



Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board

May 10, 2019

Trestle So Tahoe LLC
c/o John E. McNellis, Agent for Service of Process
419 Waverley St.
Palo Alto, CA 94301

**CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED
7017 1450 0001 3058 8604**

Rick Frost-Hurzel
6840 Steely Ridge Road
Somerset, CA 95684

**CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED
7017 1450 0001 3058 8611**

Hurzel Properties, LLC
Ricky J Hurzel, Agent for Service of Process
6840 Steely Ridge Road
Somerset, CA 95684

**CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED
7017 1450 0001 3058 8628**

Mr. Suds, LLC
c/o Thomas Chiappa, Agent for Service of Process
1013 Sundown Trail
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

**CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED
7017 1450 0001 3058 8635**

Heidis Laundromat
c/o Daniel and Theresa Le Blanc
PO Box 8944
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96158-1944

**CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED
7017 1450 0001 3058 8642**

Order to Submit Technical Report in Accordance with Section 13267 of the California Water Code, Hurzel Properties, LLC, 961 Emerald Bay Road, South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County, SCP Case No. T6S044, GeoTracker Global ID SL0601790916

Pursuant to California Water Code section 13267, subdivision (b), this Investigative Order requires Trestle So Tahoe CA LLC, Rick Frost-Hurzel, Hurzel Properties, LLC, Mr. Suds, LLC, and Heidis Laundromat to provide the information identified in the enclosed site-history questionnaires and an investigation work plan **by July 10, 2019**. The information you provide is needed for Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) staff to further investigate waste discharge(s) associated with Site Cleanup Program (SCP) Case # T6S044 and as part of a larger effort to restore groundwater beneficial uses and protect public health in the greater South "Y" area of South Lake Tahoe.

PETER C. PUMPHREY, CHAIR | PATTY Z. KOUYOUMDJIAN, EXECUTIVE OFFICER

The Hurzel Properties, LLC site is located at 961 Emerald Bay Road, South Lake Tahoe, CA (formerly 945 and 949 Emerald Bay Road), or El Dorado County Assessor's Parcel Number 023-191-21-000 (Site). Although the Water Board issued a No Further Action Required (NFAR) letter dated February 11, 2009 related to discharge(s) of chlorinated hydrocarbons from former dry cleaner operations at the Site, we have obtained new information to indicate additional investigation of the Site's potential contribution to the South Y area's regional chlorinated hydrocarbon groundwater contamination is warranted. Background information and the requirements for information in the form of completed questionnaires and an investigation work plan is described below.

Order for Technical Reports

1. Pursuant to Water Code section 13267, you are hereby ordered to provide the information requested in the enclosed questionnaires (Chemical Storage and Use Questionnaire and/or Dry Cleaner Specific Questionnaire) for each business that operated on the Property, which constitute technical reports. Please choose the appropriate questionnaire depending on the past use of the property. The information contained in the enclosed questionnaires must be received by the Water Board no later than **July 10, 2019**. Please provide electronic copies (i.e. pdf version) of the requested information in conformance with the instructions provided below.
2. Pursuant to Section 13267 of the Water Code, you are hereby ordered to submit an Investigation Work Plan for Water Board review and approval. The Investigation Work Plan, at a minimum, should be designed to address the above referenced data gaps and evaluate the following:
 - The lateral and vertical extent of soil, soil gas, and groundwater contamination originating from the Site.
 - If the Site is contributing to the regional tetrachloroethene (PCE) contamination.
 - If contaminant transport is occurring along preferential pathways (i.e., storm drain system, utility backfill, area of subsidence).

A California licensed civil engineer or geologist must sign and stamp the investigation work plan. The Investigation Work Plan must be received by the Water Board no later than **July 10, 2019**. Please provide an electronic copy (i.e. pdf version) of the requested information in conformance with the instructions provided below.

Any person aggrieved by this action of the Water Board may petition the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) to review the action in accordance with Water Code section 13320 and California Code of Regulations, title 23, sections 2050 and following. The State Water Board must receive the petition by 5:00 p.m., 30 days after the date of this Order, except that if the thirtieth day following the date of this Order falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or state holiday, the petition must be received by the State Water Board by 5:00 p.m. on the next business day. Copies of the law and regulations

applicable to filing petitions may be found on the Internet at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/public_notices/petitions/water_quality or will be provided upon request.

General Instructions for Submittal of Electronic Documents

The Water Board has implemented a paperless office system to reduce paper use, increase efficiency, and provide an efficient way for our staff, the public, and interested parties to view documents in electronic form. Please send your completed questionnaire electronically to the Water Board's email address at Lahontan@waterboards.ca.gov, and include your Property/Business Name and Address in the Subject Line. Documents that are 50 MB or larger should be transferred to a thumb drive or compact disk and mailed with a transmittal/cover letter with the requested information to the Water Board office as follows:

Brian Grey
Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board
2501 Lake Tahoe Blvd
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Electronic submittal of documents and electronic data, including the requested work plan, is also required and must conform to the requirements of the California Code of Regulations, Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 30 and the GeoTracker standards and procedures as specified on the State Water Board's website. Please submit the required information over the Internet to the State Water Board's GeoTracker database system at: <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov>.

