

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

November 14, 2017

Kuen Lau and Sar P. Kwan  
3701 Lakeshore Ave.  
Oakland, CA 94601

Sharon K. Birch  
7373 Skyline Blvd.  
Oakland, CA 94611-1121

Jon McCurdy and Sharon K. McCurdy  
7373 Skyline Blvd.  
Oakland, CA 94611-1121

James & Yvonne Littlepage  
3820 Penniman Ave.  
Oakland, CA 94619-1759

John A. and L. MacDonald  
3820 Penniman Ave.  
Oakland, CA 94619-1759

Subject: Site Characterization for Fuel Leak Case No. RO0003231 and GeoTracker Global ID  
T100000009413, 3820 Penniman Avenue, Oakland, CA 94619

Dear Responsible Parties:

Alameda County Department of Environmental Health (ACDEH) staff has reviewed the document entitled, "Investigation Summary Report and Work Plan for Additional Investigation," dated May 26, 2017 (electronically received on June 9, 2017), prepared by RPS Iris Environmental (RPS Iris) for the subject site. The report documents the results of an investigation conducted at the site in March 2017 to evaluate impacts from an unauthorized release from two former underground storage tanks (USTs) located in the sidewalk that were removed from the site in November 2015. The field investigation activities included installation of five borings and collection of six soil samples, one soil vapor sample, and four "grab" groundwater samples at the site. Based on the results of the investigation, a scope of work for additional site characterization is also included in the above-mentioned submittal. The proposed scope of work includes additional free product and groundwater delineation through the installation of three borings to first encountered groundwater and five groundwater monitoring wells, and installation of one soil gas probe to further evaluate potential vapor intrusion impacts in the southeastern portion of the warehouse building.

ACDEH understands the site is currently used as a wholesale commercial herb distributor and is located in a primarily residential area. The majority of the site is comprised of an approximate 7,000 square foot warehouse with a small loading yard located on the southeast side of the building. ACDEH further understands that there are no plans to change the use of the property in the foreseeable future.

ACDEH has evaluated the data and recommendations presented in the above-mentioned report, in conjunction with the case file, and the State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCBs) Low Threat Underground Storage Tank Case Closure Policy (LTCP). Based on ACDEH staff review, we have determined that the site fails to meet the LTCP General Criteria—d (Free Product), and f (Secondary Source Removal), and the Media-Specific Criteria for Groundwater. Additionally, there does not appear to be sufficient justification presented to approve the proposed scope of work. Therefore, at this juncture ACDEH requests that you address the Technical Comments below and submit the requisite documents in accordance with the compliance dates listed in the Technical Report/Document section.

## **TECHNICAL COMMENTS**

### **1. LTCP General Criteria Compliance**

- a. General Criteria d (Free Product)** – The LTCP requires free product to be removed to the extent practicable at release sites where investigations indicate the presence of free product. The LTCP requires that free product be removed in a manner that minimizes the spread of the unauthorized release into previously uncontaminated zones by using recovery and disposal techniques appropriate to the hydrogeologic conditions at the site, and that properly treats, discharges, or disposes of recovery byproducts in compliance with applicable laws. Additionally, the LTCP requires that abatement of free product migration be used as a minimum objective for the design of any free product removal system.

ADCEH's review of the case files indicates that insufficient data and analysis has been presented to assess free product at the site. Specifically, the "grab" groundwater sample collected from boring IE-3 located in the inferred down-gradient direction of former underground storage tanks (USTs) detected total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) as gasoline (g) at a concentration of 230,000 micrograms per liter ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ ). The concentration of TPH-g detected in groundwater is greater than the TPH-g effective solubility of 20,000  $\mu\text{g/L}$  and thus may be indicative of free-phase product.

