STATE OF CALIFORNIA
STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

ORDER WQ 2013-0024 – UST

In the Matter of Underground Storage Tank Case Closure

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25299.39.2 and the Low Threat Underground Storage Tank Case Closure Policy

BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR[1]:

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25299.39.2, the Manager of the Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Fund (Fund) recommends closure of the underground storage tank (UST) case at the site listed below.[2] The name of the Fund claimant, the Fund claim number, the site name and the applicable site address are as follows:

Robert William Imig
Claim No. 1868
Jamacha Texaco
303 Jamacha Road, El Cajon
San Diego County Health Department of Environmental Health

I. STATUTORY AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Section 25299.39.2 directs the Fund manager to review the case history of claims that have been active for five years or more (five-year review), unless there is an objection from the UST owner or operator. This section further authorizes the Fund Manager to make recommendations to the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) for closure of a five-year-review case if the UST owner or operator approves. In response to a recommendation by the Fund Manager, the State Water Board, or in certain cases the State Water Board Executive Director, may close a case or require the closure of a UST case. Closure of a UST case is appropriate where the corrective action ensures the protection of

[1] State Water Board Resolution No. (2012-0061) delegates to the Executive Director the authority to close or require the closure of any UST case if the case meets the criteria found in the State Water Board's Low Threat Underground Storage Tank Case Closure Policy adopted by State Water Board Resolution No. 2012-0016.

[2] Unless otherwise noted, all references are to the Health and Safety Code.

human health, safety, and the environment and where the corrective action is consistent with: 1) Chapter 6.7 of Division 20 of the Health and Safety Code and implementing regulations; 2) Any applicable waste discharge requirements or other orders issued pursuant to Division 7 of the Water Code; 3) All applicable state policies for water quality control; and 4) All applicable water quality control plans.

The Fund Manager has completed a five-year review of the UST case identified above, and recommends that this case be closed. The recommendation is based upon the facts and circumstances of this particular UST case. A UST Case Closure Review Summary Report has been prepared for the case identified above and the bases for determining compliance with the Water Quality Control Policy for Low-Threat Underground Storage Tank Case Closures (Low-Threat Closure Policy or Policy) are explained in the Case Closure Review Summary Report.

A. Low-Threat Closure Policy

In State Water Board Resolution No. 2012-0016, the State Water Board adopted the Low Threat Closure Policy. The Policy became effective on August 17, 2012. The Policy establishes consistent statewide case closure criteria for certain low-threat petroleum UST sites. In the absence of unique attributes or site-specific conditions that demonstrably increase the risk associated with residual petroleum constituents, cases that meet the general and media-specific criteria in the Low-Threat Closure Policy pose a low threat to human health, safety and the environment and are appropriate for closure under Health and Safety Code section 25296.10. The Policy provides that if a regulatory agency determines that a case meets the general and media-specific criteria of the Policy, then the regulatory agency shall notify responsible parties and other specified interested persons that the case is eligible for case closure. Unless the regulatory agency revises its determination based on comments received on the proposed case closure, the Policy provides that the agency shall issue a closure letter as specified in Health and Safety Code section 25296.10. The closure letter may only be issued after the expiration of the 60-day comment period, proper destruction or maintenance of monitoring wells or borings, and removal of waste associated with investigation and remediation of the site.

Health and Safety Code section 25299.57, subdivision (l)(1) provides that claims for reimbursement of corrective action costs that are received by the Fund more than 365 days after the date of a closure letter or a Letter of Commitment, whichever occurs later, shall not be reimbursed unless specified conditions are satisfied. A Letter of Commitment has already been issued on the claim subject to this order and the respective Fund claimant, so the 365-day

timeframe for the submittal of claims for corrective action costs will start upon the issuance of the closure letter.

II. FINDINGS

Based upon the UST Case Closure Review Summary Report prepared for the case attached hereto, the State Water Board finds that corrective action taken to address the unauthorized release of petroleum at the UST release site identified as:

Claim No. 1868

Jamacha Texaco

ensures protection of human health, safety and the environment and is consistent with Chapter 6.7 of Division 20 of the Health and Safety Code and implementing regulations, the Low-Threat Closure Policy and other water quality control policies and applicable water quality control plans.

Pursuant to the Low-Threat Closure Policy, notification has been provided to all entities that are required to receive notice of the proposed case closure, a 60-day comment period has been provided to notified parties, and any comments received have been considered by the Board in determining that the case should be closed.

The UST case identified above may be the subject of orders issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Water Board (Regional Water Board) pursuant to Division 7 of the Water Code. Any orders that have been issued by the Regional Water Board pursuant to Division 7 of the Water Code, or directives issued by a Local Oversight Program agency for this case should be rescinded to the extent they are inconsistent with this Order.