Background

Multiple municipal water supply wells spanning three water districts have been impacted (e.g., shut down, abandoned, require wellhead treatment) by regional chlorinated hydrocarbon contamination in the groundwater beneath the South "Y" area of South Lake Tahoe. Other water supply wells in the area are threatened by the regional groundwater contamination. Chlorinated hydrocarbons, such as PCE and trichloroethylene (TCE), are present in a variety of products, including but not limited to, dry cleaning products, metal degreasing solvents, lubricants and greases, adhesives and sealants, paints and coatings, paint removers, and printing inks.

PCE concentrations in the South Y area groundwater were first detected in municipal water supply wells in 1989, when sampling for the constituent was first conducted. Since then, multiple general and site-specific investigations and remedial actions (e.g., soil removal with off-site disposal, soil vapor extraction) have been conducted to address the groundwater contamination, and to restore the groundwater's Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN) beneficial use. In spite of such efforts, the contamination continues to exist and threaten additional water supply wells. PCE concentrations exceeding the maximum contaminant level (MCL) of 5 micrograms per liter ($\mu\text{g/L}$) have been reported (south to

north) from Industrial Avenue to Lake Tahoe and (west to east) from 13th Street to the Upper Truckee River. The estimated impacted area includes multiple properties with varying land uses, some of which have potentially used, stored, handled, produced, recycled, or disposed of products containing PCE/TCE. Investigation and monitoring results indicate PCE concentrations that are orders of magnitude above the MCL remain up-gradient of currently operating water supply wells, threatening their future operations.

Water Board staff is currently working with the three affected water districts and other parties to investigate the full lateral and vertical extent of the regional PCE contamination, identify remedial actions to protect the currently unaffected water supply wells that remain vulnerable to the PCE contamination, and to restore the affected groundwater's MUN beneficial use. As a part of this effort, Water Board staff is evaluating properties that have had documented discharges of chlorinated hydrocarbons to the environment relative to currently available information to determine if these properties are potentially contributing to the regional PCE contamination and if additional actions are needed.

Named Persons

Investigation and remedial activities associated with discharge(s) of chlorinated hydrocarbons at the Site were required by the Water Board and are associated with SCP Case No. T6S044, Hurzel Properties LLC. On February 11, 2009, the Water Board's Executive Officer issued a No Further Action Letter for SCP Case No. T6S044.

This letter is addressed to Rick Frost-Hurzel, because he was identified as the responsible party for SCP Case No. T6S044, Hurzel Properties, LLC (Ricky J Hurzel is listed as the Agent for Service of Process for Hurzel Properties, LLC) and received the February 11, 2009 NFAR letter.

This letter is also addressed to Trestle So Tahoe CA LLC, because it has been identified as the current fee title owner of the Site; to Mr. Suds, LLC, because it has been identified as a former business operator at the Site (2010-2012) where chlorinated solvents hydrocarbons may have been historically used, stored, handled, recycled, or disposed of; and to Heidi's Laundromat because it has been identified as a former business operator at the Site (1978; 1992; 1995; 1999-2004; and 2008) where chlorinated solvents hydrocarbons may have been historically used, stored, handled, recycled, or disposed of.

We were unable to identify contact information for SOS Repair or SOS Appliance. SOS Repair (1999 and 2003; 945 Emerald Bay Road) and SOS Appliance (1992; 961 Emerald Bay Road) were identified as former business operators at the Site where chlorinated hydrocarbons may have been historically used, stored, handled, recycled, or disposed of. Jack Freud, owner of SOS Repair and SOS Appliance, is deceased as of September 1, 2005 (from public records) and no other contacts are currently identified.

Review of Historical Information and Investigations

Water Board staff reviewed the documents listed in Enclosure 3 and concluded additional information and an investigation workplan is needed to evaluate (1) the extent of chlorinated and petroleum hydrocarbons in soil, soil gas, and groundwater at the Site and (2) if any chlorinated hydrocarbon discharge(s) may be potentially contributing to the regional PCE groundwater contamination, which currently is adversely affecting existing beneficial uses.

Chemical Use, Storage, and Disposal History: A description of how chlorinated hydrocarbons were delivered, handled, used, and disposed of for each business that operated on the Site is not available. Although information about Norma's Cleaners operations was provided from an interview with its former owner, no information is available relative to the other laundromats or businesses with potential chlorinated hydrocarbon use that operated on the Site after Norma's Cleaners. This includes SOS Appliance (1992-2003), Heidi's Laundromat (1999-2004; 2008), and Mr. Suds LLC (2010-2012).

Prior Dry-Cleaning Facility Operations: An interview conducted with the former owner of Norma's Cleaners, Ms. Norma Thayer, indicated the following information about the historical dry-cleaning operation at the Site:

- Norma's Cleaners operated one dry-cleaning machine from 1969 to 1977.
- Residue was collected by draining to a sealed bucket that was located on the floor next to the dry-cleaning machine.
- Disposal of the residue occurred by placing it in the trash dumpster or providing it to the PCE vendor.
- Refill of the dry-cleaning machine was made on an as-needed basis and performed by the supplier. A volume of five to ten gallons would be required to recharge the machine which occurred once every three months.
- The supply truck typically parked near the boiler room on the northwest side of the building and ran a hose through the boiler room to the machine.

