

**TO: CA Department of Water Resources, SF Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board**  
**FROM: Dana Dillworth (Member of Brisbane Baylands Community Advisory Group)**  
**RE: Proposed Remedial Action Plan at 3775 Bayshore Boulevard, VWR Parcel "B"**  
**January 6, 2023**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed remediation method for VWR Parcel "B" contamination. We appreciate the extension of time for review, as 30-days notice of a document with appendixes covering 7 years of material did not seem adequate.

I appreciate that the properties are vacant. In a prior public hearing, we were told that the only protective measure from VOC exposure to the employees in Parcel "A" was to leave the warehouse doors open. I was mortified that an industrial land use designation could render such a callous disregard for worker safety. I expect workplaces to be safe from breathing toxic vapors, not conditional to leaving the windows open, or no cracks in the floor, or some seasonal variation.

You need to note that industrial uses are not permitted in Brisbane outside of grandfathered-in Kinder Morgan and that these properties are often considered for residential use during Housing Element review. Due to the recent shift in home/work-place norms, it is logical to insist that toxic sites be cleaned up to higher standards as newer work-live patterns may make your 8-hour exposure standard an insufficient increment. At best, in the Ic's you should disallow any 24-hour work schedules... such as security.

I am concerned that you have deemed the TCH method to be nearly 100% effective while it only remedies some VOC's... leaving heavy metals and rail-related pesticides in place. You have insufficient pre-treatment baseline data and insufficient post-remediation testing for this project. These inadequacies exist for the prior-approved Parcel "A" remediation as well.

While the proposed method does accelerate the movement of VOC's, your data seems to have been gathered in an historical drought period (July/August 2021 and one test event in 2017.) You need to understand this small watershed better and anticipate that the chemicals may re-emerge when the land seeks its equilibrium as happened at the Schalge Lock site.

CEQA requires a complete characterization of the site to make an informed decision. You are not properly disclosing the site conditions by omitting Parcel "C" and areas east of the Caltrains rail tracks. Parcel "C," the tunnel property is probably the source of the persistent vapor of Naphthalene reported in earlier public hearings. While it is not part of the Brownfield application, it should be on your radar as insufficiently studied and its potential impacts to this property. Omission of this information makes this a piecemealed approach. It is my belief that storage and/or spillage of chemicals in the old tunnel impacts this property as it is up-gradient to the lagoon and should be ruled out as a contributing factor.

If this is the only chance to get Consolidated Chemical's former spills cleaned up, then you have failed to meet your RAO#4. The water entering the site from San Bruno Mountain is clean. It should be clean on the other side of the tracks... however the proposed remedy only goes to the property line and only a few feet below surface. You have no indication of any environmental studies or concern for protection from lateral movement beyond the depth of a few surface probes. Other remediation methods not considered would be to create an impermeable membrane to 55 feet (OBM) and disallow any further underground chemical migration.

Years ago, the southern end of the lagoon Audubon reported to have a potential clapper rail sighting, a rare and endangered species. You need to make sure the lagoon isn't harboring a

gaseous bubble of volatile carcinogenic substances or that its soils saturated with chemicals are waiting to burp or liquify during an earthquake. Was liquefaction part of your risk assessment? Your assertion that fully saturated, unregulated fill above loose Young Bay Mud does not pose a health risk is incomprehensible. What about sea-level rise? What impacts will being at 10' MSL have on future public health? Please review your underlying assumptions.

While there is mention of movement of groundwater there is no mention of artesian effects that are obvious on the other end of the Lagoon during negative tides. Omitted or perhaps understudied, under-stated? Further investigation of impacts to the lagoon may require remediation techniques for the lagoon such as aeration, improving flow, skimming and long-term monitoring. Natural attenuation of thousands of pounds of residual toxic substances is a big job. It seems that wildlife and future generations were under-represented in your RAO and cleanup level discussions. They are worthy of further review.

### **In conclusion:**

This RAP is inadequate and while a promising technique is proposed, it should be considered an interim measure. This new technology may have side effects, yet to be discovered, particularly when groundwater is at surface level. Will 600 degree C groundwater impact the lagoon or tracks? Seems like the steam in the outer wells would kill all life forms.

Only one year post-remediation testing is inadequate. Where else would you accept a one-year warranty? There is reference to chemicals heating at different temperatures creating a variable in the efficacy of this technique, but doesn't mention that metals and other chemicals may change their compositions, their pH's, and migrate at faster rates. Elements that would normally be stable at ambient temperatures may have a multiplier effect with this intense temperature change. It needs longer monitoring which should also be part of a sea-level rise study. By leaving these forever chemicals in place, this land remains subject to wastewater discharge requirements.

Finally, the plan may put Bayshore drivers at risk as the stack of toxic pollutants seems to vent at street level. How will you inform drivers of their Prop 65 notice warning of potential exposure to toxins? Can the releases be scheduled at night or weekends when there is less traffic? Is there a double-scrubbing system?

This piecemealed approach is akin to a No Smoking section in an aircraft. Please reopen the RAP for Parcel "A" and require at least five years of post-remediation observation, more than two air tests, and testing of tidal and seasonal changes to this contaminated site to confirm the technique's efficacy. Parcel "C"'s toxins should be studied concurrent with these plans. An overall plan that protects trench-diggers from exposure by installing an underlayment barrier should be required of all parcels as there is no mention of the arsenic and other heavy metals in the soil. You have conveniently overlooked the former rail-use impacts.

I actually like a hybrid of the two techniques... with 5 year minimum monitoring.

Thank you.  
earthhelp@earthlink.net