### ExonMobil

May 9, 2013

510 547 8196 Telephone 510 547 8706 Facsimile

Ms. Barbara Jakub Alameda County Health Care Services Agency Department of Environmental Health 1131 Harbor Bay Parkway, Suite 250 Alameda, California 94502-6577 RECEIVED

By Alameda County Environmental Health at 8:28 am, May 13, 2013

Subject:

Low Threat UST Case Closure Checklist

Former Exxon RAS #70234

3450 35th Avenue, Oakland, California

ACHCSA File No. RO0002515

Dear Ms. Jakub:

Attached for your review and comment is a copy of the *Low Threat UST Case Closure Checklist* for the above-referenced site. The document, prepared by ETIC Engineering, Inc. of Pleasant Hill, California, is submitted in response to correspondence from the Alameda County Health Care Services Agency dated January 18, 2013 and March 22, 2013.

Upon information and belief, I declare, under penalty of perjury, that the information contained in the attached document is true and correct.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at 510.547.8196.

Sincerely,

Attachment:

¢:

Jennifer C. Sedlachek Project Manager

w/ attachment:

Mr. William D. Spencer, FWS Highland LLC, 99 South Hill Drive, Brisbane, CA 94005

ETIC Low Threat UST Case Closure Checklist

Mr. Shay Wideman, The Valero Companies, Environ. Liability Mgt., P.O. Box 696000, San Antonio, TX 78269

c: w/o attachment:

Mr. Thomas E. Neely, ETIC Engineering, Inc.



9 May 2013

Ms. Jennifer C. Sedlachek ExxonMobil Environmental Services Company 4096 Piedmont Avenue #194 Oakland, California 94611

Subject: Alameda County Environmental Health, Low Threat UST Case Closure Checklist

Former Exxon Service Station 70234 3450 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Oakland, California

ACHCSA File No. RO0002515

Dear Ms. Sedlachek:

At the request of ExxonMobil Environmental Services Company on behalf of ExxonMobil Oil Corporation (ExxonMobil), ETIC Engineering, Inc. (ETIC) has prepared the attached Alameda County Environmental Health, Low Threat UST Case Closure Policy Compliance and Identification of Impediments to Case Closure Checklist for Former Exxon Service Station 70234, located at 3450 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue in Oakland, California. This checklist is being submitted in response to e-mails dated 18 January 2013 and 22 March 2013 from the Alameda County Health Care Services Agency (ACHCSA).

It should be noted that responses and information in the checklist are based upon currently available information. As additional information becomes available, the checklist should be reviewed and updated accordingly.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact Mr. Hamidou Barry at (925) 602-4710 ext. 2145 or Mr. Tom Neely at ext. 2161.

Respectfully yours,

Hamidou Barry

Project Manager

Thomas E. Neely, PG, CHG, QSD

Senior Hydrogeologist

#### Attachment:

Alameda County Environmental Health, Low Threat UST Case Closure Policy Compliance and Identification of Impediments to Case Closure Checklist

#### ALAMEDA COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH LOW THREAT UST CASE CLOSURE POLICY COMPLIANCE AND IDENTIFICATION OF IMPEDIMENTS TO CASE CLOSURE CHECKLIST

Agency Name: Alameda County Environmental Health	Date:
ACEH Case Worker: Barbara Jakub	Fuel Leak Case No: RO000 2515
Site Name: Valero #3832 (Former Exxon #70234)	GeoTracker Global ID: T06019757161
Site Address:	USTCF Claim No:
3450 35th Avenue, Oakland, CA	

has reviewed the above listed site for consideration of case closure using the framewotk provided by the State Water Resources Control Board Low-Threat Underground Storage Tank Case Closure Policy (LTCP), adopted on May 1, 2012, and effective August 17, 2012. The results of our review indicate that the site PASSES FAILS the LTCP criteria.
Section 25296.10 of the California Health and Safety Code (H&SC) requires that sites be cleaned up to protect human health, safety, and the environment. The current conceptual site model is is is not adequate to determine that residual petroleum constituents at the site do not pose a significant risk to human health, safety, or the environment.