III. ORDER

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

A. The UST case identified in Section II of this Order, meeting the general and media-specific criteria established in the Low-Threat Closure Policy, be closed in accordance with the following conditions and after the following actions are complete. Prior to the issuance of a closure letter, the Fund claimant is ordered to:

1. Properly destroy monitoring wells and borings unless the owner of real property on which the well or boring is located certifies that the wells or borings will be maintained in accordance with local or state requirements;

2. Properly remove from the site and manage all waste piles, drums, debris, and other investigation and remediation derived materials in accordance with local or state requirements; and

3. Within six months of the date of this Order, submit documentation to the regulatory agency overseeing the UST case identified in Section II of this Order that the tasks in subparagraphs (1) and (2) have been completed.

B. The tasks in subparagraphs (1) and (2) of paragraph (A) are ordered pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25296.10 and failure to comply with these requirements may result in the imposition of civil penalties pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25299, subdivision (d)(1). Penalties may be imposed administratively by the State Water Board or Regional Water Board.

C. Within 30 days of receipt of proper documentation from the Fund claimant that requirements in subparagraphs (1) and (2) of paragraph (A) are complete, the regulatory agency that is responsible for oversight of the UST case identified in Section II of this Order shall notify the State Water Board that the tasks have been satisfactorily completed.

D. Within 30 days of notification from the regulatory agency that the tasks are complete pursuant to paragraph (C), the Deputy Director of the Division of Financial Assistance shall issue a closure letter consistent with Health and Safety Code section 25296.10, subdivision (g) and upload the closure letter and UST Case Closure Review Summary Report to GeoTracker.

E. As specified in Health and Safety Code section 25299.39.2, subdivision (a) (2), corrective action costs incurred after a recommendation of closure shall be limited to $10,000 per year unless the Board or its delegated representative agrees that corrective action in excess of that amount is necessary to meet closure requirements, or additional corrective actions are necessary pursuant to section 25296.10, subdivisions (a) and (b). Pursuant to section 25299.57, subdivision (l) (1), and except in specified circumstances,

all claims for reimbursement of corrective action costs must be received by the Fund within 365 days of issuance of the closure letter in order for the costs to be considered.

F. Any Regional Water Board or Local Oversight Program Agency directive or order that directs corrective action or other action inconsistent with case closure for the UST case identified in Section II is rescinded, but only to the extent the Regional Water Board order or Local Oversight Program Agency directive is inconsistent with this Order.

Thomas Howard
Executive Director

6/6/13
Date

State Water Resources Control Board

UST CASE CLOSURE REVIEW SUMMARY REPORT

Agency Information

Agency Name: San Diego County Department of Environmental Health (County)	Address: P.O. Box 12961 San Diego CA 92112
Agency Caseworker: Tony Sawyer	Case No.: H05770-001

Case Information

USTCF Claim No.: 1868	Global ID: T0607303186
Site Name: Jamacha Texaco	Site Address: 303 Jamacha Road, El Cajon, CA 92019
Responsible Party (RP): Robert William Imig c/o Envirocap, LLC, Attn: Barbara Bowling	Address: 5510 West Lasalle Street, 3rd Floor, Tampa, FL 33607
USTCF Expenditures to Date: $350,982	Number of Years Case Open: 25

URL: http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report.asp?global_id=T0607303186

Summary

The Low-Threat Underground Storage Tank (UST) Case Closure Policy (Policy) contains general and media-specific criteria, and cases that meet those criteria are appropriate for closure pursuant to the Policy. This case meets all of the required criteria of the Policy. A summary evaluation of compliance with the Policy is shown in **Attachment 1: Compliance with State Water Board Policies and State Law**. The Conceptual Site Model upon which the evaluation of the case has been made is described in **Attachment 2: Summary of Basic Case Information (Conceptual Site Model).** Highlights of the case follow:

An unauthorized leak was reported in April 1988 following the removal of two gasoline USTs. Since then, the Site has undergone various site assessments and groundwater monitoring. In addition, one waste oil UST was removed in 1990. Accumulated site data suggest that there has been little migration of the hydrocarbon plume over the past several years and that the plume continues to shrink. Further, the residual soil contamination continues to have no significant impacts on the underlying groundwater.

The petroleum release is limited to the shallow soil and groundwater. According to data available in GeoTracker, there are no supply wells regulated by the California Department of Public Health or surface water bodies within 1,000 feet of the defined plume boundary. An irrigation supply well has been identified approximately 170 feet crossgradient from the defined plume boundary in the files reviewed. Water is provided to water users near the Site by the Helix Water District. This well has been sampled three times and no petroleum constituents have been detected. The affected groundwater is not currently being used as a source of drinking water, and it is highly unlikely that the affected groundwater will be used as a source of drinking water in the foreseeable future. Other designated beneficial uses of impacted groundwater are not threatened and it is highly

unlikely that they will be, considering these factors in the context of the site setting. Remaining petroleum hydrocarbon constituents are limited, stable and concentrations declining. Corrective action has been implemented and additional corrective actions are not necessary. Any remaining petroleum hydrocarbon constituents do not pose a significant risk to human health, safety or the environment.

