

## State Water Resources Control Board

### REVIEW SUMMARY REPORT – ADDITIONAL WORK THIRD REVIEW – AUGUST 2014

#### Current Agency Information

Agency Name: Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board)	Address: 320 West 4 <sup>th</sup> Street Suite 200 Los Angeles, CA 90013
Agency Caseworker: Noman Chowdhury	Case No.: R-10316

#### Case Information

USTCF Claim No.: 4225	GeoTracker Global ID: T0603704927
Site Name: G&M Oil #16	Site Address: 12559 Lambert Road Whittier, CA 90606
Responsible Party: G&M Oil Company Attn: Jennifer Talbert	Address: 16868 A Street Huntington Beach, CA 92647
USTCF Expenditures to Date: \$1,108,001	Number of Years Case Open: 19

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=T0603704927](http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report.asp?global_id=T0603704927)

#### 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 does not meet all of the required criteria of the Policy. Highlights of the case follow:

This Site is an active commercial petroleum fueling facility. Three 10,000-gallon gasoline USTs were removed in 1992. An unauthorized release was reported in March 1995. An unknown volume of contaminated soil was excavated to a depth of 12 feet below ground surface (bgs). Free product removal and batch extraction were conducted between 1997 and December 2001, which removed 6,834 gallons of contaminated groundwater including 69 gallons of free product. A soil vapor extraction pilot test was conducted in June 2000; estimated that the extraction rate was 90 pounds of total petroleum hydrocarbons as gasoline (TPHg) per day. Oxygen release compound filter socks were utilized in wells W-1 and W-4 from February 2003 and March 2004. A dual phase extraction pilot test was conducted in September 2005. An in-situ chemical oxidation pilot test was conducted between May 2008 and October 2009. Since 2001, 22 groundwater monitoring wells have been installed and monitored. According to groundwater data, water quality objectives have not 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 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. 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

FELICIA MARCUS, CHAIR | THOMAS HOWARD, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

unlikely that the affected shallow groundwater will be used as a source of drinking water in the foreseeable future.

#### Rationale for Closure under the Policy

- General Criteria: The case does not meet all eight Policy general criteria; free product remains.
- Groundwater Specific Criteria: The case does not meet Policy criteria because MTBE concentrations greater than 1,000 micrograms per liter ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ ) remain.
- 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: This case meets Policy Criterion 3b. Although no document titled "Risk Assessment" was found in the files reviewed, a professional assessment of site-specific risk from exposure through the direct exposure pathway was performed by Fund staff. The assessment of site-specific risk from potential exposure to residual soil contamination found that maximum concentrations of petroleum constituents remaining in soil will have no significant risk of adversely affecting human health. The Site is paved and accidental exposure to site soils is prevented. As an active petroleum fueling facility, any construction worker working at the Site will be prepared for exposure in their normal daily work.

#### Objections to Closure and Responses

According to the Path to Closure page in GeoTracker, finalized on November 20, 2013, the Regional Water Board opposes closure because:

- Secondary Source remains.  
RESPONSE: Secondary source as defined by the Policy was removed by excavation in 1992 and by active remediation.
- The case does not meet Policy groundwater criteria.  
RESPONSE: We concur.

#### Recommendation

The Fund recommends that the Regional Water Board direct the Responsible Party to resume active remediation to remove free product and reduce contaminant mass in the source area and achieve water quality objectives in a timely manner.

  
Kirk Larson, P.G.  
Engineering Geologist  
Technical Review Unit  
(916) 341-5663

8/19/2014  
Date

  
Robert Trommer, C.H.G.  
Senior Engineering Geologist  
Chief, Technical Review Unit  
(916) 341-5684

8/19/14  
Date