STATE OF CALIFORNIA
STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

ORDER WQ 2013-0008-UST

In the Matter of Underground Storage Tank Case Closure

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25299.39.2 and the Low Threat Underground Storage Tank Case Closure Policy

---

BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR[1]:

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25299.39.2, the Manager of the Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Fund (Fund) recommends closure of the underground storage tank (UST) case at the site listed below.[2] The name of the Fund claimant, the Fund claim number, the site name and the applicable site address are as follows:

Thrifty Oil Company
Claim No. 6231
Thrifty Oil #384
18975 Magnolia Street, Fountain Valley
Orange County Environmental Health Department

I. STATUTORY AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Section 25299.39.2 directs the Fund manager to review the case history of claims that have been active for five years or more (five-year review), unless there is an objection from the UST owner or operator. This section further authorizes the Fund Manager to make recommendations to the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) for closure of a five-year-review case if the UST owner or operator approves. In response to a recommendation by the Fund Manager, the State Water Board, or in certain cases the State Water Board Executive Director, may close a case or require the closure of a UST case. Closure of a UST case is appropriate where the corrective action ensures the protection of

---

[1] State Water Board Resolution No. 2012-0062 delegates to the Executive Director the authority to close or require the closure of any UST case if the case meets the criteria found in the State Water Board's Low Threat Underground Storage Tank Case Closure Policy adopted by State Water Board Resolution No. 2012-0016.

[2] Unless otherwise noted, all references are to the Health and Safety Code.

human health, safety, and the environment and where the corrective action is consistent with: 1) Chapter 6.7 of Division 20 of the Health and Safety Code and implementing regulations; 2) Any applicable waste discharge requirements or other orders issued pursuant to Division 7 of the Water Code; 3) All applicable state policies for water quality control; and 4) All applicable water quality control plans.

The Fund Manager has completed a five-year review of the UST case identified above, and recommends that this case be closed. The recommendation is based upon the facts and circumstances of this particular UST case. A UST Case Closure Review Summary Report has been prepared for the case identified above and the bases for determining compliance with the Water Quality Control Policy for Low-Threat Underground Storage Tank Case Closures (Low-Threat Closure Policy or Policy) are explained in the Case Closure Review Summary Report.

A. Low-Threat Closure Policy

In State Water Board Resolution No. 2012-0016, the State Water Board adopted the Low Threat Closure Policy. The Policy became effective on August 17, 2012. The Policy establishes consistent statewide case closure criteria for certain low-threat petroleum UST sites. In the absence of unique attributes or site-specific conditions that demonstrably increase the risk associated with residual petroleum constituents, cases that meet the general and media-specific criteria in the Low-Threat Closure Policy pose a low threat to human health, safety and the environment and are appropriate for closure under Health and Safety Code section 25296.10. The Policy provides that if a regulatory agency determines that a case meets the general and media-specific criteria of the Policy, then the regulatory agency shall notify responsible parties and other specified interested persons that the case is eligible for case closure. Unless the regulatory agency revises its determination based on comments received on the proposed case closure, the Policy provides that the agency shall issue a closure letter as specified in Health and Safety Code section 25296.10. The closure letter may only be issued after the expiration of the 60-day comment period, proper destruction or maintenance of monitoring wells or borings, and removal of waste associated with investigation and remediation of the site.

Health and Safety Code section 25299.57, subdivision (l)(1) provides that claims for reimbursement of corrective action costs that are received by the Fund more than 365 days after the date of a closure letter or a Letter of Commitment, whichever occurs later, shall not be reimbursed unless specified conditions are satisfied. A Letter of Commitment has already been issued on the claim subject to this order and the respective Fund claimant, so the 365-day

II. FINDINGS

Based upon the UST Case Closure Review Summary Report prepared for the case attached hereto, the State Water Board finds that corrective action taken to address the unauthorized release of petroleum at the UST release site identified as:

Claim No. 6231

Thrifty Oil #384

ensures protection of human health, safety and the environment and is consistent with Chapter 6.7 of Division 20 of the Health and Safety Code and implementing regulations, the Low-Threat Closure Policy and other water quality control policies and applicable water quality control plans.

Pursuant to the Low-Threat Closure Policy, notification has been provided to all entities that are required to receive notice of the proposed case closure, a 60-day comment period has been provided to notified parties, and any comments received have been considered by the Board in determining that the case should be closed.