Rationale for Closure under the Policy

- General Criteria: The case meets all eight Policy general criteria.
- Groundwater Specific Criteria: The case meets Policy Criterion 1 by Class 5. Although there is an irrigation well located 170 feet crossgradient from the defined plume boundary, a sentinel well located between the irrigation well, and the defined plume boundary routinely showed non-detect groundwater concentrations. The irrigation well has been sampled three times, and no petroleum constituents have been detected. In addition, the routine monitoring data show that the plume is shrinking.
- Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air: The case meets the Policy Exclusion for Active Station. Soil vapor evaluation is not required because the Site is an active commercial petroleum fueling facility.
- Direct Contact and Outdoor Air Exposure: The case meets Policy Criterion 3a. Maximum concentrations in soil are less than those in Policy Table 1 for Commercial/Industrial or Residential use, and the concentration limits for a Utility Worker are not exceeded.

Objections to Closure and Responses

In their January 2013 letter, the County objects to UST case closure for this case because:

- The County is requiring that a prior Corrective Action Plan be updated and revised for the Site as part of the County's programmatic requirements.
  RESPONSE:
  Readily available information about current conditions at the Site shows that the case satisfies all of the criteria in the Policy.

Determination

Based on the review performed in accordance with Health & Safety Code Section 25299.39.2 subdivision (a), the Fund Manager has determined that closure of the case is appropriate.

Recommendation for Closure

Based on available information, residual petroleum hydrocarbons at the Site do not pose a significant risk to human health, safety, or the environment, and the case meets the requirements of the Policy. Accordingly, the Fund Manager recommends that the case be closed. The State Water Board is conducting public notification as required by the Policy. San Diego County has the regulatory responsibility to supervise the abandonment of monitoring wells.

Lisa Babcock 3/22/13

Lisa Babcock, P.G. 3939, C.E.G. 1235 **Date**

Prepared by: Ramesh Sundareswaran

ATTACHMENT 1: COMPLIANCE WITH STATE WATER BOARD POLICIES AND STATE LAW

The case complies with the State Water Resources Control Board policies and state law. Section 25296.10 of the Health and Safety Code requires that sites be cleaned up to protect human health, safety, and the environment. Based on available information, any residual petroleum constituents at the site do not pose significant risk to human health, safety, or the environment.

The case complies with the requirements of the Low-Threat Underground Storage Tank (UST) Case Closure Policy as described below.[1]

Is corrective action consistent with Chapter 6.7 of the Health and Safety Code and implementing regulations? The corrective action provisions contained in Chapter 6.7 of the Health and Safety Code and the implementing regulations govern the entire corrective action process at leaking UST sites. If it is determined, at any stage in the corrective action process, that UST site closure is appropriate, further compliance with corrective action requirements is not necessary. Corrective action at this site has been consistent with Chapter 6.7 of the Health and Safety Code and implementing regulations and, since this case meets applicable case-closure requirements, further corrective action is not necessary, unless the activity is necessary for case closure.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Have waste discharge requirements or any other orders issued pursuant to Division 7 of the Water Code been issued at this case?	☐ Yes ☒ No
If so, was the corrective action performed consistent with any order?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ NA
General Criteria General criteria that must be satisfied by all candidate sites:	
Is the unauthorized release located within the service area of a public water system?	☒ Yes ☐ No
Does the unauthorized release consist only of petroleum?	☒ Yes ☐ No
Has the unauthorized ("primary") release from the UST system been stopped?	☒ Yes ☐ No
Has free product been removed to the maximum extent practicable?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ NA
Has a conceptual site model that assesses the nature, extent, and mobility of the release been developed?	☒ Yes ☐ No

[1] Refer to the Low-Threat Underground Storage Tank Case Closure Policy for closure criteria for low-threat petroleum UST sites.
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/resolutions/2012/rs2012_0016atta.pdf

Has secondary source been removed to the extent practicable?	☒ Yes ☐ No
Has soil or groundwater been tested for MTBE and results reported in accordance with Health and Safety Code Section 25296.15?	☒ Yes ☐ No
Nuisance as defined by Water Code section 13050 does not exist at the site?	☒ Yes ☐ No
Are there unique site attributes or site-specific conditions that demonstrably increase the risk associated with residual petroleum constituents?	☐ Yes ☒ No
Media-Specific Criteria Candidate sites must satisfy all three of these media-specific criteria: **1. 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:	
Is the contaminant plume that exceeds water quality objectives stable or decreasing in areal extent?	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA
Does the contaminant plume that exceeds water quality objectives meet all of the additional characteristics of one of the five classes of sites?	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA
If YES, check applicable class: ☐ **1** ☐ **2** ☐ **3** ☐ **4** ☒ **5**	
For sites with releases that have not affected groundwater, do mobile constituents (leachate, vapors, or light non-aqueous phase liquids) contain sufficient mobile constituents to cause groundwater to exceed the groundwater criteria?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ NA
2. Petroleum Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air: The site is considered low-threat for vapor intrusion to indoor air if site-specific conditions satisfy all of the characteristics of one of the three classes of sites (a through c) or if the exception for active commercial fueling facilities applies.	
Is the site an active commercial petroleum fueling facility? Exception: Satisfaction of the media-specific criteria for petroleum vapor intrusion to indoor air is not required at active commercial petroleum fueling facilities, except in cases where release characteristics can be reasonably believed to pose an unacceptable health risk.	☒ Yes ☐ No
a. Do site-specific conditions at the release site satisfy all of the applicable characteristics and criteria of scenarios 1 through 3 or all of the applicable characteristics and criteria of scenario 4?	☐Yes ☐ No ☒ NA
If YES, check applicable scenarios: ☐ **1** ☐ **2** ☐ **3** ☐ **4**	
b. Has a site-specific risk assessment for the vapor intrusion pathway	

