

State Water Resources Control Board

REVIEW SUMMARY REPORT – ADDITIONAL WORK PRELIMINARY REVIEW – AUGUST 2014

Agency Information

Agency Name: Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board)	Address: 895 Aerovista Place, Suite 101 San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
Agency Caseworker: Wei Liu	Case No.: 3488

Case Information

USTCF Claim No.: 19685	GeoTracker Global ID: T0607962057
Site Name: Former Chevron 9-0750	Site Address: 1745 Spring Street Paso Robles, CA
Responsible Party: Chevron Environmental Management Company Attn: Daryl Pessler	Address: 145 South State College Blvd. Suite 400 Brea, CA 92821
USTCF Expenditures to Date: \$0	Number of Years Case Open: 20

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=T0607962057

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 a former commercial petroleum fueling facility and currently a vacant lot. An unauthorized release was reported in April 2003 following the removal of four USTs (three gasoline and one waste oil) in March 2003. Approximately 98 cubic yards of impacted soil were excavated to a depth of 26 feet below ground surface (bgs) and disposed offsite in March 2003. Mobil high vacuum dual phase extraction was conducted between December 2011 and April 2013, which reportedly removed 84 pounds of total petroleum hydrocarbons as gasoline (TPHg). Since 2003, 15 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 Site. No other water supply wells have been identified within 1,000 feet of the Site in files reviewed. The unauthorized release is located within the service area of a public water system, as defined in the Policy. 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 monitoring wells southeast (downgradient) of MW-4 have not been sampled since 2009, which leave the plume undefined in a downgradient direction.
- **Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air:** The case does not meet Policy criteria because the maximum benzene concentration in groundwater is greater than 1,000 micrograms per liter ($\mu\text{g/L}$) and the minimum depth to groundwater is less than 30 feet.
- **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.

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:

- Free product remains.
RESPONSE: No measurable free product remains in site wells.
- Inadequate conceptual site model.
RESPONSE: Adequate data is available to prepare a conceptual site model as defined by the Policy.
- Secondary source remains.
RESPONSE: Secondary source as defined by the Policy was removed by excavation in 2003.
- The case does not meet Policy groundwater criteria.
RESPONSE: We concur.
- The case does not meet Policy vapor criteria.
RESPONSE: We concur.

Recommendation

The Fund recommends that the Regional Water Board direct the responsible party to conduct the following:

- Reactivate the existing remediation system (if still present) or initiate remediation to reduce contaminant mass in the source area to achieve water quality objectives in a timely manner,
- Continue to monitor for free product and if found conduct immediate recovery activity, and
- Perform a complete round of groundwater monitoring on all wells present, because some of the wells have not be sampled in five years.

 8/6/14
Kirk Larson, P.G. Date
Engineering Geologist
Technical Review Unit
(916) 341-5663

 8/6/14
Robert Trommer, C.H.G. Date
Senior Engineering Geologist
Chief, Technical Review Unit
(916) 341-5684