The UST case identified above may be the subject of orders issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Water Board (Regional Water Board) pursuant to Division 7 of the Water Code. Any orders that have been issued by the Regional Water Board pursuant to Division 7 of the Water Code, or directives issued by a Local Oversight Program agency for this case should be rescinded to the extent they are inconsistent with this Order.

III. ORDER

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

A. The UST case identified in Section II of this Order, meeting the general and media-specific criteria established in the Low-Threat Closure Policy, be closed in accordance with the following conditions and after the following actions are complete. Prior to the issuance of a closure letter, the Fund claimant is ordered to:

1. Properly destroy monitoring wells and borings unless the owner of real property on which the well or boring is located certifies that the wells or borings will be maintained in accordance with local or state requirements;

2. Properly remove from the site and manage all waste piles, drums, debris, and other investigation and remediation derived materials in accordance with local or state requirements; and

3. Within six months of the date of this Order, submit documentation to the regulatory agency overseeing the UST case identified in section II of this Order that the tasks in subparagraphs (1) and (2) have been completed.

B. The tasks in subparagraphs (1) and (2) of Paragraph (A) are ordered pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25296.10 and failure to comply with these requirements may result in the imposition of civil penalties pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25299 subdivision (d)(1). Penalties may be imposed administratively by the State Water Board or Regional Water Board.

C. Within 30 days of receipt of proper documentation from the Fund claimant that requirements in subparagraphs (1) and (2) of Paragraph (A) are complete, the regulatory agency that is responsible for oversight of the UST case identified in Section II of this Order shall notify the State Water Board that the tasks have been satisfactorily completed.

D. Within 30 days of notification from the regulatory agency that the tasks are complete pursuant to Paragraph (C), the Deputy Director of the Division of Financial Assistance shall issue a closure letter consistent with Health and Safety Code, section 25296.10, subdivision (g) and upload the closure letter and UST Case Closure Review Summary Report to GeoTracker.

E. As specified in Health and Safety Code section 25299.39.2 subdivision (a) (2), corrective action costs incurred after a recommendation of closure shall be limited to $10,000 per year unless the Board or its delegated representative agrees that corrective action in excess of that amount is necessary to meet closure requirements, or additional corrective actions are necessary pursuant to section 25296.10 subdivision (a) and (b). Pursuant to section 25299.57, subdivision (l) (1), and except in specified circumstances, all claims for reimbursement of corrective action costs must be received by the Fund within 365 days of issuance of the closure letter in order for the costs to be considered.

F. Any Regional Water Board or Local Oversight Program Agency directive or order that directs corrective action or other action inconsistent with case closure for the UST case identified in Section II is rescinded, but only to the extent the Regional Water Board order or Local Oversight Program Agency directive is inconsistent with this Order.

Thomas Howard
Executive Director

4/12/13
Date

State Water Resources Control Board

UST CASE CLOSURE REVIEW SUMMARY REPORT

Agency Information

Agency Name: Orange County Environmental Health Department (County)	Address: 1241 East Dyer Road, Suite 120 Santa Ana, CA 92705
Agency Caseworker: Shyamala Sundaram	Case No.: 87UT002

Case Information

USTCF Claim No.: 6231	Global ID: T0605900510
Site Name: Thrifty Oil #384	Site Address: 18975 Magnolia Street, Fountain Valley, CA 92708
Responsible Party (RP): Thrifty Oil Company/ Best California Gas	Address: 13116 Imperial HWY, Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670
USTCF Expenditures to Date: $409,036	Number of Years Case Open: 15

URL: http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report.asp?global_id=T0605900510

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 meets all of the required criteria of the Policy. A summary evaluation of compliance with the Policy is shown in **Attachment 1: Compliance with State Water Board Policies and State Law**. The Conceptual Site Model (CSM) upon which the evaluation of the case has been made is described in **Attachment 2: Summary of Basic Case Information (Conceptual Site Model)**. Highlights of the case follow:

An unauthorized leak was reported in January 1987 following the removal of three USTs. An estimated 780 tons of impacted soil were removed during UST replacement activities in 1988. Soil vapor extraction was conducted between August 1993 and June 1998 for a total of 15,243 hours, which removed 46,133 pounds of total petroleum hydrocarbons as gasoline (TPHg). Groundwater over-purging was conducted between August 2001 and June 2006, which removed 6,501 gallons of contaminated water. According to groundwater data, water quality objectives (WQO) have been achieved for all constituents except for TPHg.

