Detterman, Mark, Env. Health

From: Detterman, Mark, Env. Health
Sent: Wednesday, February 03, 2016 3:48 PM
To: britpete@aol.com; 'Sami Malaeb'
Cc: 'Elaine Kay'; mrodarte@waterboards.ca.gov; Roe, Dilan, Env. Health
Subject: 2145 35th Avenue, Oakland (Chevron 9-8861 - Independent; RO2945) Meeting Followup
Attachments: Example Figures and Tables From RO199.pdf

Sami,

As discussed in the meeting I wanted to followup on the items ACEH requested in order minimize confusion. Due to the number of redevelopment cases in Oakland and elsewhere, ACEH will have shortly a standard letter requesting site specific variations to the attached figures and tables from project proponents and their consultants to efficiently communicate the scope of a redevelopment, including depth of excavations, and remaining proposed residual contamination after excavation. There may be none, but these tables and figures very quickly and efficiently indicate this. ACEH will close this case under the Low Threat Closure Policy (LTCP); however, the imminent planned redevelopment and residual contamination will affect how it is approached and managed. The "Redevelopment Communication Tools" are requested to include:

- Full electronic plan set; most recent.
- For future plan set changes ACEH will require electronic copies, and a cover letter from the environmental professional geologist or engineer a statement that "The following plan sets, (list of sets, including applicable dates) submitted to the City of Oakland, have been reviewed and are consistent with assessment results, recommendations, and with the proposed mixed use redevelopment." The intent is to eliminate building or planning department changes, which occur at every redevelopment, and that can easily alter the understanding of commercial / residential exposure to residual contamination, if any.
- Project schedule – where is the project in entitlement project planning, CEQA, building and planning department approvals, when construction is hoped to realistically begin, a realistic time frame for regulatory review (Will try for 30 days; but will also try for better if we can, but standard is 60 days), when and what project proponents will need something in writing from ACEH for financing, and recognition that if mitigation measures are involved closure cannot be provided until a final confirmation sampling report is submitted and reviewed (60 days). The submittal of a Gantt chart may be appropriate so that we can all set realistic time frames, and incorporate changes as events happen.
- Plan view of historic borings, recent / current bores, and any proposed bores and historic infrastructure related to contamination, or areas of groundwater contamination of concern, etc.
- Plan view of proposed redevelopment related to historic, current, and any proposed bore locations. This may require several figures at complex data sites; fewer is better, but at the risk of too complex a figure that decreases the communication effort.
- Multiple cross sections across a site that depict proposed redevelopment excavation base elevation, foundation depth elevation, any proposed cut / fill lines, old soil bore locations along those cross sections, and depth-correct residual analytical proposed to remain below the foundation. Below the future proposed foundation elevation, lithology can be depicted if it plays an important role; however, an important intent is to depict the location of residual contamination relative to the proposed building foundation and the proposed lowest building level (or higher if appropriate), proposed uses (commercial / residential / day care / senior care / etc.). Groundwater depth and analytical should also be depicted as well (with groundwater level fluctuations). Lithology or data above the proposed excavation depth can be removed if it decreases the clutter of the figure; it' won't be of consequence to the future development once removed; however, the analytical data will remain in the tables (see below).
- An appropriate number of detailed cross sections through areas of interest, such as former sources (former parts storage, former UST location, dispenser locations, former dry cleaner equipment

locations, potential offsite areas of contamination that would affect reuse after redevelopment [contaminated fill beneath a sidewalk], unexplored areas of potential contamination, or other areas identified as potential areas of concern needing clearer illumination). The intent is to quickly illustrate residual contamination, or perhaps the lack of data, and once investigated, why it is protective of future occupants or future uses. These cross sections must include any offsite improvements where contamination is documented or likely (fill under sidewalk, former sidewalk UST location, etc), or café chairs and permeable pavers over residual contamination, infrastructure improvements such as utilities through residual contamination (such as a storm drain drop box, etc. at a former offsite UST location), or other items that can / will affect site users, construction workers, or the public.

