

## **APPENDIX H**

**PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT  
ADDENDUM: NORTHWEST CORNER OF  
WELD BOULEVARD AND CUYAMACA STREET,  
EL CAJON, CALIFORNIA  
Rincon Consultants, November 13, 2008**

**PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT,  
FORRESTER CREEK INDUSTRIAL PARK,  
Rincon Consultants, June 12, 2008**



**PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT  
ADDENDUM: NORTHWEST CORNER OF  
WELD BOULEVARD AND CUYAMACA STREET,  
EL CAJON, CALIFORNIA  
Rincon Consultants, November 13, 2008**





**Rincon Consultants, Inc.**

5355 Avenida Encinas, Suite 103  
Carlsbad, California 92008

760 918 9444

FAX 918 9449

info@rinconconsultants.com  
www.rinconconsultants.com

November 13, 2008  
Project 07-24380

Diane Catalano  
PBS&J  
9275 Sky Park Court, Suite 200  
San Diego, California 92123

**Phase I ESA Addendum:  
Northwest Corner of Weld Boulevard and Cuyamaca Street, El Cajon, California**

Dear Ms. Catalano:

Rincon Consultants, Inc. prepared a *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for the property located at the Northwest Corner of Weld Boulevard and Cuyamaca Street in El Cajon, California* dated April 30, 2008. In this Phase I ESA Assessment, Rincon identified an open Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) release case at 1840 Weld Boulevard which is adjacent to the west of the subject site. This release reportedly impacted soil and groundwater at this adjacent facility. As a part of the Phase I ESA Rincon personnel reviewed the file for the adjacent facility to the west, 1840 Weld Boulevard. The file indicated that assessment work was conducted at this facility in the late 1990s and early 2000s relating to a gasoline and diesel release but no work had been conducted since 2004. As a part of the Phase I ESA, Rincon personnel contacted Mr. James Clay, the caseworker for this site, of the County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health (DEH). Mr. Clay indicated that Ninyo & Moore submitted a work plan for this site in July of 2007. The work plan was approved on October 16, 2007 and Mr. Clay indicated that Ninyo & Moore conducted the drilling at the site on April 22, 2008 and the assessment report had not been submitted to the DEH. Rincon's Phase I ESA recommended conducting an additional file review at the DEH to review the Ninyo & Moore report of their recent groundwater monitoring and sampling conducted at the 1840 Weld Blvd site. This addendum letter details our findings from the review of Ninyo & Moore's report.

On October 29, 2008 Rincon personnel reviewed the following report prepared by Ninyo & Moore: *Groundwater Monitoring, Well Installation, and Sampling at the County of San Diego Santee Service Station at 1840 Weld Boulevard, El Cajon, California*, September 5, 2008. The report details the installation and sampling of three new groundwater monitoring wells (MW-4 thru MW-6) using an air rotary drill rig and the sampling of three existing wells (MW-1A, MW-2A, and MW-3A) at this adjacent facility. On April 2, 2008 three groundwater monitoring wells were installed at this facility and 10 soil samples were collected and analyzed for total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH), volatile organic compounds



(VOCs), and lead. Following several weeks of waiting for the groundwater levels to equalize and well development, the wells were sampled on April 22, 2008. The groundwater samples were analyzed for TPH as gasoline (TPHg), TPH as diesel (TPHd), benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, total xylenes, (BTEX), methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), VOCs, and lead.

#### *Soil Sampling*

MW-4 had reported concentrations of TPHd in soil of 13, 43, 8.1, 6.7, and 5.9 milligrams per Kilogram (mg/Kg) at 15, 20, 25, 30, and 35 feet, respectively. The sample at 20 feet below grade was also analyzed for VOCs and lead. No VOCs were reported and lead was found at a concentration of 4.97 mg/kg. Further, no TPH or VOCs were reported in MW-5 at 5 feet below grade. Lead was reported at 2.32 mg/kg. MW-6 at 5 feet below grade had a TPHd concentration of 14 mg/kg and a lead concentration of 1.75 mg/kg. Deeper samples were not collected since sample recovery was not possible due to the rock matrix encountered at 40 feet in MW-4 and at 10 feet below grade in MW-5 and MW-6. Based on several previous borings advanced at the site which indicated the presence of TPH impacted soil, the presence of contaminated soil in boring MW-4, and the lack of sample recovery at depth in MW-5 and MW-6, Ninyo & Moore concluded that the lateral and vertical extend of the impacted soil has not been delineated.

#### *Groundwater Sampling*

Six groundwater monitoring well samples were collected and analyzed on April 22, 2008. Ninyo & Moore reported that the depth to groundwater ranged from 37.42 to 49.84 feet below grade across the site. The groundwater gradient was reported as three separate gradients: northeast at 0.15 ft/ft, east at 0.10 ft/ft, and south at 0.10 ft/ft. With the variable groundwater gradient to the northeast, east, and south as established by Ninyo & Moore, the subject site is located down gradient from the impacted area of the facility at 1840 Weld Boulevard.