### LOW THREAT CLOSURE POLICY - GENERAL CRITERIA A

General Criteria a: Is the Unauthorized Release Water System?	Located within the Service Area of a Po	ublic Y	ES N	O NE
unlikely to be installed in the seto predict, on a statewide base undergoing new development reduce the likelihood that new petroleum in groundwater. Case based upon the fundamental personance in the area. For purpowater for human consumption	y is protective of existing water supply wells. In thallow groundwater near former UST release sis, where new wells will be installed, particular. This policy is limited to areas with available with wells in developing areas will be inadverted to be closure outside of areas with a public water porinciples in this policy and a site specific evented specific evented that provides of this policy, a public water system is an attribute the provided that the provided that the public water system is an attribute that the provided that	sites. How larly in rull le public tently imposing system shalluation of system for ances that	vever, it is ral areas water system to by ould be edeveloping the programmer than 15	s difficult that are stems to residual valuated ng water vision of or more
	n have 15 or more service connection or ndividuals daily at least 60 days of the	■ Yes	□ No	
Name of public water system a  East Bay Municipal Utility Dis Zone 7 Water Agency City of Hayward Water Alameda County Water Distri	trict Yes Yes Yes			
	formation listed below been provided in see compliance with General Criteria a?	Yes	■ No	
system been provided?	erty has a hook-up and uses the public water	Yes	■ NE	□NA
Has a well search been conduct of the site?	cted to identify wells located within 2,000 feet	Yes	■ NE	□NA
Are there existing water supply of the site?  Domestic Water Supply Wells Irrigation Wells Other Capture Systems	wells or other sources of water in the vicinity  Yes No NA Yes No NA Yes No NA	Yes	• NE	□NA
Are existing supply wells or oth owners/tenants in the vicinity or	er sources of water used by property f the site?	Yes	■ NE	□NA
Have existing supply wells or o chemicals of concern associate	ther sources of water been sampled for ed with the release site?	Yes	■ NE	□NA
Have supply wells or other soul abandoned and well destruction		Yes	• NE	□NA
(Refer to Att. 1 - CSM Deta	iled Evaluation Checklist for Identification of Dat	ta Gaps)		

### LOW THREAT CLOSURE POLICY - GENERAL CRITERIA A

ase Notes
EBMUD map indicates that the site is within the EBMUD service area.  A well search has been performed within 1,500 m for public wells, and 300m for private wells. Need to evaluate presence of water wells within 2,000 ft per ACHCSA requirement.  An updated evaluation of wells should be performed with the ACHCSA-specified search radius.
***End of General Criteria a Evaluation***

### LOW THREAT CLOSURE POLICY - GENERAL CRITERIA B

<u>General Criteria b</u> : Does the Unauthorized Rele	ase Consist only	y of Petro	leum?		YES	NO	NE
LTCP Statement: "For purpose which is liquid at standard condit Fahrenheit and 14.7 pounds per fuels, distillate fuel oils, residual additives and blending agents su	tions and temperat square inch absol fuel oils, lubricants	ure and pre ute includin , petroleum	ssure, which g the following solvents and	means 60 g substanc l used oils,	degrees es: moto includin	or fue g any	ls, jet
Site Contaminants Dectected	in Soil, Soil Gas, (	Groundwat	er, and Surfa	ce Water			
Petroleum				■ Yes	□N	0 [	NE
Motor fuels TPH middle distillates Residual fuels Fuel oxygenates Lead scavengers Aromatic compounds TPH middle distillates  Non Petroleum Contaminants VOCs SVOCs Dioxans & Furans Other PAHs PCBs Phenols Metals	" Yes	No	NE N	Yes	□ N	o [	• NE
Has the <u>minimum required info</u> the CSM for evaluation of case	ormation listed be compliance with	low been p General C	provided in riteria b?	Yes	□ N	0	
Description of the site history?				Yes	□ N		NA
Types of products or chemicals ι	- CE 100			Yes	□ N		NA
History of types of releases other Presentation of sampling results such as volatile organic compouncompounds (SVOCs), metals, pot 1,4-dioxane, dibenzofurans, or discourse of the presentation of the present	for all chemicals onds (VOCs), semi- olychlorinated biphe	volatile orga	anic	Yes Yes	□ No		■ NA □ NA
				Yes	□N		] NA
	ä			Yes	□N	o [	] NA
			ds.	Yes			] NA

### LOW THREAT CLOSURE POLICY - GENERAL CRITERIA B

ase Notes			
Petroleum detections have be	en reported in tables of the Site	Assessment Report of Apr	il 2009.
	8		
	***End of General Criteria b E		

### LOW THREAT CLOSURE POLICY - GENERAL CRITERIA C

General Criteria c:			
Has the Unauthorized ("Primary") Release from the UST System be Stopped?	een	YES	NO NE
LTCP Statement: "The tank, pipe, or other appurtenant structure that renvironment (i.e. the primary source) has been removed, repaired or replace policy to allow sites with ongoing leaks from the UST system to qualify for low	ed. It is n	ot the in	
Have the tank(s), piping, dispenser islands, or other appurtenant structures that released petroleum into the environment been removed, repaired or replaced?  Tanks?  Product piping?  Dispenser islands?  Other structures?  Have the tanks, piping, and/or dispenser islands been moved to a different	Yes	□ No	
location at the site?			
Were/are the tanks permitted by a local regulatory agency having jurisdiction over USTs?  Have the operating records been reviewed (i.e., operating permit, types of products dispensed, tanks construction, tank capacity, tank tightness tests, etc)?  Was a tank removal permit issued by the local regulatory agency?  Was a tank removal report submitted?  Is there indication that new release(s) have occurred subsequent to the initial release?  Are there spikes or increasing	Yes Yes	□ No	• NE
Have new petroleum hydrocarbons or other hazardous products been dispensed of at the site since the initial release occurred?	Yes	□No	■ NE
Is there indication of new impacts from offsite sources?	Yes	□ No	• NE

