 were identified as 650-gallon gasoline tanks. Tank #3 was a 500-gallon gasoline tank [Tank Removal Report – 1995]. Tanks #2 and #3 were observed to be badly deteriorated with holes due to corrosion.	NA
7	Confirm whether TPH-g and BTEX were detected during construction of the adjacent residential unit	Review prior reports.	The URS site investigation conducted in 2004 found no detections of TPH-g [$<1,000 \mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$] or BTEX [$<5.0 \mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$] in the borings completed to 14 feet bgs.	NA

**Table 5-1
Data Gaps Summary and Proposed Investigation (Continued)**

Item	Data Gap Item #	Proposed Investigation	Rationale	Analyses
8	Review data from the nearby service stations (Arco)	Review prior reports.	The former Arco station (731 West MacArthur Blvd.) is about 0.5 miles crossgradient of the 3884 MLK site. The BTEX levels are lower than those at the subject site; the Arco site does not appear to be contributing to on site TPH or BTEX contamination. Groundwater elevation data from this site was used to calculate groundwater flow direction, since there are currently no wells at the 3884 MLK site.	NA

Attachment 1

Responsible Party(ies) Legal Requirements / Obligations

REPORT REQUESTS

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

Alameda County Department of Environmental Health's (ACDEH) Environmental Cleanup Oversight Programs, Local Oversight Program (LOP) and Site Cleanup Program (SCP) require submission of reports in electronic form. The electronic copy replaces paper copies and is expected to 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 File Transfer Protocol (FTP) site are provided on the attached "Electronic Report Upload Instructions." 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. In September 2004, the SWRCB adopted regulations that require electronic submittal of information for all 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 monitoring wells, and other data to the GeoTracker database over the Internet. Beginning July 1, 2005, these same reporting requirements were added to SCP sites. Beginning July 1, 2005, electronic submittal of a complete copy of all reports for all sites is required in GeoTracker (in PDF format). Please visit the SWRCB website (http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/ust/electronic_submittal/) for more information on these requirements.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

All work plans, technical reports, or technical documents submitted to ACDEH must be accompanied by a cover letter from the responsible party that states, at a minimum, the following: "I have read and acknowledge the content, recommendations and/or conclusions contained in the attached document or report submitted on my behalf to ACDEH's FTP server and the SWRCB's GeoTracker website." 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 6731, 6735, and 7835) 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 licensed 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 case meet this requirement. Additional information is available on the Board of Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists website at: <http://www.bpelsg.ca.gov/laws/index.shtml>.

UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK CLEANUP FUND

Please note that delays in investigation, late 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.

Alameda County Environmental Cleanup Oversight Programs (LOP and SCP)	ISSUE DATE: July 5, 2005
	PREVIOUS REVISIONS: October 31, 2005; December 16, 2005; March 27, 2009; July 8, 2010, July 25, 2010; May 15, 2014, November 29, 2016
SECTION: Miscellaneous Administrative Topics & Procedures	SUBJECT: Electronic Report Upload (ftp) Instructions


The Alameda County Environmental Cleanup Oversight Programs (LOP and SCP) 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.

REQUIREMENTS

- **Please do not submit reports as attachments to electronic mail.**
- Entire report including cover letter must be submitted to the ftp site as **a single portable document format (PDF) with no password protection.**
- It is **preferable** that reports be converted to PDF format from their original format, (e.g., Microsoft Word) rather than scanned.
- **Signature pages and acknowledgement and perjury statements must be included and have either original or electronic signature.**
- **Do not password protect the document.** Once indexed and inserted into the correct electronic case file, the document will be secured in compliance with the County's current security standards and a password. **Documents with password protection will not be accepted.**
- Each page in the PDF document should be rotated in the direction that will make it easiest to read on a computer monitor.
- Reports must be named and saved using the following naming convention:

RO#_Report Name_Year-Month-Date (e.g., RO#5555_WorkPlan_2005-06-14)

Submission Instructions

- 1) Obtain User Name and Password
 - a) Contact the Alameda County Environmental Health Department to obtain a User Name and Password to upload files to the ftp site.
 - i) Send an e-mail to deh.loptoxic@acgov.org.
 - b) In the subject line of your request, be sure to include "**ftp PASSWORD REQUEST**" and in the body of your request, include the **Contact Information, Site Addresses**, and the **Case Numbers (RO# available in Geotracker) you will be posting for.**
- 2) Upload Files to the ftp Site
 - a) Open File Explorer using the Windows  key + E keyboard shortcut.
 - i) Note: Netscape, Safari, and Firefox browsers will not open the FTP site as they are NOT being supported at this time.
 - b) On the address bar, type in ftp://alcoftp1.acgov.org.
 - c) Enter your User Name and Password. (Note: Both are Case Sensitive)
 - d) Click Log On.
 - e) Open "My Computer" on your computer and navigate to the file(s) you wish to upload to the ftp site.
 - f) With both "My Computer" and the ftp site open in separate windows, drag and drop the file(s) from "My Computer" to the ftp window.
- 3) Send E-mail Notifications to the Environmental Cleanup Oversight Programs
 - a) Send email to deh.loptoxic@acgov.org notify us that you have placed a report on our ftp site.
 - b) Copy your Caseworker on the e-mail. Your Caseworker's e-mail address is the entire first name then a period and entire last name @acgov.org. (e.g., firstname.lastname@acgov.org)
 - c) The subject line of the e-mail must start with the RO# followed by **Report Upload**. (e.g., Subject: RO1234 Report Upload) If site is a new case without an RO#, use the street address instead.
 - d) If your document meets the above requirements and you follow the submission instructions, you will receive a notification by email indicating that your document was successfully uploaded to the ftp site.