The three groundwater monitoring wells at the adjacent facility that are located closest to our subject property are groundwater monitoring wells MW-6, MW-1A, and MW-2A. Groundwater monitoring well MW-6 is located approximately 195 feet to the southwest of the subject site and approximately 100 feet from the source area. Groundwater monitoring well MW-1A is located approximately 250 feet to the west of the subject site and 50 feet to the east of the source area. Groundwater monitoring well MW-2A is also located approximately 250 feet to the west of the subject site and approximately 40 feet to the east of the source area. The three additional groundwater monitoring wells (MW-3A, MW-4, and MW-5) are located to the west and south of the source area and are farther from the subject site.

Concentrations of TPHg, TPHd, BTEX, MTBE, MTBE or VOCs were not detected in the groundwater sample collected from MW-6. Also, only low levels of benzene, toluene, and xylenes were reported at concentrations of 1.3, 5.4, and 4.2 µg/L in well MW-1A and only low levels of benzene, toluene, and xylenes were reported in the groundwater at





concentrations of 1.9, 6.5, and 5.1 µg/L in well MW-2A. The reported benzene concentrations in these two groundwater monitoring wells are slightly higher than the benzene Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) of 1.0 µg/L. All other constituents were either below the laboratory detection limit or below established MCLs.

Greater contamination concentrations were detected in wells MW-3A and MW-5 near the source area and in MW-4 to the south. Well MW-3A had reported TPHg and TPHd concentrations of 6,200 and 12,000 µg/L and benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, xylenes, and MTBE concentrations of 65, 16, 330, 150, and 125 µg/L, respectively. Further, concentrations of several other VOCs were also reported in MW-3A. Also, well MW-5 had detected TPHg and TPHd concentrations of 5,500 and 7,300 µg/L and benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, xylenes and MTBE concentrations of 86, 430, 57, 1,190, and 13 µg/L, respectively. Well MW-4 had detected concentrations of TPHg, benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes of 220, 8.2, 2.6, 3.3, and 267 µg/L.

The concentrations of benzene (1.3 and 1.9 µg/L), toluene (5.47 and 6.5 µg/L), and xylenes (4.2 and 5.1 µg/L) in MW-1A and MW-2A were much lower than those reported in wells MW-3A and MW-5 near the source area with detected concentrations of benzene (65 and 86 µg/L), toluene (330 and 430 µg/L), and xylenes (150 and 1,190 µg/L). Wells MW-3A and MW-5 are located approximately 75 feet to the west of wells MW-1A and MW-2A. The results illustrate diminishing concentrations over distance from the source in the direction of the subject property.

Based on the results of this additional assessment and groundwater sampling, Ninyo & Moore concluded that the lateral extent of hydrocarbon-impacted groundwater to the north has been delineated but the hydrocarbon-impacted groundwater to the east, west, and south has not been delineated. This indicates that there is the potential for the contaminated groundwater plume to extend further to the east and that it has the potential to impact the subject site.

The Ninyo & Moore report recommended the installation of three additional groundwater monitoring wells to the east, south, and west of the release area and conducting at least one year of quarterly groundwater monitoring. In addition, Ninyo & Moore recommended conducting a soil vapor risk assessment based on the reported concentrations in the groundwater samples. The DEH case worker for this site, Mr. James Clay, was contacted by Rincon regarding concurrence with Ninyo & Moore's recommendation for further assessment and Mr. Clay indicated in an email correspondence with Rincon that the DEH has reviewed the September 5, 2008 Ninyo & Moore letter and that the County is requiring two more quarters of groundwater monitoring prior to determining if additional assessment is warranted. In addition, Mr. Clay indicated that the DEH is requesting that a health risk assessment (HRA) for the site be conducted. Mr. Clay also indicated that it "does not appear that contaminant levels east of the site are excessive, but at this time I can't say for sure whether additional assessment will be done in the easterly direction." On November 12, 2008 Mr. Clay conveyed the DEH response letter to Ninyo & Moore and their client which mandated two more quarters of groundwater monitoring and conducting a Human Health



Risk Assessment for occupants of the site building. In addition, the response letter requested that within 60 days a work plan be submitted to the County. The letter contained no more information regarding the adjacent facility to the west of our subject property.

While the extent of the soil and groundwater plumes on the adjacent property to the west have not been fully delineated, it is unlikely that the release at the adjacent site has impacted the subject property. Based on the non-detect concentrations in groundwater monitoring well MW-6 to the northeast of the source area, the distance from the source area to the property line (approximately 300 feet), and the diminishing concentrations of benzene, toluene, and xylenes found in groundwater monitoring wells MW-1A and MW-2A located 40 to 50 feet from the source and 250 feet from the subject property, it is unlikely that impacted soil or groundwater is present beneath the subject site at concentrations that would require remediation.

Should PBS&J like a higher degree of confidence, Rincon recommends reviewing the next two Ninyo & Moore groundwater monitoring and sampling reports and reviewing the human health risk assessment when it is completed. These reports may provide additional information showing declining contaminant concentrations over time. However, the timeframe for completion of these reports is unknown.

Rincon could conduct a health risk assessment for the proposed industrial building at the site based on the concentrations reported in the groundwater from groundwater monitoring well MW-2A, the closest groundwater monitoring well to the site with the highest detected concentrations of benzene, toluene, and xylenes.

Thank you for selecting Rincon for this project. If you have any questions or if we can be of any future assistance please contact us.

Sincerely,  
RINCON CONSULTANTS, INC.

Gregory N. Stull, REA I  
Associate Environmental Scientist

Walter Hamann, PC, CEG, REA II  
Vice President, Environmental Services