### LOW THREAT CLOSURE POLICY - GENERAL CRITERIA C

Has the minimum required information listed below been provided in the CSM for evaluation of case compliance with General Criteria c?	Yes	■ No	
Description of the history of releases and the actions taken to stop each release?	Yes	□No	□N
Evaluation and accounting for changing contaminant concentrations over he full time period of site investigations?	Yes	□No	□и
Data from other sites in the vicinity with unauthorized releases of petroleum hydrocarbons or other hazardous materials	Yes	□No	□N
Hazardous Materials Business Plans (historic and current)	Yes	☐ No	$\square$ N
CUPA UST permits and inspection reports	Yes	☐ No	N

### LOW THREAT CLOSURE POLICY - GENERAL CRITERIA D

General Criteria d:				
Has Free Product been Removed to the Maximum Extent Practicable?	YES	NO	NE	NA
LTCP Statement: "At petroleum unauthorized release sites where investigat free product, free product shall be removed to the maximum extent requirements of this section:				
(a) Free product shall be removed in a manner that minimizes the spread into previously uncontaminated zones by using recovery and disposal to hydrogeologic conditions at the site, and that properly treats, discharge byproducts in compliance with applicable laws;	echniques	appropria	ate to th	ne
(b) Abatement of free product migration shall be used as a minimum objecti product removal system; and	ve for the	design of	f any fre	ее
(c) Flammable products shall be stored for disposal in a safe and competent explosions."	manner to	prevent	fires or	
Has the minimum required information listed below been provided in the CSM for evaluation of case compliance with General Criteria d?	Yes	■ No		
Has the presence of free product been evaluated?	Yes	☐ No	□ N	Α
Has a description of investigation and monitoring activities that have been undertaken to assess whether free product is present been provided?	Yes	☐ No	□ N	Α
Has a preferential pathway study been conducted to determine the probability of free product encountering geologic and anthropogenic preferential pathways and conduits that can act as contaminant migration pathways to or from the site?	Yes	■ No	□ N	А
Has tabulation and an evaluation of historic groundwater levels and flow direction and identification of a smear zone been provided?	Yes	□No	□ N.	Α
Has data including tables and figures showing any observation and measurements of free product been provided?	Yes	☐ No	□ N.	А
Has an evaluation of the adequacy of the monitoring well network and appropriateness of screen interval to detect free product been conducted?	Yes	□ No	□ N.	А
Has an evaluation of whether free product removal is practicable, or if not practicable, a description of the conditions that prevent free product removal been conducted?				
Has free product removal been implemented?  Absorbent Materials  Bailing  Skimmer  HVDPE  Other Methods:  Pyes  No  Yes  No  Yes  No  Yes  No  Yes  No	Yes	□No	■ NA	A
Has a description of corrective action(s) that were taken to remove product, dates of removal actions, and volumes removed been provided?	Yes	□No	■ N	1
Is free product removal still being conducted?	Yes	☐ No	■ N	Α
Does data indicate rebound of free product subsequent to product removal?	Yes	☐ No	■ N	A
Does data indicate rebound of free product subsequent to product	Yes	□No		