Other Prior Business Operations: Environmental database, telephone directory and phone book searches identified the following information related to past business operations at the Site:

- SOS Appliance: A June 5, 2015 Environmental Data Resources, Inc.'s (EDR) City Directory Report prepared for the South Y Area identified "SOS Repair" in searches for the years of 1999 and 2003 at 945 Emerald Bay Road and "S-O-S Appliance Repr" and "S-O-S Appliance" at 961 Emerald Bay Road for 1992.
- Heidi's Laundromat: A June 5, 2015 EDR City Directory Report for the South Y Area project identified "Heidis Laundromat" in searches for the years of 1992, 1995, 1999, and 2003 at 949 Emerald Bay Road. An October 5, 2015 EDR Radius Map report for the Lukins Service Area PCE Investigation project identified "Heidi Laundromat" in the "EDR US Hist Cleaners" database at 949 Emerald Bay Road for the years of 1999 through 2004 and 2008. Heidis

Laundromat was listed in the 1978 Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company phone book at 949 Emerald Bay Road.

- Mr. Suds LLC: A June 5, 2015 EDR City Directory Report prepared for the South Y Area identified "Mr Suds LLC" in a search for the year of 2013 at 949 Emerald Bay Road. An October 5, 2015 EDR Radius Map report for the Lukins Service Area PCE Investigation project identified "Mr Suds LLC" in the "EDR US Hist Cleaners" database at 949 Emerald Bay Road for the years of 2010, 2011, and 2012.

Prior Onsite Investigation and Remedial Activities Conducted: Investigation and remediation conducted at the Site have included the following:

- November 2001 - Harding ESE advanced three borings to 49 feet below ground surface (bgs) and collected discrete groundwater samples at 16 and 49 feet bgs.
- October 2003 - MACTEC advanced three soil borings and collected soil samples targeting the residue bucket location, the dry-cleaning machine fill port, and where the delivery truck reportedly parked.
- September 2007 - SECOR collected discrete depth soil and groundwater samples from 18 locations. Soil samples were collected at 2, 4, and either 12 or 14 feet bgs. Groundwater samples were collected at first encountered groundwater and at 45 feet bgs. No lithologic information was collected below 16 feet bgs during the investigation.
- November 2007 - SECOR installed four monitoring wells screened from 9 to 24 feet bgs.
- January/February 2008 - SECOR oversaw the excavation of approximately 368 cubic yards of soil from the northwest side of the building.
- March 2008 - SECOR installed one monitoring well to replace MW-2, which had been installed on an adjacent property.
- September 2008 - SECOR conducted the last of four quarterly monitoring events.

Onsite Investigation Results: The above referenced investigations conducted in 2001, 2003, 2007, and 2008 identified PCE in soil and groundwater at the Site. PCE concentrations in soil were reported on the northwest side of the building in the vicinity of the delivery truck parking area, near the dry-cleaning machine fill port, and in a boring located southeast of the former business. The highest concentrations of PCE, both at 190 micrograms per kilogram (ug/kg), were detected in samples collected in soil borings B3 (from 2003) and BH-12 (from 2007); these borings were located on the northwest side of the building in the vicinity of the delivery parking area at depths of 2 feet bgs and 4-4.5 feet bgs. PCE concentrations of 98 and 16 ug/kg were reported near the dry-cleaning machine fill port (boring B2) at depths between 0.5-1.0 and 3-3.5 feet bgs, respectively, and in the parking area southeast of the former dry-cleaning business (BH-16) at a concentration of 45 ug/kg at 2 feet bgs. PCE concentrations in groundwater were consistently reported in locations up-gradient and down-gradient of the Site at both the water table surface and at approximately 45 feet bgs. PCE concentrations ranged between <0.5 and 1,300 ug/L at the water table surface and between 140 and 1,500 ug/L at approximately 45 feet bgs. The highest PCE concentration in onsite groundwater, 1,500 ug/L, was reported in boring BH-1, located approximately 110 feet to the west of the former Site dry cleaning business, at a depth

of 45 feet bgs; no detectable PCE concentrations were reported from BH-1 at the water table surface. The distribution of PCE in groundwater indicate up-gradient PCE source(s), in addition to PCE contamination originating from the Site.

Based on the results of the 2001, 2003, and 2007 soil and groundwater investigations, an in-situ chemical oxidation pilot study originally proposed was not implemented, and instead limited excavation on the northwest side of the building (with off-Site disposal) and four quarters of verification groundwater monitoring were conducted. In 2008, excavation activities removed approximately 368 cubic yards of soil from the northwest side of the building until the predetermined excavation limits were reached at approximately 5 feet bgs. Two confirmation samples collected from the floor of the excavation did not indicate detectable PCE concentrations; no sidewall confirmation samples were collected. During backfilling activities, an area (approximately 8 feet in diameter) of subsidence was observed in the excavation which the consultant noted to have been a historical problem based on the previous asphalt patching and filling that had occurred in the location. The area of subsidence was significant enough to require a rebar grid and placement of concrete to bridge the area and may represent a historical preferential contaminant transport pathway. No remediation was performed in the other areas with detectable concentrations of PCE in soil, including underneath the machine fill port or in the parking area southeast of the former dry-cleaning business.

The Site groundwater monitoring network consisted of one up-gradient monitoring well, three monitoring wells in the near vicinity of the excavation, and one cross-gradient monitoring well that was inadvertently installed on an off-Site property to the east. All monitoring wells were screened from approximately 9-24 feet bgs and were located within approximately 100 feet of the former business. Four quarters of verification monitoring were conducted from November 2007 to September 2008. Monitoring results indicated the highest PCE concentrations, ranging from 600 to 1,300 ug/L in up-gradient monitoring well MW-4. Monitoring well MW-1, the only well located in the inferred down-gradient direction, did not show any detectable PCE during the four quarterly groundwater monitoring events. PCE concentrations in the other monitoring wells ranged from 6.5 to 400 ug/L during this time period with northerly and westerly groundwater flow directions reported.

