

## State Water Resources Control Board

### UST CASE CLOSURE REVIEW SUMMARY REPORT

#### Agency Information

Agency Name: Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Redding (Regional Water Board)	Address: 364 Knollcrest Drive, Suite 200 Redding, CA 96002
Agency Caseworker: Melissa Buciak	Case No.: 450329

#### Case Information

USTCF Claim No.: 18650	GeoTracker Global ID: T0608918443
Site Name: Hilltop Gas	Site Address: 722 East Cypress Avenue Redding, CA 96001
Responsible Party: DJS Partners, LLC Attn: Sukhwinder Singh	Address: PO Box 455 Cottonwood, CA 96022
USTCF Expenditures to Date: \$156,116	Number of Years Case Open: 10

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=T0608918443](http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report.asp?global_id=T0608918443)

#### 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 and has been utilized for that purpose since 1977. An unauthorized release was reported in February 1990 and the USTs were replaced in 1994. An air sparge and soil vapor extraction system was operated at the Site from November 1996 until case closure in August 1997. An unauthorized release was reported in September 2004. Other than the air sparge/soil vapor extraction system operation conducted in 1996 and 1997, no active remediation has been implemented for soil or groundwater. Since 2012, ten groundwater monitoring wells have been installed and monitored. According to groundwater data, water quality objectives have been achieved or nearly achieved for all constituents except in the source area.

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. Remaining petroleum hydrocarbon constituents are limited and stable, and concentrations are decreasing. Corrective actions have been implemented and additional

Hilltop Gas  
722 East Cypress Avenue, Redding  
Claim No: 18650

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 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.

**Determination**

Based on the review performed in accordance with Health & Safety Code Section 25296.10 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. The County has the regulatory responsibility to supervise the abandonment of monitoring wells.

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

7/6/15  
Date

Prepared by: Kirk Larson, P.G.