### LOW THREAT CLOSURE POLICY - GENERAL CRITERIA D

Case Notes			
20			
	***End of General Crite	ria d Evaluation***	

### LOW THREAT CLOSURE POLICY - GENERAL CRITERIA E

General Criteria e:	The state of		14-742-14	( Albertade)			7
Has a Conceptual Site Model that Ade Extent, and Mobility of the Release be			the Natur	re,	YES	NO NI	
LTCP Statement: "The Conceptual Site Moinvestigation. The CSM establishes the sour affected media (including soil, groundwate hydrogeology and other physical site charal fate, and identifies all confirmed and pot surface water bodies, structures and their guide for investigative design and data collevariety of hydrogeologic settings. As a resurreceptors may be impacted by contaminant unique to each individual release site. All assessed and supported by data so that established to determine conformance with analysis used to develop the CSM are no contained in multiple reports submitted to the	urce and a er, and soin cteristics the ential continuation. Pellt, contaminations vary greater the nature applicability required	ttributes of vapor a nat affect of aminant responding to the characteristics of the control of the characteristics of the control of the cont	f the unaut is appropria contaminant eceptors (i SM is relie elease sites and transpo- ocation to lo ceteristics id- and mobili in this poli- ontained in	horized re ate), descrit environm including v d upon by in Califor ort and me ocation. The entified by ty of the icy. The s a single i	lease, de ibes loca nental trar water sup ractitio nia occur chanisms erefore, the CSM release hupporting report and	scribes all geology asport and oply wells ners as a in a wide by which a CSM is ave been data and	ill
Has a CSM that <u>adequately</u> assesses the nather release in affected media in the vicinity of				Yes	■ No		- 1
Groundwater assessment?	Yes	■ No	□ NA				6
Surface water assessment?	Yes	■ No	☐ NA				
Soil assessment?	Yes	■ No	☐ NA				
Soil vapor assessment?	Yes	■ No	☐ NA				
Indoor Air assessment?	Yes	■ No	☐ NA				=
Has the CSM been developed in accordance	e with indu	stry stand	ards?	Yes	□No	□NA	
SWRCB CA LUFT Manual, September 2012	Yes	□No	□NA				
ITRC Vapor Intrusion Pathway: A Practical Guideline (ITRC 2007)	Yes	☐ No	□NA				
ASTM Method 1689-95 - Standard Guide for Developing Conceptual Site Models for Contaminated Sites	Yes	□No	□NA			_	
ASTM Method 2531-6 - Standard Guide							5
for Development of Conceptual Models for Light Nonaqueous-Phase Liquids	Yes	No	□NA			⊡	
Released to the Subsurface  DTSC Final Guidance for the Evaluation and Mitigation of Subsurface Vapor	Yes	□No	□NA			•	
Intrusion to Indoor Air (October 2011)	L les					•	
Is the CSM presented in one comprehensive document been submitted that identifies the requisite CSM elements are located?	document	t or has a s where th	summary e	• Yes	□ □ No	□ □ NA	
Is the CSM representative of current site cor	nditions?			Yes	□No	□NA	
Does the final closure review validate the CS	- Control of the Cont			Yes	No	• NA	885
2000 the final cloud to town validate the ov		E.					

### LOW THREAT CLOSURE POLICY - GENERAL CRITERIA E

las the minimum required information listed below been provided in he CSM for evaluation of case compliance with General Criteria e?	Yes	■ No	
Site history?	Yes	□No	□N
Receptor survey?	Yes	■ No	
Description of releases?	■ Yes	□No	□ N
Geologic and hydrogeologic assessment?	■ Yes	□No	□N
dentified stratigraphic and manmade migration pathways?	Yes	■ No	
dentified controls on contaminant migration?	Yes	■ No	$\square$ N
Delineation of the lateral and vertical extent of contamination in all affected media?	Yes	■ No	□N
Assessment of vapor intrusion pathways?	Yes	■ No	
Groundwater monitoring and evaluation of plume stability?	■ Yes	☐ No	□N
Description of the type and effectiveness of corrective actions?		TINI-	ПИ
	Yes	☐ No	
(Refer to Att. 1 - CSM Detailed Evaluation Checklist for Identificate  Case Notes:  A CSM adequately addresses the nature and mobility of the release. The effurther assessment. Potential receptors need further assessment.	Yes Yes	No Saps)	ΠN
(Refer to Att. 1 - CSM Detailed Evaluation Checklist for Identificat  Case Notes:  A CSM adequately addresses the nature and mobility of the release. The e	Yes Yes	No Saps)	ΠN
dentification of data gaps?  (Refer to Att. 1 - CSM Detailed Evaluation Checklist for Identificat  Case Notes:  A CSM adequately addresses the nature and mobility of the release. The e	Yes Yes	No Saps)	ΠN
dentification of data gaps?  (Refer to Att. 1 - CSM Detailed Evaluation Checklist for Identificat  Case Notes:  A CSM adequately addresses the nature and mobility of the release. The e	Yes Yes	No Saps)	ΠN
dentification of data gaps?  (Refer to Att. 1 - CSM Detailed Evaluation Checklist for Identificat  Case Notes:  A CSM adequately addresses the nature and mobility of the release. The e	Yes Yes	No Saps)	ΠN
dentification of data gaps?  (Refer to Att. 1 - CSM Detailed Evaluation Checklist for Identificat  Case Notes:  A CSM adequately addresses the nature and mobility of the release. The e	Yes Yes	No Saps)	ΠN
dentification of data gaps?  (Refer to Att. 1 - CSM Detailed Evaluation Checklist for Identificat  Case Notes:  A CSM adequately addresses the nature and mobility of the release. The e	Yes Yes	No Saps)	ΠN
dentification of data gaps?  (Refer to Att. 1 - CSM Detailed Evaluation Checklist for Identificat  Case Notes:  A CSM adequately addresses the nature and mobility of the release. The e	Yes Yes	No Saps)	ΠN
dentification of data gaps?  (Refer to Att. 1 - CSM Detailed Evaluation Checklist for Identificat  Case Notes:  A CSM adequately addresses the nature and mobility of the release. The e	Yes Yes	No Saps)	ΠN
dentification of data gaps?  (Refer to Att. 1 - CSM Detailed Evaluation Checklist for Identificat  Case Notes:  A CSM adequately addresses the nature and mobility of the release. The e	Yes Yes	No Saps)	ΠN

