



Matthew Rodriguez
Secretary for
Environmental Protection



Department of Toxic Substances Control

Barbara A. Lee, Director
700 Heinz Avenue
Berkeley, California 94710-2721



Edmund G. Brown Jr.
Governor

June 30, 2015

Mr. Mike Lee, P.E.
WAU & Company
400 Montgomery Street, Suite 1100
San Francisco, California 94104

Dear Mr. Lee

The Department of Toxic Substances Control certified on June 30, 2015 the completion of the removal actions at the former Watsonville-1 Manufactured Gas Plant Site located at 618 Main Street in Watsonville, California. Enclosed is a copy of the certification document for your records. We appreciate your effort and cooperation in completing the cleanup of this site.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (510) 540-3759 or via email at henry.chui@dtsc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Henry Chui, P.E.
Project Manager
Brownfields and Environmental Restoration Program

Enclosure

cc: see next page

Mr. Mike Lee
Page 2
June 30, 2015

cc: Scott Carson, P.E., C.E.G., R.E.A.
County of Santa Cruz
ENV076@co.santa-cruz.ca.us

Robert Ketley
City of Watsonville
rketley@ci.watsonville.ca.us

Max Reyhani, P.E.
Terra Pacific Group
mreyhani@terrapg

Stella Romo
Romo Properties, LLC
stellamromo50@yahoo.com

**REMOVAL ACTION CERTIFICATION
Former Watsonville-1
Manufactured Gas Plant Site**

1. Certification of Removal Action:

I hereby certify that the following information is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.



Henry Chui, P.E.
Project Manager
Brownfields and Environmental Restoration Program



Date



Mark Piros, P.E.
Unit Chief
Brownfields and Environmental Restoration Program



Date

2. Certification Statement: Based upon the information which is currently and actually known to DTSC:

DTSC has determined that all appropriate response actions have been completed, that all acceptable engineering practices were implemented and that no further removal/remedial action is necessary.

DTSC has determined, based upon a removal investigation or site characterization, that the site poses no significant threat to public health, welfare, or the environment and therefore implementation of removal/remedial measures is not necessary.

DTSC has determined that all appropriate removal actions have been completed and that all acceptable engineering practices were implemented: however, the site requires ongoing operation and maintenance (O&M) and monitoring efforts and will be placed on DTSC's list of sites undergoing O&M to ensure proper monitoring of long-term clean-up efforts.

3. Site Name and Location: (Street address, County, and City)

Former Watsonville-1 Manufactured Gas Plant Site
618 Main Street
City of Watsonville, Santa Cruz County, California

A. List any other names that have been used to identify this site:

None

B. Address of site if different from above: not applicable

C. Assessor's Parcel Numbers: APN 018-151-26

4. Responsible Parties:

Romo Properties, LLC
315 Main Street
Watsonville, California 95076
Relationship to Site: Property Owner

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
3401 Crow Canyon Road
San Ramon, California 94583
Relationship to Site: Responsible Party

5. Brief Description and History of the Site:

The approximately 0.4 acre Site is in a predominantly commercial and residential area of downtown Watsonville and bordered by a bank to the northwest, a commercial property to the northeast, a market to the southwest, and Main Street to the southwest. The Site was previously part of a larger parcel that was occupied by the former Watsonville-1 Manufactured Gas Plant (MGP) Site. The original MGP was constructed in 1871 and was closed in 1905 when the Watsonville-2 MGP began operation at a different location. From around 1905 to 1931, the Site was used for various purposes including: a schoolhouse; auto painting and trimming shop; auto dealership; and an auto repair shop. In 1931, Coast Counties Gas and Electric Company constructed a building for use as a customer service center until that portion of the property was acquired by Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) in 1954. The northeastern end of the former MGP, where manufactured gas production had primarily been conducted, was sold to private parties in 1935. PG&E continued to use the Site as a customer service center until 1989, when it was leased for use as a restaurant and

eventually sold to Romo Properties, LLC. The Site continues to be occupied by a restaurant.

PG&E entered into a Voluntary Cleanup Agreement (VCA) with DTSC on December 18, 1996, with an amendment on August 21, 2006 to conduct a site assessment, prepare a Removal Action Workplan for the Site, and implement cleanup.