been conducted and demonstrates that human health is protected to the satisfaction of the regulatory agency?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ NA
c. As a result of controlling exposure through the use of mitigation measures or through the use of institutional or engineering controls, has the regulatory agency determined that petroleum vapors migrating from soil or groundwater will have no significant risk of adversely affecting human health?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ NA
3. Direct Contact and Outdoor Air Exposure: The site is considered low-threat for direct contact and outdoor air exposure if site-specific conditions satisfy one of the three classes of sites (a through c).	
a. Are maximum concentrations of petroleum constituents in soil less than or equal to those listed in Table 1 for the specified depth below ground surface (bgs)?	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA
b. Are maximum concentrations of petroleum constituents in soil less than levels that a site specific risk assessment demonstrates will have no significant risk of adversely affecting human health?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ NA
c. As a result of controlling exposure through the use of mitigation measures or through the use of institutional or engineering controls, has the regulatory agency determined that the concentrations of petroleum constituents in soil will have no significant risk of adversely affecting human health?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ NA

ATTACHMENT 2: SUMMARY OF BASIC CASE INFORMATION (Conceptual Site Model)

Site Location/History

- This case is located on the southeast corner of Jamacha Road and Lexington Avenue and is a retail fueling facility and store.
- The Site is bounded by Jamacha Road to the west, Lexington Avenue to the north, a convenience store to the east, and apartments to the south. Apartments are located across Lexington Avenue to the north and across Jamacha Road to the west.
- Site maps showing the location of the former USTs, monitoring wells, groundwater level contours, and benzene contours are provided at the end of this closure review summary (Donan Environmental Services, Inc., 2012).
- Nature of Contaminants of Concern: Petroleum hydrocarbons only.
- Source: UST system.
- Date reported: April 1988.
- Status of Release: USTs repaired.

Tank Information

Tank No.	Size in Gallons	Contents	Closed in Place/ Removed/Active	Date
1-2	4,000	Gasoline	Removed	1988
3	550	Waste oil	Removed	1990
4-5	10,000	Gasoline	Active	
6	6,000	Gasoline	Active	

Receptors

- GW Basin: San Diego Hydrologic Area; El Cajon Hydrologic Subarea.
- Beneficial Uses: The San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) Basin Plan lists Municipal and Domestic Supply.
- Land Use Designation: None Specified. Aerial photograph available on GeoTracker suggests commercial and residential land use in the vicinity of the Site.
- Public Water System: Helix Water District.
- Distance to Nearest Supply Well: According to data available in GeoTracker, there are no identified public supply wells regulated by the California Department of Public Health within 1,000 feet of the defined plume boundary. According to the consultant, there is an irrigation well 300 feet southwest of the Site which is approximately 170 feet crossgradient from the defined plume boundary. This well has been sampled three times, and no petroleum constituents have been detected.
- Distance to Nearest Surface Water: There is no identified surface water within 1,000 feet of the defined plume boundary.

Geology/Hydrogeology

- Stratigraphy: The Site is underlain by clayey sands, sandy silts, silty sands, clays and sandy clays.
- Maximum Sample Depth: 15 feet below ground surface (bgs).
- Minimum Groundwater Depth: 2.97 feet bgs.
- Maximum Groundwater Depth: 9.95 feet bgs.
- Current Average Depth to Groundwater: 5.25 feet bgs.
- Saturated Zones(s) Studied: Approximately 1.75 to 12.50 feet bgs.
- Appropriate Screen Interval: Some well screens are submerged.

- Groundwater Flow Direction: Westerly with an average gradient of 0.021 feet/foot.

Monitoring Well Information

Well Designation	Date Installed	Screen Interval (feet bgs)	Depth to Water (feet bgs) (10/21/2012 & 10/22/2012)
MW-1	October 1988	5-10	4.46
MW-2	October 1988	3.5-9.5	4.25
MW-3	October 1988	4.5-9.5	5.00
MW-4	March 1989	Not Available	4.25
MW-5	March 1989	Not Available	4.30
MW-6	February 1990	Not Available	3.81
MW-7	February 1990	Not Available	4.61
MW-8	February 1990	Not Available	4.95
MW-9	Not Available	Not Available	4.68
MW-10	Not Available	Not Available	Not Measured
MW-11	Not Available	Not Available	Not Measured
MW-12	Not Available	Not Available	Not Measured
MW-13	March 2000	1.75-11.75	4.15
MW-14	March 2000	2.5-12.5	4.65
DW-15	January 2012	2.5-12.5	7.09
DW-16	January 2012	2.5-12.5	9.95
DW-17	January 2012	2.5-12.5	6.11
DW-18	January 2012	2.5-12.5	6.55

Remedial Summary

- Free Product: None reported in GeoTracker.
- Soil Excavation: An unspecified quantity of soil was excavated during UST removal in 1988. Approximately 300 cubic yards of soils were excavated during the waste oil UST removal in 1990.
- In-Situ Soil Remediation: None reported.
- Groundwater Remediation: None reported.