Off-Site Investigation Results Near the Site: In June and July 2017, EKI Environment & Water, Inc. (EKI) prepared a report that presented data obtained during a groundwater investigation conducted in 2017 to evaluate potential chlorinated hydrocarbon sources. During the 2017 investigation, discrete grab groundwater samples were collected from 19 sample locations within seven targeted areas in the South Y area, including areas around the Site, to depths of up to 80 feet bgs. Down-gradient of the Site, the highest PCE concentrations, up to 1,040 ug/L, were reported along James Avenue and near the intersection of Fifth Street and Eloise Avenue at depths between 35 and 50 feet bgs. Boring J3, located directly north and within approximately 150 feet of the Site, indicated a PCE concentration of 351 ug/L between 35 and 39 feet bgs.

Off-Site Groundwater Monitoring Well Sampling Results Near the Site: In October 2018, off-Site monitoring wells OS-4S and OS-4M, located on James Avenue to the north of the Site, were installed by EKI. OS-4S is screened between 9 and 24 feet bgs; OS-4M is screened between 33 and 43 feet bgs. Preliminary results from the November 7, 2018 sampling event indicated PCE concentrations of 5.22 ug/L and 540 ug/L, in OS-4S and OS-4M, respectively. No other VOCs were detected in OS-4S; concentrations of 11.6 ug/L TCE and 6.38 ug/L cis-1,2 dichloroethane were reported in OS-4M.

Need for Additional Information

Available information indicates the use and disposal of chemical products containing chlorinated hydrocarbons at the Site from at least 1969 to 1977 during the operation of Norma's Cleaners. Information, including an interview with the former operator, has been provided for Norma's Cleaners. No information is currently available for the other businesses with potential chlorinated hydrocarbon use, including laundromats and an appliance repair business, that operated at the Site after Norma's Cleaners.

Investigations conducted in 2001, 2003, 2007 and 2008 identified chlorinated hydrocarbons in soil and groundwater samples which indicates unauthorized waste discharge(s) have occurred from past Site operations. These historical investigations were focused on potential source identification and mitigation. As such, the soil and groundwater investigations were limited to the near vicinity and up-gradient of the Site and did not sufficiently consider the discharge timeframe or potential preferential pathways relative to the contaminant migration that potentially occurred prior to the 2008 excavation activities. Delineation of the full lateral and vertical extent of contamination originating from the Site was never attempted and no investigation activities occurred in areas further than approximately 75 feet down-gradient of the former businesses. Additionally, the historical investigations did not target a suspected disposal area (i.e. dumpster location), potential preferential contaminant transport pathways (i.e. storm drain system, utility backfill, or area of subsidence), fine-grained lithologic units, or further evaluate the extent of contamination identified in the parking area to the southeast of the former dry-cleaning operation. Given the distribution of soil and groundwater contamination reported, the chemical properties of PCE, the discharge timeframe, the historical range of groundwater elevations, and downward vertical hydraulic gradients reported in the area, contaminant migration may have occurred prior to remedial implementation and may still be occurring in areas with known or suspected PCE contamination (i.e. beneath the dry cleaning machine fill port and in the area of southeast of the former dry cleaning business) and, potentially, along other uninvestigated contaminant transport pathways (i.e. storm drain system, utility backfill, and area of subsidence).

Recent off-Site groundwater sampling results indicate a widespread distribution of chlorinated hydrocarbon concentrations above drinking water standards in the near vicinity of the Site and in areas down-gradient of the Site. Lukins Brothers Wells #2 and #5, located approximately 4,200 feet to the northwest of the Site, were taken off-line in 2014 due to PCE concentrations above drinking water standards. The regional PCE

contamination currently threatens additional municipal supply wells operating in areas down-gradient of the reported PCE contamination.

Since the monitoring well network used in previous investigations only included monitoring wells screened across the water table surface in the near vicinity of the excavation and did not include any deeper wells at locations down-gradient of the Site, the monitoring well network coverage is not sufficient to evaluate potential down-gradient impacts. Given the limited scope of historical investigations conducted and resulting data gaps, the PCE concentrations reported at off-Site locations in the near vicinity and down-gradient of the Site, and the currently threatened and affected municipal water supply wells down-gradient of the Site, additional information is needed to evaluate the full lateral and vertical extent of contamination originating from the Site and its potential contribution to the regional PCE contamination. Staff is especially concerned about potential contaminant transport that occurred prior to the implementation of remedial actions and the ongoing potential for back-diffusion within fine-grained subsurface lithologic units outside of the excavated area.

Data Gap Evaluation

Staff has reviewed the available information and identified the following data gaps (numerated below) to aid in addressing the remaining contamination and uncertainty surrounding the Site:

- 1) Facility operation and chemical use, storage, and disposal history is incomplete.

Records and information must be provided, if available, related to the chemical use, storage, and disposal associated with each business that potentially used chlorinated hydrocarbon products following Norma's Cleaners. This information will be used to evaluate potential ongoing discharge(s) and contaminant transport scenarios.

- 2) The threat and extent of remaining onsite PCE contamination is undefined.

PCE was detected in soil at boring location B2 (2003) at the depths between 0.5-1.0 and 3-3.5 feet bgs. Boring B2 is located near the fill port of the former dry-cleaning machine and showed PCE concentrations of 98 and 18 ug/kg, respectively. No remediation has been conducted in this area.