- b. General Criteria f (Secondary Source)** – The LTCP defines "secondary source" as petroleum-impacted soil or groundwater located at or immediately beneath the point of release from the primary source. Unless site attributes prevent secondary source removal (e.g. physical or infrastructural constraints exist whose removal or relocation would be technically or economically infeasible), petroleum-release sites are required to undergo secondary source removal to the extent practicable as described herein. "To the extent practicable" means implementing a cost-effective corrective action which removes or destroys-in-place the most readily recoverable fraction of source-area mass. According to the LTCP, following removal or destruction of the secondary source, additional removal or active remedial actions shall not be required by regulatory agencies unless (1) necessary to abate a demonstrated threat to human health or (2) the groundwater plume does not meet the definition of low threat as described in this policy."

ACDEH's review of the case file indicates that insufficient data and analysis has been presented to support that secondary source has been removed to the extent practicable. During tank removal the excavation was advanced to 11 feet bgs which brought the excavation down to 3 feet below the former bottom of the tanks. Soil at 11 feet bgs were not visibly stained or odorous however bottom of excavation confirmation samples had TPH-g concentrations of up to 200 milligrams per kilogram. Soil samples from a boring installed in the former source area were not collected. Therefore, it appears that the secondary source is undefined at this time.

### **2. LTCP Media-Specific Criteria Compliance**

- a. Groundwater** – To satisfy the media-specific criteria for groundwater, the contaminant plume that exceeds water quality objectives must be stable or decreasing in areal extent, and meet all of the additional characteristics of one of the five classes of sites listed in the policy.

Soil sample analytical results collected at 3 feet and 8 feet below the ground surface (bgs) detected low concentrations of TPH as diesel (d) at 1.5 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) in sample IE-2 at 3 feet bgs. However, it was noted that high PID detections, up to 900 parts per million (ppm) were encountered at deeper depths just above the water bearing zone. As

discussed above, the “grab” groundwater sample collected from boring IE-3 located in the inferred down-gradient direction of former USTs detected TPH-g at a concentration of 230,000 µg/L. First encountered groundwater was observed during drilling at depth between 11 and 16 feet bgs and stabilized to depths ranging from 7.5 feet and 15.8 feet bgs. The proposed scope of work includes installation of five groundwater monitoring wells to define the extent of the groundwater plume. ACDEH concurs that the extent of groundwater contamination has not been defined and groundwater contaminant plume stability has not been demonstrated. However, at this time, due to the relatively shallow depth to groundwater at the site, it appears premature to install permanent monitoring points until a site conceptual model and preferential pathway evaluation is conducted to locate potential migration pathways and conduits and determine the probability of the LNAPL and/or plume (groundwater or vapor) encountering preferential pathways and conduits that could spread contamination.

3. **b. Vapor Intrusion** – Soil vapor sampling results detected tetrachloroethene (PCE) at 20 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m<sup>3</sup>) in soil vapor sample IE-5-SG. The contents of the tanks was unknown and therefore may be a source of the PCE. Additionally, according to “Phase I Environmental Assessment,” prepared by Basics Environmental, “[t]he specific use of the subject site from 1930 to 1938 and 1945 to 1956, could not be determined within this scope of work.” It was also stated in the above-mentioned report that an auto repair garage and auto repair shop historically operated at the site. Therefore, a potential source for PCE may be present at the site.

#### **TECHNICAL REPORT and DELIVERABLES REQUEST**

Please submit the following technical reports to ACDEH (Attention: Paresh Khatri), according to the file naming convention included in Attachment 2 and the associated compliance schedule listed below:

1. **Document Review:** Please conduct a document review (including Sanborn maps, etc.) for the site to determine past site uses. This information is necessary to determine optimal locations for sampling points to verify non-petroleum contamination. Should non-petroleum contamination be verified, the site investigation and/or cleanup will be performed under a separate case overseen under ACDEH’s Site Cleanup Program.
2. **Revised Data Gap Investigation Work Plan and Focused Site Conceptual Model** – Please prepare Revised Data Gap Investigation Work Plan to address the technical comments listed above. Please support the scope of work in the Revised Data Gap Investigation Work Plan with a focused SCM and Data Quality Objectives (DQOs) that relate the data collection to each LTCP criteria. For example please clarify which scenario within each Media-Specific Criteria a sampling strategy is intended to apply to. Also include the site’s current use (type of business, vacant or occupied, etc.) and include future use for the site (i.e., whether redevelopment is planned).

