

# COMMUNITY UPDATE

The mission of DTSC is to protect California's people and environment from harmful effects of toxic substances by restoring contaminated resources, enforcing hazardous waste laws, reducing hazardous waste generation, and encouraging the manufacture of chemically safer products.

## Draft Feasibility Study/Remedial Action Plan Available for Review For Habitat Area 2 Zeneca/Former Stauffer Chemical Company in Richmond, CA

The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) invites you to review and comment on the A Draft Feasibility Study/Remedial Action Plan (FS/RAP) for Habitat Area 2 (HA-2/Site). DTSC is overseeing a proposed cleanup plan for HA-2 of the Zeneca/Former Stauffer Chemical Site, located at 1415 South 47th Street, Richmond, California 94804. A Draft FS/RAP has been prepared for HA-2 of the Site. The Draft FS/RAP describes the investigation and proposed cleanup activities for HA-2.

The entire Site is an 86-acre property that has been divided into separate operable units (investigation areas) for cleanup purposes. HA-2 (approximately 9.2 acres) is located in the southeastern portion of the Site. DTSC determined that cleanup is necessary after tests showed elevated levels of arsenic, lead, copper, mercury, selenium, dieldrin, DDE, DDT, PCBs, and other chemicals including proprietary pesticides that were previously used or manufactured at the Site.

### Site History-

The Site was first developed in 1897 when Stauffer Chemical Company built a plant to manufacture sulfuric acid. Pyrite ore was used as the base material to manufacture the sulfuric acid. Spent pyrite cinders were produced as part of the manufacturing process and were used as fill at the Site and surrounding areas.

The spent pyrite cinders are a source of metals and acidity in soil and groundwater at the Site. Stauffer continually expanded its facility, acquiring adjacent parcels and expanding its manufacturing business. In the 1950's, Stauffer Chemical began manufacturing and formulating agricultural chemicals. By 1997, all manufacturing operations at the Site had ceased.

### Public Comment Period



**August 10 to September 10, 2016**

A public meeting for the Draft FS/RAP has been scheduled for August 24, 2016, 6:30 to 8:30 PM at the University of California Berkeley Global Campus at Richmond Bay (formerly the UC Richmond Field Station), Room 454, 1301 South 46th Street, Richmond, CA 94804

**Please submit your comments by 5:00 PM, September 10, 2016 to:**

Lynn Nakashima  
Project Manager  
700 Heinz Avenue, Berkeley,  
California, 94710  
(510) 540-3839  
[Lynn.Nakashima@dtsc.ca.gov](mailto:Lynn.Nakashima@dtsc.ca.gov)

For public participation questions contact Jesus Cruz at (916) 255-3315, toll free at (866) 495-5651  
[Jesus.Cruz@dtsc.ca.gov](mailto:Jesus.Cruz@dtsc.ca.gov)

When manufacturing at the Site was occurring, a series of evaporation ponds were created between 1960 and 1971 as part of the process to treat and/or store the wastewater mixtures from industrial activities, building maintenance, chemical processing, and untreated stormwater runoff. There are two remaining ponds known as the upper and lower lagoons, that are the subject of the FS/RAP and currently being used for stormwater management at the Site.

Environmental studies of HA-2 began in 1986. DTSC has been overseeing investigations of HA-2 since 2006. Arsenic, copper, nickel, lead, mercury, zinc, and proprietary pesticides were found in lagoon sediments, soils, and arsenic and proprietary pesticides in the groundwater. Organochlorine pesticides (dieldrin, DDT, DDE) were found in limited areas in soil, and PCBs were found in sediment in limited areas.

### **What Can be Done to Clean It Up?**

The primary objective of a draft FS/RAP is to evaluate cleanup alternatives and to identify a recommended cleanup plan that prevents or reduces risks to public health and the environment.

### **Cleanup Alternatives Considered**

Six cleanup alternatives were evaluated in the Draft FS/RAP for HA-2.

#### **Alternative 1 –**

No Action

This alternative would involve no cleanup action on the Site, and it would remain in its current condition.

This alternative is used as a basis of comparison when evaluating other alternatives.

#### **Alternative 2 –**

Partial sediment excavation in the lagoons (11,000 cubic yards), off-site disposal, and placement of a sediment cap in the lagoons; removal, off-site disposal and replacement of the upper lagoon south berm, and

middle berm between the upper and lower lagoons; targeted removal of soils west and north of the lagoons (21,000 cubic yards total soil); and monitoring of groundwater to confirm the effectiveness of source remediation of soils and sediments in reducing groundwater contaminant concentrations (and if needed additional data collection to evaluate whether monitored natural attenuation is occurring). Institutional controls consistent with an existing land use covenant and conservation easement would be placed on HA-2.