Most Recent Concentrations of Petroleum Constituents in Soil

Constituent	Maximum 0-5 feet bgs. [mg/kg and (date)]	Maximum 5-10 feet bgs [mg/kg and (date)]
Benzene	0.17 (11/20/03)	0.008 (11/18/03)
Ethylbenzene	0.88 (11/20/03)	0.032 (11/18/03)
Naphthalene	6.05 (11/19/03)	1.16 (11/18/03)
PAHs	NA*	NA*

NA: Not Analyzed, Not Applicable or Data Not Available
mg/kg: Milligrams per kilogram, parts per million
<: Not detected at or above stated reporting limit
PAHs: Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons
*: Approximately 300 cubic yards of soils were removed during the waste oil UST removal.

Most Recent Concentrations of Petroleum Constituents in Groundwater

Sample	Sample Date	TPHg (µg/L)	TPHd (µg/L)	Benzene (µg/L)	Toluene (µg/L)	Ethylbenzene (µg/L)	Xylenes (µg/L)	MTBE (µg/L)	TBA (µg/L)
MW-1	10/22/12	<100	<500	<1	<1	<1	<2	2	<10
MW-2	10/22/12	<100	<500	<1	<1	<1	<2	2	<10
MW-3	10/22/12	<100	<500	<1	<1	<1	<2	**6**	<10
MW-4	10/22/12	2900	<500	**133**	2	<1	7	**34**	<10
MW-5	10/22/12	310	<500	<1	<1	<1	<2	**14**	932
MW-6	10/22/12	<100	<500	<1	<1	<1	<2	<1	<10
MW-7	10/22/12	<100	<500	<1	<1	<1	<2	<1	<10
MW-8	10/22/12	<100	<500	<1	<1	<1	<2	**16**	<10
MW-9	10/22/12	<100	<500	<1	<1	<1	<2	<1	<10
MW-13	10/22/12	310	<500	<1	<1	<1	<2	3	400
MW-14	10/22/12	<100	<500	<1	<1	<1	<2	<1	<10
DW-15	10/22/12	<100	<500	<1	<1	<1	<2	<1	<10
DW-16	10/22/12	<100	<500	<1	<1	<1	<2	<1	<10
DW-17	10/22/12	<100	<500	<1	<1	<1	<2	<1	<10
DW-18	10/22/12	<100	<500	<1	<1	<1	<2	<1	<10
WQOs	-	--	--	**1**	**150**	**300**	**1750**	**5**	**1,200[a]**

NA: Not Analyzed, Not Applicable or Data Not Available
µg/L: Micrograms per liter, parts per billion
<: Not detected at or above stated reporting limit
TPHg: Total petroleum hydrocarbons as gasoline
TPHd: Total petroleum hydrocarbons as diesel
MTBE: Methyl tert-butyl ether
TBA: Tert-butyl alcohol
WQOs: Water Quality Objectives, Regional Water Board Basin Plan
--: Regional Water Board Basin Plan does not have a numeric value for TPHg or TPHd
[a]: California Department of Public Health, Response Level

Groundwater Trends

- There are 13 years of groundwater monitoring data for this case, and sufficient data have been collected to understand the contaminant footprint and behavior of the contaminant plume. Water quality objectives have been attained for all contaminants in most wells except for benzene and MTBE in the source area (MW-3, MW-4, MW-5) and slightly sidegradient (MW-8). Benzene exceeds the water quality objective in only one well, MW4. Contaminant levels in the downgradient most well, DW-15, have routinely been observed to be non-detectable, representative of a stable and shrinking plume. Furthermore, the irrigation well that is crossgradient of the plume has been sampled three times and found to be free of all of the Site's contaminants. The following figures depict MTBE trends in the source area and downgradient wells.

Source Area well



Downgradient well



Evaluation of Current Risk

- Estimate of Hydrocarbon Mass in Soil: None reported.
- Soil/Groundwater tested for methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE): Yes, see table above.
- Oxygen Concentrations in Soil Vapor: None reported.
- Plume Length: <250 feet long.
- Plume Stable or Degrading: Yes.
- Contaminated Zone(s) Used for Drinking Water: No.
- Groundwater Specific Criteria: The case meets Policy Criterion 1 by Class 5. Although there is an irrigation well located 170 feet crossgradient from the defined plume boundary, a sentinel well located between the irrigation well, and the defined plume boundary routinely showed non-detect groundwater concentrations. The irrigation well has been sampled three times, and no petroleum constituents have been detected. In addition, the routine monitoring data show that the plume is shrinking.
- Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air: The case meets the Policy Exclusion for Active Station. Soil vapor evaluation is not required because the Site is an active commercial petroleum fueling facility.
- Direct Contact and Outdoor Air Exposure: The case meets Policy Criterion 3a. Maximum concentrations in soil are less than those in Policy Table 1 for Commercial/Industrial or Residential use, and the concentration limits for a Utility Worker are not exceeded.