The SCM must include a preferential pathway study that details the potential migration pathways and potential conduits (wells, utilities, pipelines, etc.) for vertical and lateral migration that may be present in the vicinity of the site. An evaluation of all utility lines and trenches (including sewers, storm drains, pipelines, trench backfill, etc.) within and near the site and plume area(s) is required as part of your study. Please include maps and cross-sections illustrating the location and depth of all utility lines and trenches within and near the site and plume areas(s) as part of your study.

The preferential pathway study must also include a detailed well survey of all wells (monitoring and production wells: active, inactive, standby, destroyed (sealed with concrete), abandoned (improperly destroyed or lost); and dewatering, drainage, and cathodic protection wells) within a ¼ mile radius of the subject site. As part of your detailed well survey, please 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. Please review and submit copies of historical maps, such as Sanborn maps, aerial photographs, etc., when conducting the background study.

In order to expedite review, ACDEH requests the focused SCM be presented in a tabular format that highlights the major SCM elements and associated data gaps, which need to be addressed to progress the site to case closure under the LTCP. Please see Attachment A "Site Conceptual Model Requisite Elements". Please sequence activities in the proposed revised data gap investigation scope of work to enable efficient data collection in the fewest mobilizations possible.

- **December 8, 2017** – Revised Data Gap Investigation Work Plan and Focused Site Conceptual Model

3. **Path to Closure Project Schedule** - The State Water Resources Control Board passed Resolution No. 2012-0062 on November 6, 2012 requires development of a "Path to Closure Plan" by December 31, 2013 that addresses the impediments to closure for the site. The Path to Closure must have milestone dates tied to calendar quarters which will achieve site cleanup and case closure in a timely and efficient manner and minimizes the cost of corrective action. Therefore, by the date listed below, please prepare a Path to Closure Schedule for your site that incorporates the items identified by ACDEH in the Technical Comments above as impediments to closure (further detailed in Attachment B). Additionally, please evaluate the site against the LTCP criteria and incorporate additional data collection activities in the Path to Closure Schedule and Data Gap Investigation Work Plan to address other impediments to closure under the policy not identified by ACDEH.

- **December 8, 2017** – Path to Closure Schedule

3. **Electronic Submittal of Information (ESI) Compliance** - Site data and documents are maintained in two separate electronic databases – ACDEH's ftp site and the SWRCB's GeoTracker database. Both databases act as repositories for regulatory directives and reports; however, only GeoTracker has the functionality to store electronic compliance data including analytical laboratory data for soil, vapor and water samples, monitoring well depth-to-water measurements, and surveyed location and elevation data for permanent sampling locations. Although the SWRCB is responsible for the overall operation and maintenance of the GeoTracker System, ACDEH, as lead regulatory agency, is responsible to ensure the GeoTracker database is complete and accurate for sites regulated under ACEH's Environmental Cleanup Oversight Programs (SWRCB March 2011 document entitled *Electronic Reporting Roles and Responsibilities*).

A review of the case file and the State's GeoTracker database indicates that the site is not in compliance with California Code of Regulations, Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 16, Article 12, Sections 2729 and 2729.1, stating that beginning September 1, 2001, all analytical data, including monitoring well samples, submitted in a report to a regulatory agency as part of the UST or LUST program, must be transmitted electronically to the SWRCB GeoTracker system via the internet. In September 2004, the SWRCB adopted regulations that require electronic submittal of information for all groundwater

Responsible Parties

RO0003231

November 14, 2017, Page 5

cleanup programs, including SLIC programs. Beginning July 1, 2005, electronic submittal of a complete copy of all reports for all sites was required in GeoTracker. At present missing data and documents include, but may not be limited to, EDF submittals, depth to groundwater data (GEO\_WELL files), well data (GEO\_XY, and GEO\_Z files), work plans, and older reports (GEO\_REPORT files).

