

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

**ORDER WQ 2015-0144 – 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 CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR:<sup>1</sup>**

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.<sup>2</sup> By this order, the Chief Deputy Director directs closure of the UST case. The name of the Fund claimant, the Fund claim number, the site name and the applicable site address, and the lead agency are as follows:

**Short Family Investment Company  
Claim No. 8214  
Bill's Repair, Short Property  
1825 Spokane Street, Modesto**

**Stanislaus County Environmental Health Department  
Agency Case Number 4**

**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, or Chief Deputy Director, may close or require the closure of a

---

<sup>1</sup> State Water Board Resolution No. 2012-0061 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. Pursuant to Resolution No. 2012-0061, the Executive Director has delegated this authority to the Chief Deputy Director.

<sup>2</sup> Unless otherwise noted, all references are to the Health and Safety Code.

UST case. Closure of a UST case is appropriate where the corrective action ensures the protection of 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 (Policy) are explained in the Case Closure Review Summary Report.

In State Water Board Resolution No. 2012-0016, the State Water Board adopted the 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 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 be issued only 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 for the claim subject to this order and the respective Fund claimant, so the 365-day timeframe for the submittal of claims for corrective action costs will start upon the issuance of the closure letter.

## II. FINDINGS

Based upon the UST Case Closure Review Summary Report prepared for the case and 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. 8214**  
**Bill's Repair, Short Property**

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 Policy, and other applicable water quality control policies and plans.

The unauthorized release from the UST consisted only of petroleum. This order directs closure for the petroleum UST case at the site.<sup>3</sup>

Pursuant to the 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.

Pursuant to section 21080.5 of the Public Resources Code, environmental impacts associated with the adoption of this Order were analyzed in the substitute environmental document (SED) the State Water Board approved on May 1, 2012. The SED concludes that all environmental effects of adopting and implementing the Policy are less than significant, and environmental impacts as a result of complying with the Policy are no different from the impacts that are reasonably foreseen as a result of the Policy itself. A Notice of Decision was filed August 17, 2012. No new environmental impacts or any additional reasonably foreseeable impacts beyond those that were not addressed in the SED will result from adopting this Order.

The UST case identified above may be the subject of orders issued by the Regional Water Quality Control 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.

---

<sup>3</sup> This order addresses only the petroleum UST case for the site. This order does not affect any order or directive requiring corrective action for non-petroleum contamination, if non-petroleum contamination is present.

### 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 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 on page 1 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, subdivisions (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.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chief Deputy Director

9/23/15  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



## State Water Resources Control Board

### UST CASE CLOSURE REVIEW SUMMARY REPORT

#### Agency Information

Agency Name: Stanislaus County Environmental Health Department (County)	Address: 3800 Cornucopia Way, Suite C Modesto, CA 95358
Agency Caseworker: Amber Minami	Case No.: 4

#### Case Information

USTCF Claim No.: 8214	GeoTracker Global ID: T0609900034
Site Name: Bill's Repair, Short Property	Site Address: 1825 Spokane Street Modesto, CA 95358
Responsible Party: Short Family Investment Co. Attn: Elva Jane Peeler	Address: P.O. Box 36 Loyalton, CA 96118
USTCF Expenditures to Date: \$516,262	Number of Years Case Open: 28

To view all public documents for this case available on GeoTracker use the following URL.  
[http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile\\_report.asp?global\\_id=T0609900034](http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report.asp?global_id=T0609900034)