#### **Alternative 3 –**

Targeted removal and off-site disposal of sediments in the upper lagoon containing the highest concentrations of arsenic and placement of a sediment cap; removal and off-site disposal of lower lagoon sediments containing elevated concentrations of proprietary pesticides (23,200 cubic yards total for all lagoon sediments), in situ treatment of moderate proprietary pesticides concentrations, and placement of a sediment cap; removal and off-site disposal of the upper lagoon south berm, the middle berm, and targeted upland soils west and north of the lagoons (21,000 cubic yards total for all soil); and monitoring of groundwater to confirm the effectiveness of source remediation of soils and sediments in reducing groundwater contaminant concentrations (and if needed additional data collection to evaluate whether monitored natural attenuation is occurring). Institutional controls consistent with an existing land use covenant and conservation easement would be placed on HA-2.

#### **Alternative 4 –**

Removal and off-site disposal of additional sediments (compared to Alternative 3) in the upper lagoon, and placement of a sediment cap; removal and off-site disposal of sediments with the highest proprietary pesticide concentrations (25,400 cubic yards total for all lagoon sediments), in situ treatment of moderate concentration of pesticide concentrations, and placement of a sediment cap in the lower lagoon;



removal and off-site disposal of the upper lagoon south berm, the middle berm and targeted upland soils west and north of the lagoons (21,000 cubic yards total for all soil); and monitoring of groundwater to confirm the effectiveness of source remediation of soils and sediments in reducing groundwater contaminant concentrations (and if needed additional data collection to evaluate whether monitored natural attenuation is occurring). Institutional controls consistent with an existing land use covenant and conservation easement would be placed on HA-2.

**Alternative 5 –**

Complete removal of non-native sediments and off-site disposal of upper lagoon sediments, backfill as needed for restoration, and placement of a sediment cap; removal and off-site disposal of sediments with the highest concentration of proprietary pesticides (33,400 cubic yards total for all lagoon sediments), in situ treatment of moderate concentration proprietary pesticide concentrations, and placement of a sediment cap in the lower lagoon; removal and off-site disposal of the upper lagoon south berm, the middle berm and targeted upland soils west and north of the lagoons (21,000 cubic yards for all soil); and monitoring of groundwater to confirm the effectiveness of source remediation of soils and sediments in reducing groundwater contaminant concentrations (and if needed additional data collection to evaluate whether monitored natural attenuation is occurring). Institutional controls consistent with an existing land use covenant and conservation easement would be placed on HA-2.

**Alternative 6A –**

Complete removal and off-site disposal of non-native sediments in the upper and lower lagoons (49,000 cubic yards of sediments), backfill as needed for restoration and placement of a sediment cap; removal and off-site disposal of the upper lagoon south berm, the middle berm, and targeted upland soils west and north of the

lagoons (21,000 cubic yards for all soil); and monitoring of groundwater to confirm the effectiveness of source remediation of soils and sediments in reducing groundwater contaminant concentrations (and if needed additional data collection to evaluate whether monitored natural attenuation is occurring). Institutional controls consistent with an existing land use covenant and conservation easement would be placed on HA-2.

**Alternative 6B–**

Same as Alternative 6A, but instead of off-site disposal, excavated sediments and soil would be contained onsite.

DTSC recommends Alternative 4 as the preferred cleanup alternative for the Site. This alternative best meets the criteria that DTSC uses to determine an appropriate cleanup approach.

**If the plan is approved, you can expect to see the following activities:**

- Work would primarily occur between September 1 and January 31 to prevent disruption to the California Ridgway's Rail, an endangered species. Construction activities will not begin until all permits and regulatory approvals are obtained from federal and state resource agencies. The permitting process is expected to take approximately one to two years.
- Dust and odor control measures, such as spraying with water or foam.
- Air monitoring will occur during the cleanup.
- Soil and sediment stockpiling along with the use of a solidification agent, as necessary.
- Excavation of soils and sediments, in situ treatment of some sediment in the lower lagoon using an excavator with a specialized tool to mix in activated carbon, placement of clean imported backfill material within excavation areas and lagoons.
- Loading and hauling of contaminated sediments and soil for offsite transport to an appropriate disposal facility.



## California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

As the Lead Agency under CEQA, DTSC prepared an Initial Study to determine if the proposed project would result in significant impacts to the environment. The Initial Study concluded that the proposed project would not have a significant impact to the environment and DTSC concluded that a Negative Declaration was the appropriate document to issue under CEQA.

## WHERE DO I GET MORE INFORMATION?

A copy of the draft FS/RAP is available at the following locations:

Richmond Public Library, 325 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond, CA 94804, (510) 620-6554

DTSC File Room, 700 Heinz Avenue, Berkeley, CA 94710, Call for appointment (510) 540-3800

DTSC's Envirostor Website:

<http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public>

## Contact Information:

Lynn Nakashima, Project Manager, 700 Heinz Avenue, Berkeley, California, 94710 (510) 540-3839, [Lynn.Nakashima@dtsc.ca.gov](mailto:Lynn.Nakashima@dtsc.ca.gov)

For Public Participation information contact: Jesus Cruz, (916) 255-3315, toll free at (866) 495-5644 [Jesus.Cruz@dtsc.ca.gov](mailto:Jesus.Cruz@dtsc.ca.gov)

For media inquiries contact: Sandy Nax, Public Information Officer, (916) 327-6114 or [Sandy.Nax@dtsc.ca.gov](mailto:Sandy.Nax@dtsc.ca.gov)