Please upload requisite documents to GeoTracker. See Attachment 1 for limited additional details, and the State's GeoTracker website for full details. ACDEH requests notification of, and a list of, the documents uploaded to Geotracker. Please upload all submittals to GeoTracker as well documents found to be missing from ACDEH's ftp website by the date specified below.

- **December 8, 2017** – ESI Compliance

These reports are being requested pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 25296.10. California Code of Regulation, Title 23 Sections 2652 through 2654, and sections 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.

If you have any questions, please call me at (510) 777-2478 or send me an electronic mail message at [paresh.khatri@acgov.org](mailto:paresh.khatri@acgov.org).

Sincerely,

Paresh C. Khatri

Supervising Hazardous Materials Specialist

Local Oversight and Site Cleanup Program Manager

Encl.: Attachment 1 – Responsible Party (ies) Legal Requirements / Obligations  
Electronic Report Upload (ftp) Instructions  
Attachment 2 – File Naming Conventions  
Attachment 3 – ESI Compliance  
Attachment 4 – Site Conceptual Model

cc: Craig T. Pelletier, RPS Iris Environmental (*Sent via E-mail to: [Craig.Pelletier@rpsgroup.com](mailto:Craig.Pelletier@rpsgroup.com)*)  
Dilan Roe, ACDEH, Chief Land, Water Division (*Sent via E-mail to: [dilan.roe@acgov.org](mailto:dilan.roe@acgov.org)*)  
Paresh Khatri, ACDEH (*Sent via E-mail to: [paresh.khatri@acgov.org](mailto:paresh.khatri@acgov.org)*)  
Electronic File, GeoTracker

## 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/](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.

<b>Alameda County Environmental Cleanup Oversight Programs (LOP and SCP)</b>	<b>REVISION DATE:</b> December 1, 2016
	<b>ISSUE DATE:</b> July 5, 2005
	<b>PREVIOUS REVISIONS:</b> October 31, 2005; December 16, 2005; March 27, 2009; July 8, 2010, July 25, 2010; May 15, 2014, November 29, 2016
<b>SECTION:</b> Miscellaneous Administrative Topics & Procedures	<b>SUBJECT:</b> 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 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](mailto: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](mailto: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.

<b>Alameda County Environmental Cleanup Oversight Programs (LOP and SCP)</b>	<b>REVISION DATE:</b> August 1, 2017
	<b>PREVIOUS REVISIONS:</b>  July 17, 2017, November 8, 2016, December 15, 2015, December 16, 2014, June 19, 2013, June 15, 2011, March 26, 2009, April 29, 2008
	<b>ISSUE DATE:</b> June 16, 2006
<b>SECTION:</b> Miscellaneous Administrative Topics & Procedures	<b>SUBJECT:</b> File Names for Electronic Reports