#### 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. Highlights of the case follow:

This Site is a vacant lot. An unauthorized release was reported in September 1986 following the removal of four USTs (three gasoline and one waste oil) and an unknown volume of impacted soil was excavated to a depth of 10 feet below ground surface (bgs) and disposed offsite. Soil vapor extraction and air sparging were conducted intermittently between October 2012 and August 2014, which reportedly removed 11,389 pounds of total petroleum hydrocarbons as gasoline (TPHg). Since 1989, six groundwater monitoring wells have been installed and monitored. According to groundwater data, water quality objectives have been achieved or nearly 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 projected plume boundary. No other water supply wells have been identified within 1,000 feet of the projected plume boundary in files reviewed. The unauthorized release is located within the service area of a public water system, as defined in the Policy. The affected shallow groundwater is not currently being used as a source of drinking water, and it is highly unlikely that the affected shallow groundwater will be used as a source of drinking water in the foreseeable future. Other designated beneficial uses of impacted groundwater are not threatened, and it is highly unlikely that they will be, considering these factors in the context of the site setting. Remaining petroleum hydrocarbon constituents are limited and stable, and concentrations are decreasing. 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 Specific Criteria: The case meets Policy Criterion 1 by Class 2. The contaminant plume that exceeds water quality objectives is less than 250 feet in length. There is no free product. The nearest water supply well or surface water body is greater than 1,000 feet from the projected plume boundary. The dissolved concentration of benzene is less than 3,000 micrograms per liter ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ ) and the dissolved concentration of methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE) is less than 1,000  $\mu\text{g/L}$ .
- Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air: Onsite, the case meets Policy Criterion 2a by Scenario 3a. The maximum benzene concentration in groundwater is less than 100  $\mu\text{g/L}$ . The minimum depth to groundwater is greater than 5 feet, overlain by soil containing less than 100 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) of TPH. The plume extends offsite to the north; offsite land use to the north is residential. Offsite, the case also meets Policy Criterion 2a by Scenario 3a
- 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 May 29, 2014, the County staff identified the following impediments to closure:

- Comment: Free product has not been removed to the maximum extent practicable.  
Response: Groundwater monitoring reports have never reported the presence of measurable amounts of free product. The historic and recent dissolved petroleum hydrocarbon concentrations in groundwater do not support its presence either.
- Comment: Secondary source has not been removed to the extent practicable.  
Response: Secondary source is defined by the Policy as petroleum-impacted soil or groundwater located at or immediately beneath the point of release from the primary source. Contaminated soil was excavated to 10 feet bgs during the UST removal activities in 1986. Additionally, active soil vapor extraction/air sparging removed a reported 11,389 pounds of TPHg. The recent groundwater monitoring data do not support the presence of a significant mass of petroleum hydrocarbons remaining in the soil.
- Comment: The case does not meet Policy vapor criteria.  
Response: Both onsite and offsite the case meets Policy Criterion 2a by Scenario 3a, which requires the benzene concentration in groundwater to be less than 100  $\mu\text{g/l}$ , a minimum depth to groundwater of 5 feet, and the presence of at least 5 feet of soil with TPHg concentrations less than 100 mg/kg. Ten feet of clean fill was brought in to replace the affected soil removed from the UST excavation. In addition, there are no fixed structures onsite into which vapors could intrude. Offsite shallow soil has not been



Bill's Repair, Short Property  
1825 Spokane Street, Modesto  
Claim No: 8214

affected, the depth to groundwater is approximately 40 feet, and benzene concentrations offsite are well below 100 µg/l, therefore offsite conditions also meet Policy Criterion 2a by Scenario 3a.

- Comment: A nuisance exists.  
Response: For a nuisance to exist it has to meet all three of the following requirements:
  - Is injurious to health, or is indecent or offensive to the senses, or an obstruction to the free use of the property, so as to interfere with comfortable enjoyment of life or property.
  - Affects at the same time an entire community or neighborhood, or any considerable number of persons, although the extent of the annoyance or damage inflicted upon individuals may be unequal.
  - Occurs during, or as the result of, the treatment or disposal of wastes.This case does not meet any of these three conditions therefore a nuisance does not exist as defined in the Policy.

#### **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. Stanislaus County has the regulatory responsibility to supervise the abandonment of monitoring wells.



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



\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Prepared by: Kirk Larson, P.G.