The petroleum release is limited to the shallow soil and groundwater. The nearest public supply well regulated by the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) and surface water body are greater than 250 feet of the defined plume boundary. No water supply wells within 250 feet of the defined plume boundary were identified in the files reviewed. Water is provided to water users near the Site by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California. 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. Remaining petroleum hydrocarbon constituents are limited, stable and concentrations are declining. Corrective actions have been implemented and additional corrective actions are not necessary. Any remaining petroleum hydrocarbon constituents do not pose a

significant risk to human health, safety or the environment.

Rationale for Closure under the Policy

- General Criteria: The case meets all eight Policy general criteria.
- Groundwater: The case meets Policy Criterion 1 by Class 1. The plume that exceeds WQO is less than 100 feet. No free product is present. The nearest water supply well or surface water is greater than 250 feet from the defined plume boundary.
- Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air: The case meets the Policy Active Station Exclusion – Soil vapor evaluation is not required because the Site is an active commercial petroleum fueling facility.
- Direct Contact and Outdoor Air Exposure: The case meets the Policy Criterion 3a. The Site is paved preventing direct contact exposure. Thirty-eight soil samples were collected from 0 to 10 feet. All but one sample were either non-detect or below Table 1 thresholds. The remaining sample contained 90 mg/kg, which is slightly higher than the Table 1 threshold of 89 mg/kg for ethyl-benzene. 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 directly substituted for naphthalene concentrations with a safety factor of eight. Benzene concentrations from the Site are below the naphthalene thresholds in Table 1 of the Policy. Therefore, the estimated naphthalene concentrations meet the thresholds in Table1 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.

Objection to Closure and Response

The County objects to UST case closure for this case because there is an increasing tert-butyl alcohol (TBA) trend in MW-2.

RESPONSE: A single sample from MW-2 in 2010 interrupted a decade-long sampling history of non-detect. Concentrations since returned to non-detect since 2010. (See graph page 9 of 12). The case meets the Policy criteria for closure. In addition, Resolution 92-49 does not require requisite level of water quality be met at the time of closure; it specifies compliance with cleanup goals and objectives within a reasonable time frame.

Determination

Based on the review performed in accordance with Health & Safety Code Section 25299.39.2 subdivision (a), the Fund Manager has determined that closure of the case is appropriate.

Recommendation for Closure

Based on available information, residual petroleum hydrocarbons at the Site do not pose a significant risk to human health, safety, or the environment, and the case meets the requirements of the Policy. Accordingly, the Fund Manager recommends that the case be closed. The State Water Board is conducting public notification as required by the Policy. Orange County has the regulatory responsibility to supervise the abandonment of monitoring wells.

Lisa Babcock
Lisa Babcock, P.G. 3939, C.E.G. 1235

1/22/13
Date

PREPARED BY: Kirk Larson

ATTACHMENT 1: COMPLIANCE WITH STATE WATER BOARD POLICIES AND STATE LAW

The case complies with the State Water Resources Control Board policies and state law. Section 25296.10 of the Health and Safety Code requires that sites be cleaned up to protect human health, safety, and the environment. Based on available information, any residual petroleum constituents at the site do not pose significant risk to human health, safety, or the environment.

The case complies with the requirements of the Low-Threat Underground Storage Tank (UST) Case Closure Policy as described below.[1]

Is corrective action consistent with Chapter 6.7 of the Health and Safety Code and implementing regulations? The corrective action provisions contained in Chapter 6.7 of the Health and Safety Code and the implementing regulations govern the entire corrective action process at leaking UST sites. If it is determined, at any stage in the corrective action process, that UST site closure is appropriate, further compliance with corrective action requirements is not necessary. Corrective action at this site has been consistent with Chapter 6.7 of the Health and Safety Code and implementing regulations and, since this case meets applicable case-closure requirements, further corrective action is not necessary, unless the activity is necessary for case closure.	☒ Yes ☐ No
Have waste discharge requirements or any other orders issued pursuant to Division 7 of the Water Code been issued at this case?	☐ Yes ☒ No
If so, was the corrective action performed consistent with any order?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ NA
General Criteria General criteria that must be satisfied by all candidate sites:	
Is the unauthorized release located within the service area of a public water system?	☒ Yes ☐ No
Does the unauthorized release consist only of petroleum?	☒ Yes ☐ No
Has the unauthorized ("primary") release from the UST system been stopped?	☒ Yes ☐ No
Has free product been removed to the maximum extent practicable?	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA
Has a conceptual site model that assesses the nature, extent, and mobility of the release been developed?	☒ Yes ☐ No