Groundwater Plan-Q4-12
Texaco Service Station
303 Jamacha Road
El Cajon, California
Donan Environmental Services, Inc.
KEY
ND Not Detected by Lab Test Method
Groundwater elevation (GWE) contour in feet per NAVD 88 datum from 2/8/2012 survey
Groundwater monitoring well
Primary Groundwater flow
Secondary groundwater flow direction (October 2012)
Approximate Assessor's parcel boundary for offsite properties
Jamacha Road
Lexington Avenue
S Ivory Avenue
SITE
Primary Groundwater flow direction
Residential Apartments
Residential Apartments
Pacific Bell Utility Vault
Utility Pole
Utility Boxes
APN 511-141-13-00
224 S Ivory Avenue
APN 511-141-12-00
1350 E. Lexington Avenue
APN 511-170-43-00
291 Jamacha Road
APN 489-210-32-00
292 Jamacha Road
Domestic well PI approximately 100 feet west
Lexington Tank
Excavation Trench
MW-1
MW-2
MW-3
MW-4
MW-5
MW-6
MW-7
MW-8
MW-9
MW-10
MW-11
MW-12
MW-13
MW-14
MW-15
MW-16
MW-17
MW-18
MW-19
MW-20
MW-21
MW-22
MW-23
MW-24
MW-25
MW-26
MW-27
MW-28
MW-29
MW-30
MW-31
MW-32
MW-33
MW-34
MW-35
MW-36
MW-37
MW-38
MW-39
MW-40
MW-41
MW-42
MW-43
MW-44
MW-45
MW-46
MW-47
MW-48
MW-49
MW-50
MW-51
MW-52
MW-53
MW-54
MW-55
MW-56
MW-57
MW-58
MW-59
MW-60
MW-61
MW-62
MW-63
MW-64
MW-65
MW-66
MW-67
MW-68
MW-69
MW-70
MW-71
MW-72
MW-73
MW-74
MW-75
MW-76
MW-77
MW-78
MW-79
MW-80
MW-81
MW-82
MW-83
MW-84
MW-85
MW-86
MW-87
MW-88
MW-89
MW-90
MW-91
MW-92
MW-93
MW-94
MW-95
MW-96
MW-97
MW-98
MW-99
MW-100
MW-101
MW-102
MW-103
MW-104
MW-105
MW-106
MW-107
MW-108
MW-109
MW-110
MW-111
MW-112
MW-113
MW-114
MW-115
MW-116
MW-117
MW-118
MW-119
MW-120
MW-121
MW-122
MW-123
MW-124
MW-125
MW-126
MW-127
MW-128
MW-129
MW-130
MW-131
MW-132
MW-133
MW-134
MW-135
MW-136
MW-137
MW-138
MW-139
MW-140
MW-141
MW-142
MW-143
MW-144
MW-145
MW-146
MW-147
MW-148
MW-149
MW-150
MW-151
MW-152
MW-153
MW-154
MW-155
MW-156
MW-157
MW-158
MW-159
MW-160
MW-161
MW-162
MW-163
MW-164
MW-165
MW-166
MW-167
MW-168
MW-169
MW-170
MW-171
MW-172
MW-173
MW-174
MW-175
MW-176
MW-177
MW-178
MW-179
MW-180
MW-181
MW-182
MW-183
MW-184
MW-185
MW-186
MW-187
MW-188
MW-189
MW-190
MW-191
MW-192
MW-193
MW-194
MW-195
MW-196
MW-197
MW-198
MW-199
MW-200
MW-201
MW-202
MW-203
MW-204
MW-205
MW-206
MW-207
MW-208
MW-209
MW-210
MW-211
MW-212
MW-213
MW-214
MW-215
MW-216
MW-217
MW-218
MW-219
MW-220
MW-221
MW-222
MW-223
MW-224
MW-225
MW-226
MW-227
MW-228
MW-229
MW-230
MW-231
MW-232
MW-233
MW-234
MW-235
MW-236
MW-237
MW-238
MW-239
MW-240
MW-241
MW-242
MW-243
MW-244
MW-245
MW-246
MW-247
MW-248
MW-249
MW-250
MW-251
MW-252
MW-253
MW-254
MW-255
MW-256
MW-257
MW-258
MW-259
MW-260
MW-261
MW-262
MW-263
MW-264
MW-265
MW-266
MW-267
MW-268
MW-269
MW-270
MW-271
MW-272
MW-273
MW-274
MW-275
MW-276
MW-277
MW-278
MW-279
MW-280
MW-281
MW-282
MW-283
MW-284
MW-285
MW-286
MW-287
MW-288
MW-289
MW-290
MW-291
MW-292
MW-293
MW-294
MW-295
MW-296
MW-297
MW-298
MW-299
MW-300
MW-301
MW-302
MW-303
