STATE OF CALIFORNIA
STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

ORDER WQ 2013-0062 – 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:

Erwin Family LLC
Claim No. 16230

Erwin Family Ranch

2292 La Sierra Avenue, Riverside

Riverside County 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. 16230

Erwin Family Ranch

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.

Executive Director

8/16/13

Date

State Water Resources Control Board

UST CASE CLOSURE REVIEW SUMMARY REPORT

Agency Information

Agency Name: Riverside County Department of Environmental Health (County)	Address: 4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor Riverside, CA 92501
Agency Caseworker: Linda Shurlow	Case No.: 200016790

Case Information

USTCF Claim No.: 16230	Global ID: T0606599277
Site Name: Erwin Family Ranch	Site Address: 2292 La Sierra Ave Riverside, CA 92503
Responsible Party: Erwin Family LLC Attn: John Erwin	Address: Private Address
USTCF Expenditures to Date: $889,815	Number of Years Case Open: 12

URL: **http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report.asp?global_id=T0606599277**

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:

This case involves the fueling area of a former ranch that has been redeveloped for residential homes. An unauthorized release was reported in October 2000 following the removal of four USTs. In August 2000, approximately 246 cubic yards of contaminated soil were excavated beneath the USTs and disposed offsite. The total depth of the excavations was 10 feet beneath Tank 1 and 24 feet beneath Tanks 2 and 3. Soil vapor extraction was conducted intermittently between January 2004 and May 2008, which removed 10,576 pounds of total petroleum hydrocarbons as gasoline (TPHg). Groundwater extraction was conducted between June 2006 and December 2007, which removed 1,050 gallons of contaminated groundwater. Since 2001, 13 active monitoring wells have been installed and monitored regularly. According to groundwater data, water quality objectives have been achieved or nearly achieved for all constituents except benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes.

The petroleum release is limited to the soil and shallow 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. No other water supply wells have been identified within 1,000 feet of the defined plume boundary in files reviewed. Water is provided to water users near the Site by the Western Municipal Water District of Riverside County. 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 and stable, and concentrations are decreasing. 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: The case meets Policy Criterion 1 by Class 2. The contaminant plume that exceeds water quality objectives is less than 250 feet in length. There is no free product. The nearest water supply well or surface water body is greater than 1,000 feet from the defined plume boundary. The dissolved concentration of benzene is less than 3,000 µg/L and the dissolved concentration of methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE) is less than 1,000 µg/L.
- Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air: The case meets Policy Criterion 2a by Scenario 1. High concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons (> 1,000 µg/L of benzene) remain dissolved in the groundwater. The minimum depth to groundwater is greater than 30 feet, overlain by soil containing less than 100 mg/kg of TPH.
- 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 Residential land 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 directly substituted 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 Response

In correspondence dated November 22, 2011, the County objected to UST case closure because:

- It is necessary to confirm that the hydrocarbon plume is stable or decreasing.
  RESPONSE: Available data indicate that the hydrocarbon plume is limited in areal extent and stable.
- Additional remediation may be necessary.
  RESPONSE: The case meets all Policy criteria. The Policy allows for case closure before water quality objectives are met. Groundwater trends indicate water quality objectives will be achieved without further remediation.

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

Lisa Babcock

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

5/30/13

Date

Prepared by: Walter Bahm

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

- The Site is a former 18-acre ranch surrounded by land that has been redeveloped for residential land use.
- Thirteen active monitoring wells have been installed and monitored regularly since 2000.
- Site maps showing the location of the former USTs, monitoring wells, groundwater level contours, and benzene concentrations are provided at the end of this closure review summary (Tank Team, Inc., 2012).
- Nature of Contaminants of Concern: Petroleum hydrocarbons only.
- Source: UST system.
- Date reported: October 2000.
- Status of Release: USTs removed.
- Free Product: Historically, free product has been detected in monitoring well MW-2, at a thickness up to 29 inches (4/24/2001). Free product has not been detected since February 2002.

Tank Information

Tank No.	Size in Gallons	Contents	Closed in Place/ Removed/Active	Date
1	5,000	Gasoline	Removed	July 2000
2	5,000	Gasoline	Removed	July 2000
3	550	Gasoline	Removed	July 2000

Receptors

- GW Basin: Unnamed.
- Watershed: Santa Ana River – Middle Santa Ana River.
- Beneficial Uses: Municipal and Domestic Supply (GeoTracker).
- Land Use Designation: Residential, Vacant.
- Public Water System: Western Municipal Water District of Riverside County.
- Distance to Nearest Supply Well: According to data available in GeoTracker, there are no public supply wells regulated by California Department of Public Health within 1,000 feet of the determined plume boundary. No other water supply wells were identified within 1,000 feet of the defined plume boundary in the files reviewed.
- Distance to Nearest Surface Water: There is no identified surface water within 1,000 feet of the define plume boundaries.