PCE was detected in soil at boring location BH-16 (2007) at a depth of 2 feet bgs; PCE was not detected at the sampled depths of 7 or 14 feet bgs. Boring BH-16 is located in the parking area southeast of the former dry-cleaning business and reported a PCE concentration of 45 ug/kg at 2 feet bgs. Groundwater samples collected at approximately 45 feet bgs indicated a concentration of 510 ug/L PCE; no water table surface groundwater samples were collected from BH-16. No other borings were advanced within approximately 100 feet of BH-16 and no remediation has been conducted in this area.

The lateral and vertical extent of PCE in soil and groundwater around borings B2 and BH-16 has not been fully evaluated. Available data cannot be used to conclusively determine the extent of contamination or if the areas with identified PCE contamination in soil are potentially contributing to the regional PCE groundwater contamination. Information is needed to further evaluate the extent and potential threat of remaining contamination in order to design and evaluate potential receptor protection options.

PCE was detected in onsite groundwater at concentrations indicative of the potential presence of free-phase PCE product. During the 2007 investigation, a PCE concentration of 1,500 ug/L was reported in boring BH-1 at a depth of 45 feet bgs; detectable PCE concentrations were not reported at the water table surface in BH-1. Boring BH-1 is located along the northwestern property boundary and is the westernmost onsite boring advanced. Dissolved phase PCE concentrations above 1,500 ug/L indicate free-phase PCE product may be present in the near vicinity of the sample location. The source and extent of contamination around BH-1 remain undefined. Information is needed to further evaluate the extent and potential threat of remaining contamination in order to design and evaluate potential receptor protection options.

3) Preferential pathways were not identified or have not been fully evaluated.

Available information has not contained discussion or identification of potential onsite preferential pathways in narrative or on figures. Soil, soil gas, and groundwater sampling have not targeted specific potential preferential pathways. Information is needed to evaluate if contaminant transport is occurring along specific pathways in order to design and evaluate potential receptor protection options.

Sewer and utilities: Onsite sewer and utilities have not been shown on figures. No soil, soil gas, or groundwater samples have been collected within sewer or utility backfill materials.

Storm water: The onsite storm water drainage system, including potential discharge points to off-Site properties, has not been identified, discussed, or shown on Site figures. No soil, soil gas, or groundwater samples have been collected within or directly adjacent to the storm water drainage system.

Area of subsidence: The location of the area of subsidence has not been shown on figures or specifically identified in the narrative. As such, it remains unclear if soil or groundwater samples have been collected from within or below the area of subsidence noted during soil excavation activities. Given the report discussion and distribution of sampling locations along the perimeter of the excavation limits, it is likely soil, soil gas, and groundwater samples have not been collected within or below the area of subsidence.

Fine grained lithologic units: Historical soil, soil gas, and groundwater sampling has not specifically targeted fine-grained lithologic units; no lithologic information was collected below 16' bgs during the 2007 investigation. Staff is specifically concerned about adsorbed contamination and the potential for back diffusion from these fine-grained subsurface units outside of the excavated area.

4) Potential waste discharge areas have not been fully evaluated.

Dumpster location: The interview with Ms. Norma Thayer, operator of Norma's Cleaners, indicated disposal of PCE residue occurred by placing it in the trash dumpster or providing it to the PCE vendor. Available information has not specifically discussed or identified the dumpster location. Comments received on LTLW's Revised Cleanup and Abatement Order indicated that historical aerial photographs show the dumpster in the northern portion of the Site, adjacent to James Avenue.

Other potential discharge areas: Information is not currently available for the other business operations following Norma's Cleaners, so it remains unclear if other potential discharge locations may be present.

Justification for Order

The Water Board's authority for issuing this Investigative Order is provided in Water Code section 13267, subdivision (b), which states, in part,

"...the regional board may require that any person who has discharged, discharges, or is suspected of having discharged or discharging, or proposes to discharge waste within its region ... shall furnish, under penalty of perjury, technical or monitoring program reports which the regional board requires... In requiring those reports, the regional board shall provide the person with a written explanation with regard to the need for the reports and shall identify the evidence that supports requiring that person to provide the reports."

In compliance with Water Code section 13267, subdivision (b), the Water Board is providing the following facts and information regarding the need for the report, the evidence that supports the requirement for the report, and the benefits to be obtained from the report. This information is also further described elsewhere in this letter.

1. You are named in this Order because you are either the current owner of the Property or were the owner of the Property at the time of the waste discharge(s) or were a former operator. This information and the detection of chlorinated hydrocarbons in soil and groundwater at and near the subject property indicates you as a person who is suspected of having discharged or is currently discharging waste.

2. The Water Board needs the required information in order to more fully characterize the regional PCE groundwater contamination, identify sources, and evaluate water supply protection and remedial action alternatives. Such information will be used in one or more efforts to restore the MUN beneficial use of the groundwater.
3. You are required to submit information to evaluate historical business operations at the Property, the nature and extent of soil, soil gas, and groundwater contamination originating from the Site and its potential contribution to the regional PCE groundwater contamination. The required information will increase the potential for the investigative activities to effectively and efficiently move forward, to restore the affected groundwater's quality and to protect human health.

The required technical reports are critical to developing appropriate remedial actions necessary to address the contamination in a manner that restores beneficial uses, including municipal, and continues to protect public health. Therefore, the burden of the reports, including costs, bears a reasonable relationship to the need for the reports and the benefits to be obtained from the reports.

