REVIEW SUMMARY REPORT – ADDITIONAL WORK
PRELIMINARY REVIEW – JUNE 2016

Agency Information

Agency Name: Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board)	Address: 320 West 4th Street, Suite 260 Los Angeles, CA 90013
Agency Caseworker: Chandra Tyler	Case No.: R-26430

Case Information

Cleanup Fund (Fund) Claim No: 19316	GeoTracker Global ID: T060379630
Site Name: Shell Service Station	Site Address: 24301 Valencia Boulevard Valencia, CA 91355
Responsible Party: Shell Oil Products Attn: Deborah Pryor	Address: 20945 South Wilmington Avenue Carson, CA 90810
Fund Expenditures to Date: $0	Number of Years Case Open: 14
Fund Budget Category: Soil and Groundwater Investigation	

To view all public documents for this case available on GeoTracker use the following URL:
http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report.asp?global_id=T060379630

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 October 2001 after a groundwater assessment was conducted at the Site. Approximately 226 tons of impacted soil were excavated and disposed offsite in November 2003 during a dispenser upgrade. A dual phase extraction pilot test was conducted in March 2009, which removed 113 gallons of contaminated groundwater. Groundwater extraction pilot tests were conducted in 2010, which removed 0.27 pounds of petroleum hydrocarbons. Soil vapor extraction and air sparging were conducted between March and November 2014, which removed 618 pounds (based on analytical data) of total petroleum hydrocarbons as gasoline (TPHg). Active remediation has not been conducted at the Site for the past year. Since 2012, 14 groundwater monitoring and two remediation wells have been installed and monitored. According to groundwater data, water quality objectives have been not achieved.

The petroleum release is limited to the soil and shallow groundwater. According to data available in GeoTracker, there is one public water supply well 850 feet west (downgradient) of the projected plume boundary. No other water supply wells or surface water bodies have been identified within 1,000 feet of the projected 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.

Rationale for Closure under the Policy

- General Criteria: The case meets all eight Policy general criteria.
- Groundwater Specific Criteria: The case does not meet Policy criteria because the contaminant plume that exceeds water quality objectives is undefined to the northwest, while the nearest water supply well is less than 1,000 feet from the projected plume boundary and the maximum dissolved concentration of methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE) is greater than 1,000 micrograms per liter (µg/L).
- Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air: This active fueling facility meets the Active Commercial Petroleum Fueling Facility Exception. Exposure to petroleum vapors associated with historical fuel system releases is comparatively insignificant relative to exposures from small surface spills and fugitive vapor releases that typically occur at active fueling facilities.
- 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.

Objections to Closure and Responses

According to the LTCP Checklist page in GeoTracker dated October 19, 2015, Regional Water Board staff objects to UST case closure because:

- Comment: Conceptual site model (CSM) that assesses the nature, extent, and mobility of the release has not been developed.
  Response: There is sufficient site-specific information to evaluate the threat to human health, safety, and the environment, therefore a CSM that assesses the nature, extent, and mobility of the release has been developed. The goal of a CSM is to provide sufficient site-specific information to evaluate the threat to human health, safety, and the environment. The supporting data and analysis used to develop the CSM are not required to be contained in a single report. The information may be contained in multiple reports submitted to the regulatory agency over a period of time.
- Comment: The case does not meet Policy Groundwater criteria.
  Response: We agree; the case does not meet Policy criteria because the contaminant plume that exceeds water quality objectives is undefined to the northwest, while the nearest water supply well is less than 1,000 feet from the projected plume boundary and the maximum dissolved concentration of MTBE is greater than 1,000 µg/L.

Recommendation

State Water Board staff agrees with the proposed work plan to collect groundwater samples from air sparging wells to define the current groundwater MTBE and tert-butyl alcohol (TBA) plume.

6/2/16

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

6/7/16

Pat G. Cullen, P.G. Date
Senior Engineering Geologist
Chief, Technical Review Unit
(916) 341-5684