[1] Refer to the Low-Threat Underground Storage Tank Case Closure Policy for closure criteria for low-threat petroleum UST sites.
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/resolutions/2012/rs2012_0016atta.pdf

Has secondary source been removed to the extent practicable?	☒ Yes ☐ No
Has soil or groundwater been tested for MTBE and results reported in accordance with Health and Safety Code Section 25296.15?	☒ Yes ☐ No
Nuisance as defined by Water Code section 13050 does not exist at the site?	☒ Yes ☐ No
Are there unique site attributes or site-specific conditions that demonstrably increase the risk associated with residual petroleum constituents?	☐ Yes ☒ No
Media-Specific Criteria Candidate sites must satisfy all three of these media-specific criteria: **1. Groundwater:** To satisfy the media-specific criteria for groundwater, the contaminant plume that exceeds water quality objectives must be stable or decreasing in areal extent, and meet all of the additional characteristics of one of the five classes of sites: **Is the contaminant plume that exceeds water quality objectives stable or decreasing in areal extent?**	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA
Does the contaminant plume that exceeds water quality objectives meet all of the additional characteristics of one of the five classes of sites?	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA
If YES, check applicable class: ☒ **1** ☐ **2** ☐ **3** ☐ **4** ☐ **5** **For sites with releases that have not affected groundwater, do mobile constituents (leachate, vapors, or light non-aqueous phase liquids) contain sufficient mobile constituents to cause groundwater to exceed the groundwater criteria?**	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ NA
2. Petroleum Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air: The case is considered low-threat for vapor intrusion to indoor air if site-specific conditions satisfy all of the characteristics of one of the three classes of sites (a through c) or if the exception for active commercial fueling facilities applies. **Is the site an active commercial petroleum fueling facility?** Exception: Satisfaction of the media-specific criteria for petroleum vapor intrusion to indoor air is not required at active commercial petroleum fueling facilities, except in cases where release characteristics can be reasonably believed to pose an unacceptable health risk.	☒ Yes ☐ No
a. Do site-specific conditions at the release site satisfy all of the applicable characteristics and criteria of scenarios 1 through 3 or all	☐Yes ☐ No ☒ NA

of the applicable characteristics and criteria of scenario 4? If YES, check applicable scenarios: ☐ **1** ☐ **2** ☐ **3** ☐ **4**	
b. Has a site-specific risk assessment for the vapor intrusion pathway been conducted and demonstrates that human health is protected to the satisfaction of the regulatory agency?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ NA
c. As a result of controlling exposure through the use of mitigation measures or through the use of institutional or engineering controls, has the regulatory agency determined that petroleum vapors migrating from soil or groundwater will have no significant risk of adversely affecting human health?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ NA
3. Direct Contact and Outdoor Air Exposure: The case is considered low-threat for direct contact and outdoor air exposure if site-specific conditions satisfy one of the three classes of sites (a through c).	
a. Are maximum concentrations of petroleum constituents in soil less than or equal to those listed in Table 1 for the specified depth below ground surface (bgs)?	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA
b. Are maximum concentrations of petroleum constituents in soil less than levels that a site specific risk assessment demonstrates will have no significant risk of adversely affecting human health?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ NA
c. As a result of controlling exposure through the use of mitigation measures or through the use of institutional or engineering controls, has the regulatory agency determined that the concentrations of petroleum constituents in soil will have no significant risk of adversely affecting human health?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ NA

ATTACHMENT 2: SUMMARY OF BASIC CASE INFORMATION (Conceptual Site Model)

Site Location/History

- The Site is located at 18975 Magnolia Street in Fountain Valley and is an active gasoline service station and convenience store.
- The Site is bound by residences to the west, a paved parking lot to the north, Magnolia Street to the east and Garfield Avenue to the south.
- Three USTs have been removed and there are currently three 10,000-gallon gasoline UST's, one dispenser island, and a station building at the Site. The expected future land use is to remain as a gasoline service station and convenience store.
- Ten monitoring wells have been installed and monitored regularly since 1987.
- A Site map showing the location of the current USTs, monitoring wells, and site features is provided at the end of this summary.
- Nature of Contaminants of Concern: Petroleum hydrocarbons only.
- Source: UST system.
- Date reported: January 1987.
- Status of Release: USTs replaced.
- Free Product: Historically, none noted since 1991.