Please contact me at (530) 542-5414 (Patty.Kouyoumdjian@waterboards.ca.gov), Brian Grey, Engineering Geologist, at (530) 542-5421 (Brian.Grey@waterboards.ca.gov), or Jeff Brooks, Senior Engineering Geologist, at (530) 542-5420 (Jeff.Brooks@waterboards.ca.gov) if you have any questions.



PATTY Z. KOUYOUMDJIAN
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Enclosures:

1. Chemical Storage and Use Questionnaire
2. Dry Cleaner Operations Questionnaire
3. List of Documents Reviewed to Support Request for Technical Report for Hurzel Properties, LLC

cc: PCE Interested Parties Mailing List
Jeff Brooks, Lahontan Water Board
Brian Grey, Lahontan Water Board

ENCLOSURE 1

Chemical Storage and Use Questionnaire

I. Facility Information

1. Address: _____

II. Property Ownership Information

1. Name of Current Property Owner: _____

2. Mailing Address of Current Property Owner: _____

3. Telephone: _____ 4. E-Mail: _____

5. Prior Property Owner(s) (provide a separate sheet of paper, if necessary):

Property Owner Name and Mailing Address (Phone Number and Email Address if Available)	Dates of Ownership	
	From	To

III. Current Tenant Information

1. Tenant Name: _____

2. Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Code: _____

3. Brief Description of Business: _____

4. EPA/State Generator Number(s): _____

5. Years in business at this location: _____

6. Contact Name: _____

7. Telephone: _____

IV. Past Tenants

List any prior tenants. Provide a separate sheet of paper, if necessary.

Company Name and Current Mailing Address (Phone Number and Email Address if Available)	Type of Business	Dates of Operation at the Site	
		From	To

V. Operations

Answer the following questions regarding current and past operations at the property. On a separate sheet of paper, provide additional details for any “Yes” responses. Include the timeframe and the name associated with any past tenant for which the “Yes” response applies.

Question		Current Tenant		Past Tenant(s)	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
1.	Has manufacturing or plating of circuit boards occurred?				
2.	Has metal work or metal degreasing been performed?				
3.	Has a dry cleaning and/or laundry business operated on the property?				
4.	Has there ever been a clarifier, sump, tank, or other holding facility for wastewater and other waste?				
5.	Has there ever been an underground storage tank installed?				
6.	Has there ever been an above-ground storage tank (AST) installed?				
7.	Has there ever been an industrial waste permit for sewer discharge?				
8.	Has there ever been a septic system in use?				
9.	Have chemicals ever been stored at this location?				
10.	Have chlorinated solvents ¹ been used or stored at this location?				
11.	Has there ever been a release of chemicals to the ground surface or subsurface?				
12.	Have lubricating oils, fabrics, dyes, rubber, or paints been used or manufactured on the property?				
13.	Has pigment making or welding been performed on the property?				
14.	Have paint booth operations occurred on the property?				

¹Chlorinated solvents, such as tetrachloroethylene (PCE) and trichloroethylene (TCE), are present in a variety of products including but not limited to dry cleaning aids, metal degreasing solvents, lubricants and greases, adhesives and sealants, paints and coatings, paint removers, and printing inks

Question	Current Tenant		Past Tenant(s)	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
15. Have solvents, including varnishes and lacquers and laboratory cryoscopy solvents, been used or disposed of on the property?				

VI. Waste Management

1. What are the sources of industrial wastes² from the site? Identify sources by process, composition of wastes generated, and approximate quantity disposed of monthly.

VII. Sewer Information

1. Was a different sewer system used when the business was in operation? ____ Yes ____ No
If "Yes", specify type: _____

VIII. General Questions

1. Has there ever been a Phase I environmental site assessment (ESA) performed for the property? ____ Yes ____ No

If "Yes", include a copy of each Phase I ESA report when submitting this questionnaire to the Regional Board.

2. Has there ever been a soil, soil vapor, groundwater, or wastewater investigation conducted at the property? ____ Yes ____ No

If "Yes", on a separate sheet of paper, list all reports or other documents that provide the results of these investigations. Indicate which government agencies, if any, were involved in the project(s). Provide copies of these reports or other documents to the Regional Board when submitting this questionnaire.

² Industrial wastes could include but are not limited to waste oil, mixed oil, hazardous waste, oxygenated solvents, unspecified solvent mixtures, hydrocarbon solvents, liquids with halogenated organic compounds, unspecified oil-containing waste, and unspecified aqueous solution.

XI. Site Characterization

1. Has a site characterization assessment been conducted? _____ Yes _____ No

If "No" proceed to next section.

If "Yes", describe site characterization activities performed and answer questions XI.2 through X1.6:

2. Has the lateral and vertical extent of contamination been completed?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Not applicable

3. Describe the field activities completed as part of site characterization (by whom, when, etc.)

4. Describe any remaining data gaps in site characterization:

5. Has a Conceptual Site Model been developed?

_____ Yes _____ No

6. Was a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) completed?

_____ Yes _____ No

If "Yes", describe conclusions of the HHRA:

XII. Remedial Actions

1. Have remedial actions⁴ for soil, soil gas, or groundwater been performed for this site?
____ Yes ____ No

If "No", proceed to next section.