MW-304
MW-305
MW-306
MW-307
MW-308
MW-309
MW-310
MW-311
MW-312
MW-313
MW-314
MW-315
MW-316
MW-317
MW-318
MW-319
MW-320
MW-321
MW-322
MW-323
MW-324
MW-325
MW-326
MW-327
MW-328
MW-329
MW-330
MW-331
MW-332
MW-333
MW-334
MW-335
MW-336
MW-337
MW-338
MW-339
MW-340
MW-341
MW-342
MW-343
MW-344
MW-345
MW-346
MW-347
MW-348
MW-349
MW-350
MW-351
MW-352
MW-353
MW-354
MW-355
MW-356
MW-357
MW-358
MW-359
MW-360
MW-361
MW-362
MW-363
MW-364
MW-365
MW-366
MW-367
MW-368
MW-369
MW-370
MW-371
MW-372
MW-373
MW-374
MW-375
MW-376
MW-377
MW-378
MW-379
MW-380
MW-381
MW-382
MW-383
MW-384
MW-385
MW-386
MW-387
MW-388
MW-389
MW-390
MW-391
MW-392
MW-393
MW-394
MW-395
MW-396
MW-397
MW-398
MW-399
MW-400
MW-401
MW-402
MW-403
MW-404
MW-405
MW-406
MW-407
MW-408
MW-409
MW-410
MW-411
MW-412
MW-413
MW-414
MW-415
MW-416
MW-417
MW-418
MW-419
MW-420
MW-421
MW-422
MW-423
MW-424
MW-425
MW-426
MW-427
MW-428
MW-429
MW-430
MW-431
MW-432
MW-433
MW-434
MW-435
MW-436
MW-437
MW-438
MW-439
MW-440
MW-441
MW-442
MW-443
MW-444
MW-445
MW-446
MW-447
MW-448
MW-449
MW-450
MW-451
MW-452
MW-453
MW-454
MW-455
MW-456
MW-457
MW-458
MW-459
MW-460
MW-461
MW-462
MW-463
MW-464
MW-465
MW-466
MW-467
MW-468
MW-469
MW-470
MW-471
MW-472
MW-473
MW-474
MW-475
MW-476
MW-477
MW-478
MW-479
MW-480
MW-481
MW-482
MW-483
MW-484
MW-485
MW-486
MW-487
MW-488
MW-489
MW-490
MW-491
MW-492
MW-493
MW-494
MW-495
MW-496
MW-497
MW-498
MW-499
MW-500
MW-501
MW-502
MW-503
MW-504
MW-505
MW-506
MW-507
MW-508
MW-509
MW-510
MW-511
MW-512
MW-513
MW-514
MW-515
MW-516
MW-517
MW-518
MW-519
MW-520
MW-521
MW-522
MW-523
MW-524
MW-525
MW-526
MW-527
MW-528
MW-529
MW-530
MW-531
MW-532
MW-533
MW-534
MW-535
MW-536
MW-537
MW-538
MW-539
MW-540
MW-541
MW-542
MW-543
MW-544
MW-545
MW-546
MW-547
MW-548
MW-549
MW-550
MW-551
MW-552
MW-553
MW-554
MW-555
MW-556
MW-557
MW-558
MW-559
MW-560
MW-561
MW-562
MW-563
MW-564
MW-565
MW-566
MW-567
MW-568
MW-569
MW-570
MW-571
MW-572
MW-573
MW-574
MW-575
MW-576
MW-577
MW-578
MW-579
MW-580
MW-581
MW-582
MW-583
MW-584
MW-585
MW-586
MW-587
MW-588
MW-589
MW-590
MW-591
MW-592
MW-593
MW-594
MW-595
MW-596
MW-597
MW-598
MW-599
MW-600
MW-601
MW-602
MW-603
MW-604
MW-605
MW-606
MW-607
MW-608
MW-609
MW-610
MW-611
MW-612
MW-613
MW-614
MW-615
MW-616
MW-617
MW-618
MW-619
MW-620
MW-621
MW-622
MW-623
MW-624
MW-625
MW-626
MW-627
MW-628
MW-629
MW-630
MW-631
MW-632
MW-633
MW-634
MW-635
MW-636
MW-637
MW-638
MW-639
MW-640
MW-641
MW-642
MW-643
MW-644
MW-645
MW-646
MW-647
MW-648
MW-649
MW-650
MW-651
MW-652
MW-653
MW-654
MW-655
MW-656
MW-657
MW-658
MW-659
MW-660
MW-661
MW-662
MW-663
MW-664
MW-665
MW-666
MW-667
MW-668
MW-669
MW-670
MW-671
MW-672
MW-673
MW-674
MW-675
MW-676
MW-677
MW-678
MW-679
MW-680
MW-681
MW-682
MW-683
MW-684
MW-685
MW-686
MW-687
MW-688
MW-689
MW-690
MW-691
MW-692
MW-693
MW-694
MW-695
MW-696
MW-697
MW-698
MW-699
MW-700
MW-701
MW-702
MW-703
MW-704
MW-705
MW-706
MW-707
MW-708