Format: REPORT\_NAME\_R\_YYYY-MM-DD  
Ex: SWI\_R\_VOL1\_2006-05-25

<b>LOP and SCP (VRAP) INCOMING REPORTS AND LETTERS</b>	
<b>Document Name</b>	<b>Abbreviation File Name= Abbreviation + Date (yyyy- mm-dd)</b>
Abandoned Well Information/Water Supply Well Information	ABWELLINF_R
Addendum	ADEND_R (added after report name)
Additional Information Report	ADD_R
Analytical Reports (Loose data sheets not in report)	ANALYT_R
As Built Drawings (or Plans)	AS_BUILT
Case File Scanned By OFD	CASE_FILE
Cleanup and Abatement Report	CAO_R
Case Transfer Form (from CUPA)	CASE_TRNSFR_F
Conduit Study/Well Search/Sensitive Receptor/Well Survey/Preferential Pathway Study	COND_WELL_R
Corrective Action Plan (CAP)	CAP_R
Correspondence	CORRES_L
Court Injunctions	INJ_L
Development Plans (Includes Plan Set, Cross-sections, and Related Drawings)	DEV_PLAN_date
Development Schedule (Project Schedule, Gant Chart, etc.)	DEV_SCHD_date
DWR Confidential Well Logs (Report containing)	report name_R_CONFIDENTIAL_YYYY-MM-DD (Ex: SWI_R_CONFIDENTIAL_YYYY-MM-DD)
DWR Well Completion Report-Confidential (Loose well logs)	DWR_WELL_CONFIDENTIAL_YYYY-MM-DD (Date of Well Log)
ESI/DAR (Environmental Site Investigation, Data Assessment Report)	ESI_R
Excavation Report	EX_R
Extension Request Letter	EXT_RQ_L
Fact Sheet	FACT_SHT

Feasibility Study	FEASSTUD_R
Groundwater Monitoring/Quarterly Summary Report	GWM_R
Financial Assurance/Letter of Credit	FNCL_ASSRNC_LOC
Interim Remedial Action Plan	IRAP_R
Interim Remediation Results (Includes Pilot Test Reports, Vapor Mitigation Reports, Soil Reports, Free Product Removal Reports, & Dual-Phase Extraction Reports)	IR_R
Lawsuit	LAWSUIT_R
Migration Control Report	MIG_R
Miscellaneous Report/Soil Sample	MISC_R
Miscellaneous Sample Report (analytical results)	MISC_SAMP_R
Notification Letter	NOT_L
NPDES Miscellaneous Reports	NPDES_R
Operations & Maintenance Plan	OM_P
Operations & Maintenance Report	OM_R
Pay for Performance	PFP_R
Petition	PETITION_R
Phase 1 Environmental Assessment Report	PHASE1_R
Photos	PHOTO_date
Preliminary Site Assessment Report/Phase 2 (historic reports only)	PSA_R
Remedial Action Plan	RAP_R
Remedial Design & Implementation Plan	RDIP_R
Remediation Progress Report	REM_R
Request for Closure	RFC(_L or _R)
Risk Assessment Report	RISK_R
Risk Based Corrective Action	RBCA_R
List of Landowners Forms	LNDOWNR_F_DATE
SB2004 Letter of Commitment	LOC_L
Site Conceptual Model/Conceptual Site Model	SCM_R
Site Health & Safety Plan	SFTY_PLAN_R
Site Management	SITE_MANAGE_R_
Site Management Plan	SMP_R
Site Summary Report	SITE_SUM_R

Soil and Water Investigation Report (Includes soil gas/vapor reports, indoor, additional site investigation, well installation, site characterization, cross section, indoor air, additional onsite investigation, Phase II/preliminary site assessment)	SWI_R
Soil Disposal Report	SOIL_DSPL_R
Source Area Characterization	SOURCAREA_R
State Information	STATE_INFO (no date)
Status Report(monthly remediation status reports addressed to sanitary district requires no stamp/perjury)	STAT_R
Tank/Tank System Removal Report	TNK_R
Tentative Order Report	TENT_R
Unauthorized Release Form	URF_R
UST Sampling Report	UST_SAMP_R
USTCF 5 Year Review	USTCF_5YR
USTCF issued Public Notice	USTCF_PP_L
Well Construction Report (limited to water supply wells)	WELL_CST_R
Well Decommissioning Report/Letter (well destruction/abandonment)	WELL_DCM_R
Work Plan	WP_R