If "Yes", describe remedial actions performed:

2. Have groundwater monitoring activities been performed at the site (or are groundwater monitoring activities ongoing)?

____ Yes ____ No

If "Yes", list the contaminants monitored, monitoring timeframe and concentration distribution:

3. Were light non-aqueous phase liquids (LNAPL) or dense non-aqueous phase liquids (DNAPL) present? ____ Yes ____ No

a. If "Yes", specify which were present (check all that apply)?

LNAPL DNAPL

b. If "Yes", were the LNAPL and or DNAPL removed to the extent practical?

____ Yes ____ No

4. What was the land use for the cleanup scenario?

- Unrestricted
- Residential
- Commercial/Industrial
- Other

5. Were any environmental regulatory letters or orders sent in association with the property? If "Yes", provide copies with this questionnaire.

- General Correspondence
- California Water Code 13267 Order
- Cleanup and Abatement Order (CAO)
- Notice of Violation (NOV)
- Administrative Civil Liability (ACL)
- No Further Requirements (NFR)
- Others (Specify): _____
- No environmental regulatory letters or orders have been produced for the site.

6. Was site closure achieved and approved by the appropriate agency

____ Yes ____ No ____ Not applicable

⁴ Remedial actions could include but are not limited to soil excavation, soil vapor extraction, groundwater pump and treatment, chemical oxidation, and monitored natural attenuation.

XIII. Sources of Information Used to Complete This Questionnaire

1. Provide a description of the sources consulted to respond to the above items (e.g. written records, former employees, local agency files).

This questionnaire shall be signed below by a principal, an executive of the company, or other authorized representative of the company in accordance with the following statement:

I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared by me, or under my direction or supervision, in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gathered and evaluated the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Printed Name: _____

Title: _____

Telephone: _____

E-Mail: _____

Chemical Inventory Form

Site Name: _____

Site Address: _____

1. Chemical Name: _____
2. Common/Trade Name: _____
3. Maximum Quantity Stored During Any Given Day: _____
4. Storage Method: Underground Tank Drums
 Above-ground tank Other (specify)
5. Waste Disposal: Sewer Onsite recycling
 Hauled Offsite recycling
6. Is the waste treated prior to disposal? Yes No
7. Is manifest documentation available for designated waste streams? If yes, provide copies with this questionnaire. Yes No

ENCLOSURE 2

Dry Cleaner Operations Questionnaire

Directions: This questionnaire should be completed for each dry cleaner operation (i.e., one completed questionnaire for each separate business entity that operated on the property). Owners and/or operators should provide complete responses to each question, to the extent that this information is known or reasonably available. Owners and/or operators should use as much space as needed to provide complete responses and may attach supporting information.

I. Facility Information

1. Address: _____

II. Property Ownership Information

I. Name of Current Property Owner: _____

II. Mailing Address of Current Property Owner: _____

2. Telephone: _____ 4. E-Mail: _____

5. Prior Property Owner(s) (provide a separate sheet of paper, if necessary):

Property Owner Name and Mailing Address (Phone Number and Email Address if Available)	Dates of Ownership	
	From	To

III. Current Tenant Information

1. Tenant Name: _____

2. Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Code: _____

3. Brief Description of Business: _____

4. EPA/State Generator Number(s): _____

5. Years in business at this location: _____

6. Contact Name: _____

7. Telephone: _____

8. Email Address: _____

IV. Past Tenants

List any prior tenants. Provide a separate sheet of paper, if necessary.

Company Name and Current Mailing Address (Phone Number and Email Address if Available)	Type of Business	Dates of Operation at the Site	
		From	To

V. Solvent Deliveries and Storage

1. Indicate the solvent delivery method. If the method changed over time, identify the approximate timeframe for each method.

Method	Timeframe
Bulk tank truck	
Drums	
Other (describe)	

2. Identify the company or companies that delivered the solvent:

Company Name	Timeframe

3. Describe any spills that occurred during deliveries:

Est. Date of Spill	Est. Quantity Spilled	Steps Taken to Clean Up

4. For bulk tank truck deliveries, provide additional information:

a. Do you recall a name/logo on the truck? ___Yes ___No

If so, please describe it. _____

b. Did you see leaks from the hose as the truck driver reeled it back in after a delivery? ___Yes ___No

5. Describe where solvent was stored at the dry cleaners: _____

6. Describe how solvent was stored and quantity stored on any given day (e.g. above or underground tank; barrels; dry cleaning machine):

7. Describe how and what quantity of solvent was transferred from storage into the dry cleaning machine:

VI. Dry Cleaning Equipment and Operation

1. Describe the type of dry cleaning equipment used:

Equipment	Timeframe	Type of Solvent Used (PCE, Stoddard, etc.)

2. For tetrachloroethene (PCE) machines only – describe any leaks from the following sources: dry cleaning equipment, gaskets, hoses, or button traps:

Source of Leak	Est. Date	Est. Volume of Solvent Leaked (gal)	Steps Taken to Recover Solvent

3. Describe equipment setup and operations for each dry cleaning machine (use additional space for multiple machines):

a. Machine type? _____

b. Purchased new or used? ___New ___Used

c. Who set up the equipment? _____

d. Do you have the operation manual(s)? ___Yes ___No

e. Who trained your employees? (e.g., equipment manufacturer or vendor)

f. Any secondary containment (like a pan) under the machine? ___Yes ___No

Describe type of secondary containment, if applicable.

g. Was the machine plumbed to the drain? ___Yes ___No

h. If machine was plumbed to the drain, describe the location of drain and drain piping.

