

## State Water Resources Control Board

### REVIEW SUMMARY REPORT – ADDITIONAL WORK FIFTH 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.: 908061225

#### Case Information

USTCF Claim No.: 16762	GeoTracker Global ID: T0603790005
Site Name: Cal Fed Bank	Site Address: 2202 Long Beach Blvd. Long Beach, CA 90806
Responsible Party: Brian B. Woo Don I. Oh	Address: Private Address
USTCF Expenditures to Date: \$631,795	Number of Years Case Open: 13

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=T0603790005](http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report.asp?global_id=T0603790005)

#### 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 strip mall. Eight gasoline USTs were removed in December 1986. Approximately 29 cubic yards of impacted soil were excavated, disposed offsite, and replaced with clean fill in 1987. An unauthorized release was reported in December 2000. Soil vapor extraction and air sparging were conducted between June 2010 and March 2012, which removed 39 pounds of total petroleum hydrocarbons as gasoline (TPHg) and were discontinued due to low concentrations. No active remediation has been conducted in two years. Since 2000, five 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. 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.

### 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 objective is not defined.
- Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air: The case meets Policy Criterion 2b. Although no document titled "Risk Assessment" was found in the files reviewed, a professional assessment of site-specific risk from exposure through the vapor intrusion pathway was performed by Fund staff. The assessment found that there is no significant risk of petroleum vapors adversely affecting human health. No buildings have been or could be constructed over the residual contamination because of its proximity to the road. In addition, the Site is paved limiting vapor migration.
- 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 October 30, 2013, the Regional Water Board opposes closure because:

- Secondary Source remains.  
RESPONSE: Secondary source as defined by the Policy was removed by excavation in 1987.
- The case does not meet Policy groundwater criteria.  
RESPONSE: We concur.
- The case does not meet Policy vapor criteria.  
RESPONSE: The case meets Policy Criterion 2b.
- The case does not meet Policy direct contact criteria.  
RESPONSE: The case meets Policy Criterion 3a.

### Recommendation

The Fund recommends that the Regional Water Board direct the responsible party to define the extent of groundwater contamination west (downgradient) of the Site.

  
Kirk Larson, P.G.                      8/19/14  
Engineering Geologist                      Date  
Technical Review Unit  
(916) 341-5663

  
Robert Trommer, C.H.G.                      8/19/14  
Senior Engineering Geologist                      Date  
Chief, Technical Review Unit  
(916) 341-5684