MW-709
MW-710
MW-711
MW-712
MW-713
MW-714
MW-715
MW-716
MW-717
MW-718
MW-719
MW-720
MW-721
MW-722
MW-723
MW-724
MW-725
MW-726
MW-727
MW-728
MW-729
MW-730
MW-731
MW-732
MW-733
MW-734
MW-735
MW-736
MW-737
MW-738
MW-739
MW-740
MW-741
MW-742
MW-743
MW-744
MW-745
MW-746
MW-747
MW-748
MW-749
MW-750
MW-751
MW-752
MW-753
MW-754
MW-755
MW-756
MW-757
MW-758
MW-759
MW-760
MW-761
MW-762
MW-763
MW-764
MW-765
MW-766
MW-767
MW-768
MW-769
MW-770
MW-771
MW-772
MW-773
MW-774
MW-775
MW-776
MW-777
MW-778
MW-779
MW-780
MW-781
MW-782
MW-783
MW-784
MW-785
MW-786
MW-787
MW-788
MW-789
MW-790
MW-791
MW-792
MW-793
MW-794
MW-795
MW-796
MW-797
MW-798
MW-799
MW-800
MW-801
MW-802
MW-803
MW-804
MW-805
MW-806
MW-807
MW-808
MW-809
MW-810
MW-811
MW-812
MW-813
MW-814
MW-815
MW-816
MW-817
MW-818
MW-819
MW-820
MW-821
MW-822
MW-823
MW-824
MW-825
MW-826
MW-827
MW-828
MW-829
MW-830
MW-831
MW-832
MW-833
MW-834
MW-835
MW-836
MW-837
MW-838
MW-839
MW-840
MW-841
MW-842
MW-843
MW-844
MW-845
MW-846
MW-847
MW-848
MW-849
MW-850
MW-851
MW-852
MW-853
MW-854
MW-855
MW-856
MW-857
MW-858
MW-859
MW-860
MW-861
MW-862
MW-863
MW-864
MW-865
MW-866
MW-867
MW-868
MW-869
MW-870
MW-871
MW-872
MW-873
MW-874
MW-875
MW-876
MW-877
MW-878
MW-879
MW-880
MW-881
MW-882
MW-883
MW-884
MW-885
MW-886
MW-887
MW-888
MW-889
MW-890
MW-891
MW-892
MW-893
MW-894
MW-895
MW-896
MW-897
MW-898
MW-899
MW-900
MW-901
MW-902
MW-903
MW-904
MW-905
MW-906
MW-907
MW-908
MW-909
MW-910
MW-911
MW-912
MW-913
MW-914
MW-915
MW-916
MW-917
MW-918
MW-919
MW-920
MW-921
MW-922
MW-923
MW-924
MW-925
MW-926
MW-927
MW-928
MW-929
MW-930
MW-931
MW-932
MW-933
MW-934
MW-935
MW-936
MW-937
MW-938
MW-939
MW-940
MW-941
MW-942
MW-943
MW-944
MW-945
MW-946
MW-947
MW-948
MW-949
MW-950
MW-951
MW-952
MW-953
MW-954
MW-955
MW-956
MW-957
MW-958
MW-959
MW-960
MW-961
MW-962
MW-963
MW-964
MW-965
MW-966
MW-967
MW-968
MW-969
MW-970
MW-971
MW-972
MW-973
MW-974
MW-975
MW-976
MW-977
MW-978
MW-979
MW-980
MW-981
MW-982
MW-983
MW-984
MW-985
MW-986
MW-987
MW-988
MW-989
MW-990
MW-991
MW-992
MW-993
MW-994
MW-995
MW-996
MW-997
MW-998
MW-999
MW-1000


Groundwater Impact Plan-Q4-12
MTBE Iso-Concentrations
Texaco Service Station
303 Jamacha Road
El Cajon, California
Donan Environmental Services, Inc.
KEY
MTBE MTBE by EPA Method 8260 in parts per billion (ppb)
MTBE Iso Concentration Contour in ppb
Approximate Assessor's parcel boundary for offsite properties
ND Not Detected by Lab Test Method
Groundwater monitoring well
Primary groundwater flow direction (October 2012)
Lexington Avenue
Jamacha Road
S. Ivory Avenue
SITE
Interceptor Trench
Domestic well PI approximately 100 feet west
APN 511-141-13-00
224 S. Ivory Avenue
APN 511-141-12-00
1350 E. Lexington Avenue
APN 511-170-43-00
291 Jamacha Road
APN 49-210-32-00
292 Jamacha Road
Residential Apartments
Pacific Bell Utility Vault
Utility Pole
Utility Boxes
>13 ppb
>30 ppb
0
30
60