### LOW THREAT CLOSURE POLICY - GENERAL CRITERIA F

General Criteria f:	-		
Has Secondary Source been Removed to the Extent Practicable?		YES N	O NE
LTCP Statement: "Secondary source" is defined as petroleum-impacted soil immediately beneath the point of release from the primary source. Un secondary source removal (e.g. physical or infrastructural constraints exist would be technically or economically infeasible), petroleum-release site secondary source removal to the extent practicable as described herein. means implementing a cost-effective corrective action which removes or readily recoverable fraction of source-area mass. It is expected that more efforts will be completed in one year or less. Following removal or destruction additional removal or active remedial actions shall not be required by regulational removal or active remedial actions shall not be required by regulation of low threat as described in this policy."	less site whose re s are re "To the destroy st secon on of the julatory	e attributes emoval or re equired to extent pra s-in-place dary mass e secondar agencies u	s prevent relocation undergo acticable" the most removal y source, nless (1)
Has secondary source been removed to the extent practicable?  Petroleum-impacted soil?  Petroleum-impacted groundwater?  Yes No NE	Ye	es No	■ NE
Is corrective action currently in progress to remove or destroy-in-place the most readily recoverable fraction of source-area mass?  Petroleum-impacted soil remediation?  Petroleum-impacted groundwater remediation?  Have the current site remediation efforts been in progress for more than one year?  Petroleum-impacted	Ye		□ NE
Petroleum-impacted soil?  Petroleum-impacted groundwater?  Yes No NE  Yes No NE			
Has the minimum required information listed below been provided in the CSM for evaluation of case compliance with General Criteria f?	■ Ye	s 🗆 No	
History of corrective actions for the site including the types of cleanup actions taken, dates of the actions, and mass removed?	<b>■</b> Ye		□NA
Figures depicting the location(s) of the removal action?	■ Ye	s No	☐ NA
Confirmation sampling results which demonstrate the effectiveness of secondary source removal?	<b>■</b> Ye	s No	□NA
Narrative description of the actions and areas of success or infeasibility of actions?	<b>I</b> Ye	s No	□NA
For in-situ corrective actions, presentation of long-term monitoring data that demonstrate that concentration have not rebounded following the cessation of corrective action?  (Refer to Att. 1 - CSM Detailed Evaluation Checklist for Identification)	☐ Ye		■NA

### LOW THREAT CLOSURE POLICY - GENERAL CRITERIA F

Case Notes	
	340 2
***End of General Criteria f Evaluation***	

### LOW THREAT CLOSURE POLICY - GENERAL CRITERIA G

<u>General Criteria g:</u> Has Soil or Groundwater been Tested for MTBE and Results Repo Accordance with Health and Safety Code Section 25296.15?	rted in	YES	NO NE
LTCP Statement: "Health and Safety Code section 25296.15 prohibits classil, groundwater, or both, as applicable have been tested for MTBE and known to the Regional Water Board. The exception to this requirement is determined that the UST that leaked has only contained diesel or jet fuel pursuant to this policy, the requirements of section 25296.15, if applicable, so	the results s where a . Before cl	of that tes regulatory osing a U	sting are agency
Has the minimum required information listed below been provided in the CSM for evaluation of case compliance with General Criteria g?	Yes	☐ No	
Presentation of sufficient data to assess whether MTBE is or was present in soil at or in the vicinity of the site?	Yes	□No	□ NE
Presentation of sufficient data to assess whether MTBE is or was present in groundwater at or in the vicinity of the site?	■ Yes	☐ No	□NE
Case Notes: Table 3A from the Site Assessment Report of April 2009 presents MTBE data. The 2Q2012 monitoring report presents MTBE data for groundwater.	a for soil.		
	4)		