Tank Information

Tank No.	Size in Gallons	Contents	Closed in Place/ Removed/Active	Date
1	6,000	Diesel	Removed	May 88
2,3	10,000	Gasoline	Removed	May 88
4-6	10,000	Gasoline	Active	-

Receptors

- GW Basin: Coastal Plain of Orange County.
- Beneficial Uses: Municipal and Domestic Supply.
- Land Use Designation: Commercial.
- Public Water System: Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, P.O. Box 54153 Los Angeles, CA 90054-0153, (213-217-6000).
- Distance to Nearest Supply Well: According to data available in GeoTracker, there are no public supply wells regulated by CDPH within 250 feet of the defined plume boundary. No other water supply wells within 250 feet of the defined plume boundary were identified in files reviewed.
- Distance to Nearest Surface Water: There is no identified surface water within 250 feet of the defined plume boundary.

Geology/Hydrogeology

- Stratigraphy: The Site is underlain by interbedded and intermixed sand, silt and clay.
- Maximum Sample Depth: 50 feet below ground surface (bgs).
- Minimum Groundwater Depth: 5.45 feet bgs at monitoring well MW-11.
- Maximum Groundwater Depth: 23.60 feet bgs at monitoring well MW-12.
- Current Average Depth to Groundwater: 10 feet bgs.
- Saturated Zones(s) Studied: Approximately 5 - 50 feet bgs.

- Groundwater Flow Direction: Southeast with an average gradient of 0.0025 feet/foot (ft/ft).

Monitoring Well Information

Well Designation	Date Installed	Screen Interval (feet bgs)	Depth to Water (feet bgs) (09/17/2012)
MW-1	Aug 91	5-30	10.39
MW-2	Aug 91	5-30	10.37
B-5R	Nov 00	7-27	9.64
B-6	Nov 87	8-38	9.02
B-7	Nov 87	8-38	9.20
RS-8	Nov 88	5-35	9.80
RS-9	Nov 88	5-35	10.05
RS-10	Nov 88	5-35	9.35
MW-11	Mar 06	45-50	8.97
MW-12	Mar 06	45-50	8.87

Remediation Summary

- Free Product (FP): FP was initially observed in monitoring well B-5 (up to 10.2 feet) and RS-8 (up to 0.81 feet). No FP was noted after 1991. Total FP recovered is 310 gallons.
- Soil Excavation: An estimated 780 tons of impacted soil was removed during UST replacement activities in 1988.
- In-Situ Soil Remediation: Soil vapor extraction was conducted between August 1993 and June 1998 for a total of 15,243 hours, which removed 46,133 pounds of TPHg.
- Groundwater Remediation: Groundwater over-purging, conducted between August 2001 and June 2006, removed 6,501 gallons of contaminated water.

Most Recent Concentrations of Petroleum Constituents in Soil

Constituent	Maximum 0-5 feet bgs [mg/kg and (date)]	Maximum 5-10 feet bgs [mg/kg and (date)]
Benzene	1.1 (07/17/97)	4.64 (11/07/88)
Ethylbenzene	90 (10/30/02)*	21.7 (11/07/88)
Naphthalene	NA	NA
PAHs	NA	NA

NA: Not Analyzed, Not Applicable or Data Not Available
mg/kg: milligrams per kilogram, parts per million
<: Not detected at or above stated reporting limit
PAHs: Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons
*One of 38 samples exceeded LTCP Table 1 limits

Most Recent Concentrations of Petroleum Constituents in Groundwater

Sample	Sample Date	TPHg (µg/L)	TPHd (µg/L)	Benzene (µg/L)	Toluene (µg/L)	Ethyl-Benzene (µg/L)	Xylenes (µg/L)	MTBE (µg/L)	TBA (µg/L)
MW-1	10/01/2012	<50	NA	<1	<5	<5	<5	<1	<10
MW-2	10/01/2012	<50	NA	<1	1	<5	<5	<1	<10
B-5R	09/22/2012	**55.5**	NA	<1	<5	<5	<5	<1	460
B-6	09/22/2012	<50	NA	<1	<5	<5	<5	1.7	160
B-7	09/22/2012	<50	NA	<1	<5	<5	<5	1.6	480
RS-8	10/01/2012	<50	NA	<1	<5	<5	<5	<1	<10
RS-9	10/01/2012	<50	NA	<1	<5	<5	<5	<1	<10
RS-10	10/01/2012	<50	NA	<1	<5	<5	<5	<1	<10
MW-11	09/22/2012	<50	NA	<1	<5	<5	<5	<1	<10
MW-12	09/22/2012	<50	NA	<1	<5	<5	<5	1.9	<10
WQOs	-	**50[a]**	**100[b]**	**1**	**150**	**300**	**1,750**	**5**	**1,200[c]**