- Electronic Phase 1 for all involved parcels.
- A table with ALL historic and current analytical data, with removed soil (historic and future) indicated by shading or strike out (but still legible). If you want to distinguish between historic removed and proposed, you might use different shadings. Many of the example tables (pg 8 and beyond of the attached scan) tabulate data by "soil to be removed / soil proposed to remain"; alternatively the data can remain in standard presentation style form (consecutive bore / sample / depth).
- All ND tabulated analytical listed by individual chemical detection limit (<x), and highlighting / bolding of detects, or of concentrations over ESLs (or other goals), <u>including non-detects over ESLs</u>. Can partly be combined with a professional signed statement that your consultant has reviewed all analytical data and has found it is below ESLs or other goals for the site.
- An extra column on soil / groundwater tables for "Sample Depth Relative to Proposed Foundation Depth".
- Appropriate use of ESLs where appropriate relative to the future proposed foundation depth (groundwater or a soil vapor sample at a site may have been 10 feet bgs, may now be 2 ft below the proposed foundation, and would not meet the 10 foot separation distance groundwater ESLs assume or 5 ft separation that VI ESLs assume / require, or the minimum 5 foot separation the LTCP uses).
- If mitigation measures are required (removal of fill under sidewalk to prevent gardener exposure) then the site might need a RAP and / or a HHRA to evaluate risk with and without mitigation measures (assuming no removal of residual contamination below the future foundation). If needed, the RAP must be approved by ACEH and then incorporated into the building plans, which requires coordination with ACEH, building department, and the consultant throughout the final plan approval to ensure changes made during building department or planning review do not conflict with ACEH approved plans. This is a constant issue ACEH is having. All plan changes will also require a professional signed statement from the professional consultant that the changes do not affect the proposed mitigation measures.
- Generation of a robust SMP to deal with any proposed "Remedial Actions"; known (volumes, destinations, etc.) or unexpected contamination that might be found during redevelopment, construction dust management / monitoring for onsite and additionally dust exposure monitoring for any offsite residential receptors, stormwater, step-out contingency, vertical and lateral confirmation samples below undefined contamination, potential USTs? - perhaps a contingency for contact info with ACEH CUPA group, etc.

I think that is it. You should review the attached tables and figures for additional ways to effectively communicate with ACEH, project proponents, and eventually the public at closure. This effort is to build the case that residual contamination is appropriate to leave (if any), is protective of future occupants or uses, and the general public.

Additional site specific items we discussed in the meeting include:

- A request for groundwater monitoring and sampling of wells MW-2 and MW-3, the measurement of groundwater in all wells at the same time, and the generation of hydrographs (TPH and volatiles against depth to water measurements). The intent is to collect groundwater at potentially non-drought levels. All groundwater sampling at the site has only been generated since the start of the historic

drought, and the 5 foot vapor bioattenuation zone beneath the depth of the reported future foundation the LTCP vapor criteria uses is very limited (less than ½ foot) and has only been documented in the drought period.

- As discussed in the meeting, ACEH is in agreement that the generation of a Site Management Plan (SMP) should be delayed, and that a soil excavation work plan should be submitted instead. Therefore, ACEH has extended the SMP submitted 6 months, or until September 16, 2016 on Geotracker, and has required the submittal of an Interim Remedial Action Work Plan by April 1, 2016. The destruction of well MW-3 is likely to be associated with this work; please include a brief discussion as needed.
- ACEH additionally understands that the vapor investigation work plan will be submitted as requested on March 21, 2016.

Once you have a chance to digest this let me know and if needed we can identify a submittal date in order to keep the project moving to the best of our abilities. Please understand that while more informal, this email will be saved as a directive letter, and will be uploaded to Geotracker.
Let me know if you have questions; hopefully this helps.

Mark Detterman
Senior Hazardous Materials Specialist, PG, CEG
Alameda County Environmental Health
1131 Harbor Bay Parkway
Alameda, CA 94502
Direct: 510.567.6876
Fax: 510.337.9335
Email: mark.detterman@acgov.org

PDF copies of case files can be downloaded at:

http://www.acgov.org/aceh/lop/ust.htm