### LOW THREAT CLOSURE POLICY - GENERAL CRITERIA H

General Criteria h:					П
Does a Nuisance as Defined by Water Coo	de Section 13050 Exist at t	he	YES	МО	NE NE
LTCP Statement: "Water Code section 13050 following requirements:	0 defines "nuisance" as anyth	ing which	meets	all of t	the
(1) Is injurious to health, <u>or</u> is indecent or offer property, so as to interfere with the comforts			to the fre	e use	of
(2) Affects at the same time an entire commo persons, although the extent of the annoyan					
(3) Occurs during, or as a result of, the treatme	ent <u>or</u> disposal of wastes.				
For the purpose of this policy, waste means a pe	etroleum release."				
Does a nuisance condition currently exist (condition by the LTCP above?	or potentially could exist) as	Yes	□ No		NE
Is injurious to health?		Yes	□No	1	NE
Is indecent or offensive to the senses?		Yes	☐ No	1	NE
Is an obstruction to the free use of property so comfortable enjoyment of life or property?	as to interfere with the	Yes	□ No	1	NE
Affects at the same time an entire community of considerable number of persons, although the damage inflicted upon individuals may be unequently	extent of the annoyance or	Yes	□No	1	NE
Is a result of the treatment or disposal of waste		☐Yes	□No		NE
Has the minimum required information liste the CSM for evaluation of case compliance of the potential to pose nuisance conditions during expected site activities?  Surface soils?  Near surface soils?  Utility corridors?  Groundwater?  Surface water?  Soil gas?  Basements or other subsurface structures?	with General Criteria h? esent in locations that have	☐ Yes	■ No	in militarii	NA
Descriptions of the type and vertical and lateral	extent of shallow soil?	Yes	ПNо		NE
Descriptions of the lateral extent of surface soil contamination?		Yes	□ No		NE
Presentation of analytical results for surface so groundwater, and surface water samples?	il, shallow soil, soil gas,	Yes	□No		NE
Discussion of odors or visual evidence of conta	mination?	Yes	No		VE.
Presentation of preferential pathway and utility	conduit surveys?	Yes	□No		٧E
Evaluation of potential points for exposure such product seeps into basements or surface water	bodies or conveyances?	Yes	□No		NE
Description of surface water runoff from the prosites, or other surface water body receptors?	perty to storm drains, other	Yes	☐ No		NE
Description of the current and expected future or potentially impacted property in the site vicin	ity?	Yes	□No		NE
(Refer to Att. 1 - CSM Detailed Evalu	uation Checklist for Identification	of Data G	Baps)		

### LOW THREAT CLOSURE POLICY - GENERAL CRITERIA H

	Case Notes	
	•	
***End of General Criteria h Evaluation***		A .

Does the site meet the LTCP criteria for groundwater, <u>or</u> does the site qualify for the Soil Only Case exemption?	YES NO
LTCP Statement: "This policy describes criteria on which to base a determina existing and anticipated beneficial uses of groundwater have been mitigated or are d cases that have not affected groundwater.	
State Water Board Resolution 92-49, <i>Policies and Procedures for Investigation Abatement of Discharges Under Water Code Section 13304</i> is a state policy for vand applies to petroleum UST cases. Resolution 92-49 directs that water affected release attain either background water quality or the best water quality that is reaso water quality cannot be restored. Any alternative level of water quality less stringe must be consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the state, not unreason and anticipated beneficial use of affected water, and not result in water quality less to the water quality control plan for the basin within which the site is located. Resolution require that the requisite level of water quality be met at the time of case of compliance with cleanup goals and objectives within a reasonable time frame.	vater quality control by an unauthorized nable if background nt than background onably affect current than that prescribed tion No. 92-49 does
Water quality control plans (Basin Plans) generally establish "background" water quaendpoint. This policy recognizes the regulatory authority of the Basin Plans by flexibility contained in Resolution 92-49.	
It is a fundamental tenet of this low-threat closure policy that if the closure criteria desare satisfied at a petroleum unauthorized release site, attaining background water questablishing an alternate level of water quality not to exceed that prescribed in the apis appropriate, and that water quality objectives will be attained through natural a reasonable time, prior to the expected need for use of any affected groundwater.	uality is not feasible, oplicable Basin Plan
If groundwater with a designated beneficial use is affected by an unauthorized rel media-specific criteria for groundwater, the contaminant plume that exceeds water must be stable or decreasing in areal extent, and meet all of the additional character five classes of sites listed below. A plume that is "stable or decreasing" is a contaminate expanded to its maximum extent: the distance from the release where attenuation extensions.	er quality objectives eristics of one of the inant mass that has
"Sites with Releases that Have Not Affected Groundwater - Sites with soil that sufficient mobile constituents [leachate, vapors, or light non-aqueous-phase liquids groundwater to exceed the groundwater criteria in this policy shall be considered low groundwater medium. Provided the general criteria and criteria for other media are a are eligible for case closure. For older releases, the absence of current groundwater good indication that residual concentrations present in the soil are not a source pollution."	(LNAPL)] to cause v-threat sites for the llso met, those sites er impact is often a
Does the site qualify for the Soil Only Case EXEMPTION?	Yes No
If the site <u>does not</u> qualify for the soil only exemption, then, is the contaminant plume stable or decreasing in areal extent?	☐ Yes ☐ No
If the contaminant plume is stable or decreasing, then	☐ Yes ☐ No
does it meet all of the additional characteristics of one of the five (5) LTCP	
classes?  Class 1	
Class 2	
Class 3 Yes No	
Class 4 Yes No	
Class 5 Yes No	
(Refer to Next Page for Contaminant Plume Classification Characteristics)  (Media Specific Criteria for Groundwater Evaluation Continued on Next F	'age)