NA: Not Analyzed, Not Applicable or Data Not Available, NL: Not Listed
µg/L: micrograms per liter, parts per billion
<: Not detected at or above stated reporting limit
TPHg: Total petroleum hydrocarbons as gasoline
TPHd: Total petroleum hydrocarbons as diesel
MTBE: Methyl tert-butyl ether
TBA: Tert-butyl alcohol
WQOs: Water Quality Objectives, Region 8 Basin Plan
[a]: Typical Laboratory Detection Limits
[b]: Taste and odor threshold
[c]: California Department of Public Health, Response Level

Groundwater Trends:
Groundwater monitoring has been conducted regularly since 1987. TBA trends are shown below: Source Area (B-5R), Near Source Area (B-7) and Downgradient (MW-12). Crossgradient well MW-2 had a single elevated TBA concentration after more than a decade of non-detect results. TBA concentrations have since returned to non-detect.

Source area well



Near-source area well



Downgradient well

MW-2





Evaluation of Current Risk

- Estimate of Hydrocarbon Mass in Soil: None reported.
- Soil/Groundwater tested for methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE): Yes, see table above.
- Plume Length: <100 feet long.
- Plume Stable or Degrading: Yes.
- Contaminated Zone(s) Used for Drinking Water: No.
- Oxygen Concentrations in Soil Vapor: None reported.
- Groundwater Risk from Residual Petroleum Hydrocarbons: The case meets Policy Criterion 1 by Class 1. The plume that exceeds WQO is less than 100 feet. No free product is present. The nearest water supply well or surface water is greater than 250 feet from the defined plume boundary.
- Indoor Vapor Risk from Residual Petroleum Hydrocarbons: The case meets the Policy Active Station Exclusion – Soil vapor evaluation is not required because Site is an active commercial petroleum fueling facility.
- Direct Contact Risk from Residual Petroleum Hydrocarbons: The case meets the Policy Criterion 3a. The Site is paved preventing direct exposure. Thirty-eight soil samples were collected from depths between 0 to 10 feet. All but one sample were either non-detect or below Table 1 thresholds. The remaining sample contained 90 mg/kg which is slightly higher than the Table 1 threshold of 89 mg/kg for ethyl-benzene. 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 directly substituted for naphthalene concentrations with a safety factor of eight. Benzene concentrations from the Site are below the naphthalene thresholds in Table 1 of the Policy. Therefore, the estimated naphthalene concentrations meet the thresholds in Table1 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.


BUILDING
BUILDING
WALKWAY
WALKWAY
BUILDING OVERHANG
RS-9
RS-10
A'
RS-8
SIDEWALK
POWER POLE
AREA LIGHT
DRIVEWAY
MAGNOLIA STREET
DIVIDER ISLAND
CONCRETE BLOCK WALL
PLANTER
TRASH ENCL.
TANK PAD
AREA LIGHT
DISPENSER ISLANDS
CANOPY
COVER
TDD-1
TDD-2
TDD-3
TDD-4
TDD-5
TDD-6
TDD-7
TV-1
TV-2
B-1
B-2
B-3
B-4
B-5
B-5R
B-6
B-7
BH-A
BH-B
C-1
C-2
C-3
C-4
C-5
C-6
C-7
C-8
C-9
MW-1
MW-2
MW-11
MW-12
TRANSFORMER ON PAD
A
B
SIDEWALK
DRIVEWAY
HANDICAP RAMP
BUS STOP
POWER POLE
POWER POLE
DIVIDER ISLAND
WELL B
GARFIELD AVENUE
SIDEWALK
WELL A
LEGEND
▲ - NEWLY INSTALLED DEEP ZONE GW WELLS
- GROUNDWATER MONITORING WELL
- BORING HOLE
- SOIL BORING
A-A' - LINE OF GEOLOGIC CROSS-SECTION
APPROXIMATE SCALE IN FEET
0'
40'
80'
GEOHYDROLOGIC CONSULTANTS, INC.
5912 Bolsa Avenue, Suite 200
Huntington Beach, CA 92649
www.geohydrologic.com
NORTH
GHC: 1342
DATE: 03/28/06
FIGURE 2
SITE PLAN
THRIFTY SERVICE STATION #384
18975 Magnolia Street
Fountain Valley, CA