

## State Water Resources Control Board

### UST CASE CLOSURE REVIEW SUMMARY REPORT

#### Agency Information

Agency Name: Alameda County Health Care Services (County)	Address: 1131 Harbor Bay Parkway, Suite 250, Alameda, CA 94502
Agency Caseworker: Mark Detterman	Case No.: RO0000500

#### Case Information

USTCF Claim No.: 5952	GeoTracker Global ID: T0600100334
Site Name: Chevron # 9-1026	Site Address: 3701 Broadway Oakland, CA 94611
Responsible Party: Chevron Corporation Attn: Alexis Fischer	Address: 6101 Bollinger Canyon Road, San Ramon, CA 94583
USTCF Expenditures to Date: \$247,483	Number of Years Case Open: 26

To view all public documents for this case available on GeoTracker use the following URL.

URL: [http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile\\_report.asp?global\\_id=T0600100334](http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report.asp?global_id=T0600100334)

#### 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 case is currently a commercial building and a former commercial petroleum fueling facility. An unauthorized release was reported in June 1988. Site historical data show that nine USTs (gasoline, diesel, and waste oil) were removed between 1982 and 1988 and approximately 7,800 cubic yards were excavated and removed. In 1992, soil vapor extraction was determined to be ineffective. Groundwater extraction removed 14 million gallons of petroleum impacted groundwater. In 2007 and during the construction of a medical building onsite, the majority of remaining hydrocarbon mass was excavated from the Site. An impermeable barrier was installed beneath the medical building that was constructed. Active remediation has not been conducted at the Site for the past five years. Since 1982, ten groundwater monitoring wells have been installed (five wells destroyed in 2006) and irregularly monitored. According to groundwater data, water quality objectives have been achieved.

The petroleum release is limited to the soil and shallow groundwater. According to data available in GeoTracker, there are no public water supply wells or surface water bodies within 250 feet of the defined plume boundary. No other water supply wells have been identified within 250 feet of the defined plume boundary in files reviewed. The unauthorized release is located within the service area of a public water system, as defined in the Policy. The affected shallow groundwater is not currently being used as a source of drinking water, and it is highly unlikely that the affected shallow 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. Corrective actions have 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 1. The contaminant plume that exceeds water quality objectives is less than 100 feet in length. There is no free product. The nearest water supply well or surface water body is greater than 250 feet from the defined plume boundary.
- **Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air:** The case meets Policy Criterion 2a by Scenario 3a. The maximum benzene concentration in groundwater is less than 100 micrograms per liter ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ ). The minimum depth to groundwater is greater than 5 feet, overlain by soil containing less than 100 milligrams per kilogram ( $\text{mg/kg}$ ) of TPH. In addition, an impermeable barrier was installed beneath the medical building that was constructed
- **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**

According to a letter dated April 29, 2014, the County opposes closure because:

- Further groundwater benzene plume assessment is necessary.  
RESPONSE: The majority of soil and groundwater contamination was removed by excavation in 2007. One detection of benzene in 2002 at slightly above the detection limit has been reported in the four remaining downgradient perimeter wells. These wells have been monitored regularly between 2002 and 2014. Additional, benzene assessment is not necessary.
- Preferential pathway assessment needed.  
RESPONSE: Groundwater varies between 12 - 18 feet bgs. Very few, if any infrastructure projects are constructed that would intersect groundwater at this elevation.
- Water supply well survey needed.  
RESPONSE: A well survey is not necessary because the area downgradient (based on 26 years of data) has been redeveloped with high-rise buildings for more than 500 feet. If any water supply wells once existed they would have been removed prior to the new construction.
- Vapor intrusion assessment needed for medical building.  
RESPONSE: An impermeable barrier was installed beneath the medical building that was constructed. As such, any residual contamination will not pose a significant risk to

human health or the environment. Additional, no practical corrective actions can be implemented at the Site due to its current land use.

**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. Alameda County has the regulatory responsibility to supervise the abandonment of monitoring wells.

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

11/19/14  
Date