Geology/Hydrogeology

- Stratigraphy: Silty sand and sandy silts to depths ranging from 18 to 24 feet below ground surface (bgs), underlain by sand (decomposed granite) to depths ranging from 50 to 77 feet bgs, underlain by granitic bedrock.
- Maximum Sample Depth: 77 feet bgs.
- Minimum Groundwater Depth: 18.79 feet bgs at monitoring well MW-10.
- Maximum Groundwater Depth: 48.81 feet bgs at monitoring well MW-15.
- Current Average Depth to Groundwater: Approximately 38 feet bgs.
- Saturated Zones(s) Studied: Approximately 25-76 feet bgs.
- Groundwater Flow Direction: Northwest at a gradient of approximately 0.06 feet/foot.

Monitoring Well Information

Well Designation	Date Installed	Screen Interval (feet bgs)	Depth to Water (feet bgs) (6/31/2012)
MW1	11/2000	36-76	--[1]
MW2	12/2000	32-57	35.75
MW4	5/2001	30-60	38.77
MW5	5/2001	30-55	34.02
MW6	7/2002	20-65	--[1]
MW7	7/2002	30-65	--[1]
MW8	7/2002	25-50	38.71
MW11	7/2002	30-60	Well Paved Over
MW12	7/2002	29-59	41.93
MW13	4/2003	25-65	26.65
MW14	5/2004	28-48	38.93
MW15	5/2004	25-55	41.53
MW16	6/2006	25-55	42.91
MW17	6/2006	27-57	41.11

-- Not recorded
[1]: Wellhead reconstructed with horizontal remote access

Remediation Summary

- Free Product: Historically, free product has been detected in monitoring well MW2 at a thickness of up to 29 inches (4/24/2001). Approximately 27 gallons of free product were hand-bailed from MW2 between December 2000 and November 2001. Free product has not been detected since February 2002.
- Soil Excavation: Approximately 246 cubic yards of contaminated soil were excavated beneath the USTs in August 2000 and disposed offsite. The total depth of the excavations was 10 feet beneath Tank 1 and 24 feet beneath Tanks 2 and 3.
- In-Situ Soil/Groundwater Remediation: Soil vapor extraction was conducted intermittently between January 2004 and May 2008, which removed 10,576 pounds of TPHg. Groundwater extraction was conducted between June 2006 and December 2007, which removed 1,050 gallons of contaminated groundwater.

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	<0.005 (04/03)	<0.005 (04/03)
Ethylbenzene	<0.005 (04/03)	<0.005 (04/03)
Naphthalene	NA	NA
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

Most Recent Concentrations of Petroleum Constituents in Groundwater

Sample	Sample Date	TPHg (µg/L)	Benzene (µg/L)	Toluene (µg/L)	Ethyl-Benzene (µg/L)	Xylenes (µg/L)	MTBE (µg/L)	TBA (µg/L)
CSBMW2	06/27/12	3,090	**286**	**251**	149	599	<1	105
MW2	06/27/12	11,000	**1,570**	**294**	**516**	**2,284**	<1	285
MW4	06/27/12	<10	<1	<1	<1	<3	<1	<50
MW8	06/27/12	465	**1.91**	<1	<1	<2	<1	73.7
MW14	06/27/12	<10	<1	<1	<1	<2	<1	<50
MW16	06/27/12	59.4	**5.06**	<1	4.36	<2	<1	<50
WQOs	-	--	**1**	**150**	**300**	**1,750**	**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
MTBE: Methyl tert-butyl ether
TBA: Tert-butyl alcohol
WQOs: Water Quality Objectives, Regional Water Board Basin Plan
--: Regional Water Board Basin Plan has no numeric water quality objective for TPHg
[a]: California Department of Public Health, Response Level

Groundwater Trends:

- There are 13 years of regular groundwater monitoring data for this case. Benzene trends are shown below: Near Downgradient (MW-2) and Far Downgradient (MW-4).

Near Downgradient Well



Far Downgradient Well



Evaluation of Current Risks

- Estimate of Hydrocarbon Mass in Soil: None reported.
- Soil/Groundwater tested for MTBE: Yes, see table above.
- Oxygen Concentrations in Soil Vapor: None reported.
- Plume Length: <150 feet.
- Plume Stable or Decreasing: Yes.
- Contaminated Zone(s) Used for Drinking Water: No.

- Groundwater Risk from Residual Petroleum Hydrocarbons: The case meets Policy Criterion 1 by Class 2. The contaminant plume that exceeds water quality objectives is less than 250 feet in length. There is no free product. The nearest water supply well or surface water body is greater than 1,000 feet from the defined plume boundary. The dissolved concentration of benzene is less than 3,000 µg/L and the dissolved concentration of MTBE is less than 1,000 µg/L.
- Indoor Vapor Risk from Residual Petroleum Hydrocarbons: The case meets Policy Criterion 2a by Scenario 1. High concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons (> 1,000 µg/L of benzene) remain dissolved in the groundwater. The minimum depth to groundwater is greater than 30 feet, overlain by soil containing less than 100 mg/kg of TPH.
- Direct Contact Risk from Residual Petroleum Hydrocarbons: The case meets Policy Criterion 3a. Maximum concentrations in soil are less than those in Table 1 for Residential/Commercial and the concentration limits for Utility Worker are satisfied. Site pavement prevents direct contact. 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 directly substituted 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.



FIGURE 4
GROUNDWATER GRADIENT MAP
JUNE 27, 2012



FIGURE 5
BENZENE IN GROUNDWATER
JUNE 27, 2012