Investigations were conducted at the Site between 1986 and 2011. The contaminants detected included polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), naphthalene, total petroleum hydrocarbon (TPH), and volatile organic compounds (VOCs). Concentrations of PAHs expressed in benzo(a)pyrene were detected at a maximum concentration of 21 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg); naphthalene at a maximum concentration of 320 mg/kg; TPH-gasoline at a maximum concentration of 5,300 mg/kg; TPH-diesel at a maximum concentration of 14,000 mg/kg; and TPH-motor oil at a maximum concentration of 9,500 mg/kg.

DTSC approved the Final Removal Action Workplan on October 27, 2011. The implementation of the removal activities is documented in the Final Removal Action Completion Report, dated May 2, 2013. The Completion Report was prepared by Terra Pacific Group on behalf of PG&E.

6. Type of Site:

Has the Site been identified in the EnviroStor database as an active DTSC site?

Yes X No

RCRA-Permitted Facility	<u> </u>	Bond-funded	<u> </u>
RCRA Facility Closure	<u> </u>	RP-Funded	<u> X </u>
NPL	<u> </u>	Federal Facility	<u> </u>
Other (i.e. walk-in)	<u> </u>	Explain Briefly:	

7. Size of the Site:

Small X Medium Large Extra-Large

8. Dates of Removal Action:

a. Initiated: February 2012

b. Completed: May 2012

9. Response Action Taken on Site: (check appropriate action)

- Removal Action (satisfactory abatement of site)
- Final Removal Action
- RCRA enforcement/closure action
- No action, further investigation verified that no clean-up action at the site was need.

A. Type of Remedial or Removal Action: (e.g. excavation and disposal, on-site treatment, etc.)

The selected removal action consisted of focused excavation of soil, containment, and institutional controls. Two feet of soil was excavated from landscape planter areas and 1.5 feet of asphalt pavement and soil were excavated from the existing parking lot. New concrete pavement was installed in the parking lot and will serve as a cap over remaining contaminated soil. Institutional controls have been put in place through a land use covenant that has been recorded with the Santa Cruz County Recorder. Soil gas and groundwater monitoring will continue to be performed. A total of approximately 686 tons of contaminated soil was removed and properly disposed at a permitted landfill. Approximately 6,000 cubic yards of contaminated soil remains in place and is capped.

B. Estimated quantity of waste associated with the site (i.e., tons/gallons/cubic yards) which was:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> treated | amount: |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> untreated (capped sites) | amount: approximately 6,000 cubic yards |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> removed | amount: approximately 686 tons |

10. Cleanup Levels/Standards:

a. What were the cleanup standards established by DTSC pursuant to the Final Remedial Action Plan or Removal Action Workplan?

The target soil cleanup levels established in the Removal Action Workplan, which were used in defining the area to be capped, are:

Benzene	0.12 mg/kg (risk-based)
Naphthalene	1.3 mg/kg (risk-based)
PAHs – as B(a)P equivalent	0.9 mg/kg (ambient)
TPHg	100 mg/kg (ESL)
TPHd (top 5 feet)	100 mg/kg (ESL)
TPHd (below 5 feet)	1,000 mg/kg (ESL)
TPHmo (top 5 feet)	500 mg/kg (ESL)
TPHmo (below 5 feet)	1,000 mg/kg (ESL)
Arsenic	10 mg/kg (background)

ESL – Environmental Screening Level developed by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region

b. **Were the specified cleanup standards met?** Yes ___ No X

c. **If "no", why not:**

A limited "hot spots" removal was performed; however, most of the contaminated soil was left in place and capped.

11. DTSC Involvement in the Removal Action:

A. Did DTSC order the Removal Action?

Yes ___ No X Date of Order: VCA, December 16, 1996, with amendment on August 21, 2006

B. Did DTSC review and approve the following plans/procedures? (indicate date of review/approval, if done):

Sampling and Analysis Procedures Date: October 27, 2011

Health and Safety Protections Date: October 27, 2011

Removal Action Workplan Date: October 27, 2011

C. If the site was abated by responsible party, did DTSC receive a signed statement from a licensed professional on all phases of the Removal Actions? (indicate date of statement)

Removal Action Workplan Date: October 27, 2011

Post-Remediation Date: May 2, 2013

D. Did a registered engineer or geologist verify that acceptable engineering practices were implemented?

Yes No

Name: Richard McCartney, California Professional Geologist #PG5140

Name: Max Reyhani, California Professional Civil Engineer #C056046

Date: May 2, 2013 (verification included in Removal Action Completion Report)

