

State Water Resources Control Board

UST CASE CLOSURE REVIEW SUMMARY REPORT

Current Agency Information

Current Agency: State Water Resources Control Board (State Board)	Address: 1101 I Street Sacramento, CA 95814
Agency Caseworker: Matthew Cohen	

Former Agency Information

Former Agency: Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (County)	Address: 900 South Fremont Avenue Alhambra, CA 91803
Agency Caseworker: John Awujo	Case No.: 000972-001019

Case Information

USTCF Claim No.: 19860	GeoTracker Global ID: T10000000545
Site Name: The Jankovich Company	Site Address: 14066 Garfield Avenue Paramount, CA 90723
Responsible Party: The Jankovich Company Attn: John Kenner	Address: 14066 Garfield Avenue Paramount, CA 90723
USTCF Expenditures to Date: \$0	Number of Years Case Open: 10

URL: http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report.asp?global_id=T10000000545

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. Highlights of the case follow:

This Site is an active commercial petroleum fueling facility. Four petroleum USTs were removed and replaced in 2003. A soil vapor extraction pilot test was conducted in July 2010. No groundwater monitoring wells have been installed. This is a soil only case based on soil analytical data and the estimated depth to groundwater at the Site.

The petroleum release is limited to the soil. 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 Site. No other water supply wells have been identified within 1,000 feet of the Site in files reviewed. Water is provided to water users near the Site by the City of Paramount Water Department and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California. 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 criteria. This is a soil only case. There are not sufficient mobile constituents (leachate, vapors, or light non-aqueous liquids [LNAPL]) to cause groundwater to exceed the groundwater criteria in this Policy. Past soil assessments show the deepest petroleum impact is 30 feet below ground surface (bgs). The December 2008 site assessment demonstrated groundwater is greater than 40 feet bgs at the Site.
- Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air: The case meets the Policy Exclusion for an Active Commercial Petroleum Fueling Facility. Soil vapor evaluation is not required because the Site is an active commercial petroleum fueling facility and the release characteristics do not pose an unacceptable health risk.
- 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 use, and the concentration limits for a Utility Worker are not exceeded. There are no soil sample results in the case record for naphthalene. However, the relative concentration of naphthalene in soil can be conservatively estimated using the published relative concentrations of naphthalene and benzene in gasoline. Taken from Potter and Simmons (1998), gasoline mixtures contain approximately 2 percent benzene and 0.25 percent naphthalene. Therefore, benzene can be used as a surrogate for naphthalene concentrations with a safety factor of eight. Benzene concentrations from the Site are below the naphthalene thresholds in Policy Table 1. Therefore, the estimated naphthalene concentrations meet the thresholds in Table 1 and the Policy criteria for direct contact by a factor of eight. It is highly unlikely that naphthalene concentrations in the soil, if any, exceed the threshold.

Objections to Closure and Responses

The County, by June 12, 2008 letter, opposes closure because:

- The extent of contamination is not defined.
RESPONSE: No significant soil contamination has been identified. The case meets all Policy criteria.

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.



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



Date

Prepared by: Kirk Larson