i. What kind of floor was under the machine (e.g. linoleum, concrete, concrete sealed with PCE-resistant paint)?

j. If the flooring was concrete, were there any chips, cracks, or evidence of wear)?
___Yes ___No

VII. Dry Cleaning Waste Management Practices

1. Separator wastewater – List any and all of the practices used at the dry cleaner for separator wastewater, and indicate the timeframe associated with each practice:

a. Collect in a bucket and dispose on ground. ___Yes ___No

i. Timeframe: _____

b. Collect in a bucket and dispose down drain. ___Yes ___No

i. Timeframe: _____

c. Run a hose from separator to sink or drain. ___Yes ___No

i. Timeframe: : _____

d. Plumb dry cleaning machine directly to drain. ___Yes ___No

i. Timeframe: _____

e. Picked up by hazardous waste disposal company. ___Yes ___No

- i. Timeframe: _____
 - f. Other method of waste water disposal. Yes No
 - i. Timeframe: _____
 - ii. Identify how waste was managed: _____

- 2. If you listed option "e" (picked up by hazardous waste disposal company), provide the following additional information:
 - a. Name of hazardous waste disposal company: _____

 - b. Onsite location where separator wastewater stored before pick-up: _____

 - c. Did you retain manifests or invoices? Yes No
- 3. "Muck", sludge, and filters – List all of the practices used at the dry cleaner for "muck", sludge, and filter handling, and indicate the timeframe associated with each practice:
 - a. Washed down drains. Yes No
 - i. Timeframe: _____
 - b. Collected in a bucket. Yes No
 - i. Timeframe: _____
 - c. Transported to the dump. Yes No
 - i. Timeframe: _____
 - d. Placed in trash cans or dumpster. Yes No
 - i. Timeframe: _____
 - e. Picked up by hazardous waste disposal company. Yes No
 - i. Timeframe: _____
 - f. Other method of hazardous waste disposal. Yes No
 - i. Timeframe: _____
 - ii. Identify how waste was managed: _____

4. If you listed option "e" (picked up by hazardous waste disposal company), provide the following additional information:
 - a. Name of hazardous waste disposal company: _____

 - b. Onsite location where muck/sludge/filters stored before pick-up: _____

 - c. Did you retain manifests or invoices? ____Yes ____No

VIII. Local Agency Records

1. Permits – Provide copies of any dry cleaning facility permits that you have/had; these may include:
 - a. Initial permit authorizing installation or modification of dry cleaning machines (issued by the State Fire Marshal or the local agency that issues hazardous materials storage permits)
 - b. Permit for occupancy issued by the city or county building department
 - c. Hazardous waste generator permit
 - d. Hazardous materials storage permit
 - e. Site or owner-specific EPA identification number issued by DTSC
 - f. Hazardous materials business plan
2. Inspections – Provide copies of any local agency inspection reports that you have concerning dry cleaning operations.
3. Correspondence – Provide copies of any local agency correspondence that you have concerning dry cleaning operations.
4. Reports – Provide copies of any technical reports or other documents that you may have for the property concerning investigation or remedial activities related to dry cleaning operations. This could include but not be limited to the following: Environmental Site Assessment Phase 1 report(s), soil, groundwater, and/or soil vapor investigation report(s), and/or remedial action report(s).

This questionnaire shall be signed below by a principal, an executive of the company, or other authorized representative of the company in accordance with the following statement:

I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared by me, or under my direction or supervision, in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gathered and evaluated the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Printed Name: _____

Title: _____

Telephone: _____

E-Mail: _____

ENCLOSURE 3

Enclosure 3

List of Documents Reviewed to Support Request for Technical Report for Hurzel Properties, LLC, SCP Case No. T6S044

- Harding, 2001, Groundwater Investigation, Hurzel Properties, 949 Emerald Bay Road, December 12.
- GHH, 2002, Regional PCE Data Compilation Report, October
- Water Board, 2003, PCE Report of Findings at 949 Emerald Bay Road, December 2.
- Water Board, 2007, Request for Clean Up Plan 949 Emerald Bay Road, May 18.
- Secor, 2007, Work Plan for Soil and Groundwater Characterization and In-Situ Chemical Oxidation Pilot Study, July 18.
- Secor, 2008, Site Investigation Report, 949 Emerald Bay, May 30.
- Stantec, 2008, Third Quarter 2008 Water Quality Report, Former Dry Cleaning Business, 949 Emerald Bay, December 10.
- Water Board, 2009, No Further Action Required for Hurzel Property, 949 Emerald Bay Road, South Lake Tahoe, February 11.
- E2C Remediation, 2010, Interim Remedial System Installation/Pilot Testing Report of Findings and Draft Remedial Action Plan for Vadose Zone Soil and Shallow Groundwater Cleanup, Lake Tahoe Laundry Works, August 12.
- 2015 Electronic Database Report
- Hogan and Lovells, 2016, Response to CAO for Lake Tahoe Laundry Works, 1024 Lake Tahoe Boulevard, South Lake Tahoe, September 16.
- EKI Environment and Water, 2017, Offsite Groundwater Investigation Data Report, South Y Area South Lake Tahoe, August 30.
- EKI Environment and Water/PES Environmental, Inc., 2018, Progress and Planning Report No. 7 and OS Well Groundwater Results, Lake Tahoe Laundry Works, November 13
- EKI Environment and Water, 2019, Investigation Summary Report, Former Lake Tahoe Laundry Works, 1024 Lake Tahoe Boulevard, April 1.