# ATTACHMENT 3

## Electronic Submittal of Information (ESI) Compliance

Currently, site data and documents are maintained in two separate electronic databases – ACDEH's File Transfer Protocol (FTP) site and the SWRCB's Geotracker website. Both databases act as repositories for Portable Document Format (PDF) files of regulatory directives and reports, but only Geotracker has the functionality to store electronic compliance data in Electronic Deliverable Format (EDF) including analytical laboratory data for soil, vapor and water samples, monitoring well depth-to-water measurements, and surveyed location and elevation data for permanent sampling locations. Although the SWRCB is responsible for the overall operation and maintenance of the Geotracker System, ACDEH, as lead regulatory agency, is responsible to ensure that the Geotracker database is complete and accurate for sites regulated by ACDEH under the LOP and SCP (SWRCB March 2011 document entitled *Electronic Reporting Roles and Responsibilities*).

Because Geotracker is often used as the sole source of information at sites where chemical releases have occurred, the accuracy, completeness, and timeliness of the information on the database is critical in the following realms in order to facilitate review and analysis of data and informed decision making that is protective of human health, safety and the environment:

- The public domain during the public participation process as required by Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Chapter 16, Section 2728;
- The real-estate industry during property transactions;
- RPs, consultants, and the LOP during the site investigation, corrective action, monitoring, and case closure process; and
- State and federal government during decision making related to closure recommendations and petitions, priorities and funding, and evaluation of the UST cleanup program effectiveness.

Pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 30, Articles 1 and 2, Sections 3890 to 3895, the following data and documents require electronic submittal, but may not be limited to:

- complete copies of reports, in pdf format, including the signed transmittal letter and professional certification (GEO\_REPORT files);
- analytical data for soil, water and vapor samples collected for the purpose of subsurface investigation or remediation, including influent/effluent water samples from remediation systems (EDF files);
- surveyed elevation measurements to the top of well casings (GEO\_Z files);
- the latitude and longitude (GEO\_XY files) of any permanent monitoring well for which data is reported in EDF format;
- depth-to-water information for permanent sampling points whenever the data is collected, even if the well is not sampled during the sampling event (GEO\_WELL files);
- stand alone site maps displaying tank locations, streets bordering the facility, and sampling locations for all soil, water and vapor samples (GEO\_MAP files);
- stand alone boring logs with depth to the screened interval and the length of screened interval for any permanent monitoring well installed (GEO\_BORE files);

# ATTACHMENT 4

## 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"> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 5 to 20 feet bgs: very dark-brown silty clay grades to a greenish-gray silty clay and brown silty clay and gravelly clay.</li> </ul> <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)**

<b>CSM Element</b>	<b>CSM Sub-Element</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Data Gap Item #</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
Geology and Hydrogeology	Site	<p>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).</p> <p>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).</p>	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)**

<b>CSM Element</b>	<b>CSM Sub-Element</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Data Gap Item #</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
		The area around the ramps and pit in the southern area of the site is considered a potential source area.		
LNAPL		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.	1. Need monitoring wells at the site.	Monitoring wells (5) to be installed.
Source Removal Activities		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.	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.	Ten soil borings are proposed, as discussed in the data gaps table.
Contaminants of Concern		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	4.	

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

<b>CSM Element</b>	<b>CSM Sub-Element</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Data Gap Item #</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
		former shop building, and in the northwestern area of the Site.		
Petroleum Hydrocarbons in Soil		<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>	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.	Additional soil borings to be advanced, as described in the data gaps table.
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>	8. There are no monitoring wells on site.	Five monitoring wells will be installed, as described in the data gaps table and in the work plan.

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

CSM Element	CSM Sub-Element	Description	Data Gap Item #	Resolution
		<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>		
Risk Evaluation		<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:</p> <p>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).</p> <p>Step out borings: Step out boring SB-5 to be completed proximal to the UST #3 source area.</p> <p>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)**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Data Gap Item #</b>	<b>Proposed Investigation</b>	<b>Rationale</b>	<b>Analyses</b>
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)**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Data Gap Item #</b>	<b>Proposed Investigation</b>	<b>Rationale</b>	<b>Analyses</b>
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