Public Comment
UST Case Closure – RCH Corp
Deadline: 11/19/10 by 12 noon

RECEIVED
NOV 17 2010
SWRCB EXECUTIVE

Chairman Charles R. Hoppin, Vic Chair Frances Spivy-Weber, Board Member Arthur Baggett. Jr., Board Member Tam M. Doduc. Board Member Walter Pettit
State Water Resources Control Board
1001 I Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBJECT: **UST CASE CLOSURE, PETITION OF RCH CORPORATION, 7891 STOCKTON BOULEVARD, SACRAMENTO**

In response to your Notice Of Opportunity For Public Comment On The Proposed Denial Of Underground Storage Tank Case Closure For RCH Corporation, 7891 Stockton Boulevard, Sacramento, we, the residents of Victory Avenue, Robinette Road, Lenhart Road, and Stevenson Avenue offer the following comments:

1. We are extremely gratified that the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) staff has recommended denial of the case closure for a site that has polluted the source of many of our water supply wells. We note that the SWRCB staff draft order requires the completion of a site assessment to address: "a. The extent to which groundwater affected by the Petitioner's unauthorized petroleum release migrated to depths greater than the screened intervals of the existing monitoring wells; and b. The vertical and lateral extent of MTBE and 1,2-DCA in groundwater down gradient of wells, MW-103 and MW-104."

   We are also pleased that the draft order requires the sampling and analysis of groundwater from domestic supply wells within a 1,000-foot radius of the subject site.

   We are, however, very concerned that the scope of the investigation in the area down gradient of MW-103 and MW-104 will be limited to only MTBE and 1,2-DCA. Both of these wells (and MW-9) are screened across the current water table (approximately 51 feet BGS) and while we concur with this recommendation, we ask that Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons as gasoline (TPHg), and Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons as diesel (TPHd) and Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene, Xylenes (collectively known as BTEX) and Naphthalene be added to the analyte suite for delineation both in the shallow zone and in deeper zones.

   Additionally, because MW-103, 104 or MW-9 do not intersect the historical water table (approximately 70 feet BGS) where free product is believed to be "trapped" by the rising water table, we request that additional lateral delineation of the extent of free product be determined in that zone.

   Furthermore, we ask that our well-water be analyzed for TPHg, TPHd, and Naphthalene in additional to BTEX, MTBE, and 1,2-DCA. We understand that the analysis for BTEX, MTBE, and 1,2-DCA includes TPHg, and Naphthalene and that little or no extra cost would be incurred by the Petitioner

to include these additional analytes. We also understand that the TPHd could be included as an analyte for minimal cost.

2. We are very concerned with Section D of the draft Order (Page 8) which delays removal of free product from our water source. Given that the Petitioner has done no work to reduce the pollution other than groundwater monitoring and tank and soil removal since approximately 2004, we feel that it is crucial that free product removal as well as remediation of the dissolved constituents be implemented as soon as practicable, i.e. after the Regional Water Quality Control Board – Central Valley has reviewed the necessary feasibility study.

   We object that the State Water Resources Control Board would restrict the Regional Board from protecting and restoring the water-bearing zones (aquifers) underlying the site that we depend on for our domestic supply.

3. The draft Order incorrectly describes the well construction for the onsite water supply well. The well was constructed using a cable tool using a driven casing. The 6-inch casing extends to 132 feet BGS, and a 5-inch liner extends this casing to 146 feet BGS. The total depth of the well is 201 feet – not "about 145 feet deep" as shown in the first paragraph of Page 4 of the draft Order. The well log is found on the Geotracker website. Thus this well is drawing water from the interval between 146 and 201 feet BGS and is cased off from the "free product" zone and the water-bearing zone located between 102 and ~~108~~ 125 feet BGS. Use of the lack of contamination found in this well to argue that contamination has not reached deeper water-bearing zones is misleading at best.

   In addition, please note that the consultant's use of wells with long well screens which intersect different lengths of the water column and in one case overlap is not a hydrologicaly sound argument that vertical gradients do not exist at the site (see Regional Board letter dated 28 September 2010.

4. We are very concerned with the SWRCB's staff's response to the Regional Board's comment No. 1 where it is surmised that additional free product removal at the Site would require additional corrective action at considerable cost. If, as stated on Page 2, the SWRCB's own Resolution 92-49 *"directs that water affected by an unauthorized release attain either background water quality or the best water quality that is reasonable if background water quality cannot be restored.....Any alternative level of water quality less stringent than background must be consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the state, not unreasonably affect current and anticipated beneficial use of affected water, and not result in water quality less than that prescribed in the water quality control plan for the basin within which the site is located....Resolution 92-49 does not require, however, that the requisite water quality be met at the time of site closure. Resolution No. 92-49 specifies compliance with cleanup goals and objectives within a reasonable time frame.....The Basin Plan specifies that the following narrative water quality*

objective for "Tastes and Odor":... "Ground waters shall not contain taste or odor producing substances in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses...," it would seem logical to us that the free product that will continue to dissolve and degrade our water resource should be removed as soon as practicable. The SWRCB staff's argument appears to contradict the Board's own resolution and the Regional Board's Basin Plan for the Sacramento Valley

5. We are equally disturbed by the SWRCB's staff's response to the Regional Board's comment No. 3 that declining contaminant trends cannot be established for all site wells and that a prediction cannot be made of the time required to meet Water Quality Objectives. SWRCB staff indicate that "declining concentrations are not a requirement for case closure." If this is the case, it cannot be shown that Water Quality Objectives will be met within a reasonable amount of time. This requirement of Resolution 92-49 appears to be conveniently overlooked or disregarded by the professional engineers and geologists at the SWRCB. It seems pretty plain to us - the Petitioner is required to show that Water Quality Objectives will be met within a reasonable amount of time.

   For a scientifically sound basis on which to close a site, one needs data. We have seen no data that microbes are present and consuming the contamination (such as dissolved oxygen concentrations versus time – is there sufficient dissolved oxygen to sustain microbial populations? Or sulfate, manganese, iron and nitrate concentrations versus time?). These indicators of natural attenuation are discussed in the Natural Attenuation Section of new DRAFT LUFT manual.

Again, we are very gratified that your staff has recommended denial of the Petition to grant closure to 7891 Stockton Boulevard, especially when such high levels of contamination remain, including free product. This contamination will continue to threaten our water supply until cleaned up. We urge you to include our comments in the record and take the additional steps we have outlined to safeguard the quality of our water supply.

Sincerely,

X Saesor Yang — SAESOR YANG 11-10-10

Signature — Printed Name — Date

Signature — Printed Name — Date