E. Did DTSC confirm completion of all Removal Actions?

Yes No

Date: May 7, 2013 (date of Removal Action Completion Report approval)

F. Did DTSC (directly or through a contractor) actually perform the removal action?

Yes No Name of Contractor:

G. Was there a community relations plan in place?

Yes No

A Community Profile was prepared and approved on September 20, 2000

H. Was a removal/remedial action plan developed for this site?

Yes No

Final Removal Action Workplan – approved October 27, 2011

I. Did DTSC hold public meetings regarding the draft RAP?

Yes No

J. Were public comments addressed?

Yes No

Date of DTSC responses to public comments:
Responsiveness Summary October 26, 2011

K. Are all of the facts cited above adequately documented in the DTSC files?

Yes No

If no, identify areas where documentation is lacking:
Not applicable

12. EPA Involvement in the Removal Action;

A. Was EPA involved in the site cleanup?

Yes No

B. If yes, did EPA concur with all removal actions?

Yes No

C. EPA comments

EPA staff involved in cleanup: (name, title, address, and phone number)

13. Other Regulatory Agency Involvement in the Cleanup Action:

Agency:

Activity:

RWQCB

ARB

CHP

Caltrans

Other

Reviewed and commented on technical documents,
provided inputs on cleanup; and conducted site

inspections.

Scott Carson, PG, CEG
Santa Cruz County Environmental Health Service
701 Ocean Street, Room 312
Santa Cruz, California 95060

Robert Ketley
City of Watsonville
275 Main Street, #400
Watsonville, California 95076

Name of contact persons and agency:

14. Post Closure Activity:

**A. Will there be post-closure activities at this site?
(e.g. Operation and Maintenance)**

Yes X No

B. Have post-closure plans been prepared and approved by DTSC?

Yes X No

Soil Management and Operation & Maintenance Plan, approved June 16, 2015

Operation & Maintenance Agreement, executed June 23, 2015

C. What is the estimated duration of post-closure (including Operation and Maintenance) activities?

A land use covenant has been recorded that requires annual inspections and reports to verify compliance with the restrictions and requirements of the land use covenant. The inspections and reports will be required as long as soil remains on the Site with concentrations of contaminants above levels that allow for unrestricted land use. Groundwater and soil gas monitoring activities will be conducted semiannually and will be reevaluated after three years of monitoring to determine if the monitoring

program needs to be modified.

D. Are deed restrictions proposed or in place?

Yes No

If "yes", have deed restrictions been recorded with the County recorder?

Yes No

Land Use Covenant recorded with Santa Cruz County, June 24, 2015

If "no", who is responsible for assuring that the deed restrictions are recorded? not applicable

Who is the Program contact? Henry Chui 510-540-3759
name/phone number

E. Has cost recovery been initiated?

Yes No

If "yes", amount received: \$263,505.10; 100% of DTSC's invoiced costs.

F. Were local planning agencies notified of the cleanup action?

Yes No

If "yes", the name and address of the agency:

Mr. Robert Ketley
City of Watsonville
275 Main Street, #400
Watsonville, California 95076

15. Expenditure of Funds and Sources: (Information to be supplied by Toxic Account Unit.) funding source and amount expended:

<input type="checkbox"/> HWCA	\$ _____	<input type="checkbox"/> HSA	\$ _____
<input type="checkbox"/> HSCF	\$ _____	<input type="checkbox"/> RCRA	\$ _____

RP \$ unknown ___ Other \$ _____
___ Federal Cooperation Agreement \$ _____

16. Problems Encountered Which Caused Major Delays:

DTSC coordinated with the Santa Cruz County and City of Watsonville officials to ensure their concerns and cleanup objective were addressed. The local officials also wanted PG&E to clean up the adjacent parcel where the former Watsonville-1 MGP had also operated. DTSC will be conducting a search of potential responsible parties for the adjacent parcel to investigate and cleanup that property.

17. Accomplishments Unique to this Project:

DTSC and PG&E worked closely through the Site investigation, preparation of the Removal Action Workplan, and implementation to ensure that all the stakeholders' objectives were met.

18. Final Use of Site:

The Site will continue to be used as a restaurant.