roundwater Contaminant Plume Classification Characteristics			
If the Contaminant Plume is Stable or Decreasing, then  Does the contaminant plume meet <u>all of the additional characteristics</u> of one of the five (5) LTCP classes listed below?	Yes	□No	■ NE
Class 1	Yes	No	- NE
Is < 100 feet in length	Yes	No	• NE
There is no free product	Yes	No	NE
The nearest existing water supply well is > 250 feet from the defined plume boundary	Yes	No	• NE
The nearest existing surface water body is > 250 feet from the defined plume boundary	Yes	□No	• NE
Class 2	Yes	No	• NE
Is < 250 feet in length	Yes	☐ No	■ NE
There is no free product	• Yes	No	NE
The nearest existing water supply well is > 1,000 feet from the defined plume boundary	Yes	No	• NE
The nearest existing surface water body is > 1,000 feet from the defined plume boundary	Yes	■ No	☐ NE
The dissolved concentration of benzene is <3,000 µg/L	Yes	No	NE
The dissolved concentration of MTBE is <1,000 µg/L	Yes	■ No	☐ NE
Class 3	Yes	No	• NE
ls < 250 feet in length	Yes	No	• NE
Free product has been removed to the maximum extent practicable, may still be present below the site where the release originated, but does not extend off-site	■ Yes	No	☐ NE
The plume has been stable or decreasing for a minimum of 5 years	Yes	☐ No	■ NE
The nearest existing water supply well is > 1,000 feet from the defined plume boundary	Yes	☐ No	• NE
The nearest existing surface water body is > 1,000 feet from the defined plume boundary	Yes	■ No	□ NE
The property owner is willing to accept a land use restriction if the regulatory agency requires a land use restriction as a condition for closure	Yes	□ No	■ NE
Class 4	Yes	☐ No	■ NE
ls < 1,000 feet in length	Yes	No	■ NE
There is no free product	Yes	☐ No	☐ NE
The nearest existing water supply well or surface water body is > 1,000 feet from the defined plume boundary	Yes	■ No	☐ NE
The nearest existing surface water body is > 1,000 feet from the defined plume boundary	Yes	■ No	□ NE
The dissolved concentration of benzene is <1,000 μg/L	Yes	No	☐ NE
The dissolved concentration of MTBE is <1,000 μg/L	Yes	■ No	☐ NE
Class 5	Yes	No	• NE
Based on an analysis of site specific conditions at the site under current and reasonable anticipated near-term future scenarios, the contaminant plume poses a low threat to human health and safety and to the environment and water quality objectives will be achieved within a reasonable time frame	Yes	No	■ NE

Plume Length (That Exceeds Water Quality Objectives)			in a			
≥ 100 feet and < 250 feet		Yes			T	
≥ 250 feet and < 1,000 feet		Yes				
≥ 1,000 feet		Yes				
Unknown		Yes				
For Sites with Free Product						
Free product in groundwater		Yes		No		UNK
Free product has been removed to the maximum extent practicable	п			No		UNK
The plume has been stable or decreasing for 5-Years				No		UNK
The owner is willing to accept a Land Use Restriction (if required)				No	п	UNK
Free product extends offsite		Yes				UNK
Benzene Concentration				wig field		
≥ 1,000 µg/L and < 3,000 µg/L		Yes				
≥ 3,000 µg/L	_  _	Yes				
Unknown		Yes		AVANTALIS		
MTBE Concentration		V	1		9 <u>- 2 182</u>	*
≥ 1,000 µg/L Unknown	-   -	Yes Yes				
Nearest Supply Well (From Plume Boundary)		res	Le, Kie			TENEVE
≤ 250 Feet	TE	Yes	ľ			cales ( )
> 250 Feet and ≤ 1,000 Feet	1	Yes				
Unknown		100000				
Nearest Surface Water Body (From Plume Boundary)		100		F. H. T.		
≤ 250 Feet	ПП	Yes				
	-					
Unknown		Yes				
> 250 Feet and ≤ 1,000 Feet		Yes				

CSM Minimum Required Information			
Has the minimum required information listed below been provided in the CSM for evaluation of case compliance with Media Specific Criteria for Groundwater?	☐ Yes	■ No	
Sufficient data been presented to demonstrate that site characterization activities have defined the horizontal and vertical extent of the plume?	Yes	■ No	□NA
Demonstration of plume stability using a valid technical analysis that considers the accuracy of data from the wells, well placement within the plum, and changes in horizontal and vertical extent of the plume?	☐ Yes	■ No	□NA
Evaluation of factors such as seasonal variability, water level changes, sampling methods, well construction, and other factors that can affect data quality?	☐ Yes	■ No	□NA
A recent well survey that uses all available well information from both the Department of Water Resources and local agencies (Zone 7 Water Agency of Alameda County Public Works as appropriate)?	Yes	■ No	□NA
The location of surface water bodies and water supply wells located within 2,000 feet of the site presented on a site figure with benzene and MTBE isoconcentration contours?	Yes	■ No	□NA
A table identifying each water supply well along with the well construction details?	Yes	■ No	□NA
A discussion of surface water bodies within 2,000 feet of the site and details on hydraulic connection with the groundwater plume?	Yes	■ No	□NA
A discussion of current and reasonable anticipated near-term future scenarios at the site and in the vicinity of the site and possible Land Use Restrictions?	Yes	■ No	□NA
	☐ Yes	☐ No	□NA
	Yes	□ No	□NA
	Yes	□ No	□NA
	Yes	☐ No	□NA
	Yes	☐ No	□NA
(Refer to Att. 1 - CSM Detailed Evaluation Checklist for Identifica	ation of Data	a Gaps)	

