

## State Water Resources Control Board

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

#### Agency Information

Agency Name: San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board)	Address: 1515 Clay Street Suite 1400 Oakland, CA 94612
Agency Caseworker: Barbara Sieminski	Case No.: 01-2344

#### Case Information

USTCF Claim No.: 16970	GeoTracker Global ID: T0600102154
Site Name: Abe Petroleum	Site Address: 17715 Mission Boulevard Hayward, CA 94544
Responsible Party: Paul Garg Som Gupta	Address: Residential addresses
USTCF Expenditures to Date: \$240,487	Number of Years Case Open: 17

**URL: [http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile\\_report.asp?global\\_id=T0600102154](http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report.asp?global_id=T0600102154)**

#### 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 case is an active commercial petroleum fueling facility. An unauthorized release was reported in September 1997 following the removal of five USTs (four gasoline and one waste oil). An unknown amount of impacted soils were removed to a depth of 13 feet below ground surface (bgs) and disposed offsite in 1997. Dual phase extraction (DPE) has been proposed and approved but yet to be implemented. Active remediation has not been conducted at the Site for the past seventeen years. Since 2007, seven groundwater monitoring wells have been installed and irregularly monitored. According to groundwater data, water quality objectives have been achieved or nearly achieved for all constituents in most wells except for benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, xylenes and methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE) in wells MW-1, MW-2 and MW-3.

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 projected plume boundary. According to the Regional Board, other water supply wells could potentially exist downgradient of and within 250 feet of the Site. The unauthorized release is located within the service area of a public water system, as defined in the Policy. 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.

#### **Rationale for Closure under the Policy**

- General Criteria: The case meets all eight Policy general criteria.
- Groundwater Specific Criteria: The case does not meet the groundwater specific criteria because the maximum concentration of MTBE is greater than 1000 µg/L and of the potential presence of downgradient non-municipal wells less than 250 feet from the Site.
- Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air: The case meets the Policy Exclusion for Active Station. 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 potential exposure to residual soil contamination was completed by Fund staff. The results of the assessment 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. Therefore, the pathway is incomplete. 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**

The Regional Water Board objects to UST case closure (March 13, 2013 letter) because:

- The Conceptual Site Model is incomplete due to a partial sensitive receptor survey. The potential presence of unpermitted non-municipal wells proximal to the Site has not been addressed in the receptor survey.  
RESPONSE: The Fund concurs.
- Secondary source has not been removed to the extent practicable.  
RESPONSE: Secondary source as defined by the Policy has been removed during the UST removal in 1997.
- The maximum concentration of dissolved MTBE is more than 1,000 parts per billion (ppb) and the contaminant plume is less than 1,000 feet from a surface water receptor (San Lorenzo Creek).  
RESPONSE: The Fund concurs that the MTBE levels are more than 1,000 ppb.

**Recommendation**

The Fund recommends that the Regional Board use enforcement and direct the Responsible Party to (1) confirm the absence/presence of any supply wells, obtain well completion data including sanitary seals and their current operational status among those residences west of the Site and (2) require a complete round of groundwater monitoring to determine current groundwater conditions.

   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ramesh Sundareswaran      Date  
Water Resource Control Engineer  
Technical Review Unit  
(916) 341-5670

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