Case Notes	
On page 18 the Benzene concentration "Yes" should not be checked. On page 18 the Nearest Surface Water Body "Unknown" should not be checked.	
***End of Groundwater Criteria Evaluation***	

Does the site meet one of the three petroleum vapor intrusion to indoor air specific criteria (a, b, or c), <u>or</u> qualify for the active commercial fueling facility exemption?	] ≣S	NO
LTCP Statement: "Exposure to petroleum vapors migrating from soil or groundwater to indepose unacceptable human health risks. This policy describes conditions, including bioattenut which if met will assure that exposure to petroleum vapors in indoor air will not pose unacceptisks. In many petroleum release cases, potential human exposures to vapors are not bioattenuation processes as vapors migrate toward the ground surface. For the purposes of the term "bioattenuation zone" means an area of soil with conditions that support biodecontrolleum hydrocarbon vapors.	ation zo table h nitigate this se	ones, lealth d by ction,
The low-threat vapor-intrusion criteria described below apply to sites where the release ori impacted or potentially impacted adjacent parcels when:	ginated	d and
(1) existing buildings are occupied or may be reasonably expected to be occupied in the futu	re, <u>or</u>	
(2) buildings for human occupancy are reasonably expected to be constructed in the future.		
Appendices 1 through 4 (attached) illustrate four potential exposure scenarios an characteristics and criteria associated with each scenario. Petroleum release sites shall satisfy specific criteria for petroleum vapor intrusion to indoor air and be considered low-threat for intrusion-to-indoor-air pathway if:	the mr	edia- apor-
<ul> <li>Site-specific conditions at the release site satisfy all of the characteristics and criteria of through 3 as applicable, or all of the characteristics and criteria of scenario 4 as applicable</li> </ul>	e; <u>or</u>	
<ul> <li>A site-specific risk assessment for the vapor intrusion pathway is conducted and demor human health is protected to the satisfaction of the regulatory agency; or</li> </ul>		
c. As a result of controlling exposure through the use of mitigation measures or through institutional or engineering controls, the regulatory agency determines that petrole migrating from soil or groundwater will have no significant risk of adversely affecting huma	eum va	apors
Exception: Exposures to petroleum vapors associated with historical fuel system recomparatively insignificant relative to exposures from small surface spills and fugitive vapor retypically occur at active fueling facilities. Therefore, satisfaction of the media-specific criteria for vapor intrusion to indoor air is not required at active commercial petroleum fueling facilities cases where release characteristics can be reasonably believed to pose an unacceptable heal	eleases or petro s, exce	that leum ept in
Does the site qualify for an EXEMPTION from the Petroleum Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air criteria (i.e., the site is an active commercial petroleum fueling facility?	Yes	No
Are release characteristics reasonably believed to pose an unacceptable health risk to facility users or nearby facilities?		
a. Do site-specific conditions at the release site satisfy all of the characteristics and criteria of scenarios 1 through 3 as applicable, <u>or</u> all of the characteristics and criteria of scenario 4?	☐ Yes	□ No
Scenario 1: Unweathered LNAPL in groundwater       Yes       No         Scenario 2: Unweathered LNAPL in soil       Yes       No         Scenario 3: Dissolved benzene concentrations in groundwater (oxygen ≥ 4%)       Yes       No		
Scenario 4: Dissolved phase benzene concentrations in groundwater (oxygen < Yes No		
(Refer to Next Page for Scenario 1 through 4 Characteristics) 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
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
(Media Specific Criteria for Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air Evaluation Continued on Next Pa	ge)	

Scenario 1: Unweathered LNAPL in Groundwater				
The bioattenuation zone is a continuous zone provides a separation of at least 30 feet vertically between the LNAPL in groundwater and the foundation of existing or potential buildings and	Ye	s No	NI	E 🖪 NA
Total TPH (TPH-g and TPH-d combined) are less than 100 mg/k hroughout the entire depth of the bioattenuation zone	g  Ye	s No	D I NI	E □NA
Scenario 2: Unweathered LNAPL in Soil				
The bioattenuation zone is a continuous zone that provides a separation of at least 30 feet vertically between the LNAPL in solute the foundation of existing or potential buildings; and	∏ Ye	s No	D   NI	E NA
otal TPH (TPH-g and TPH-d combined) are <100 mg/kg hroughout the entire lateral and vertical extent of the pioattenuation zone	Ye	s No	D I NI	E NA
Scenario 3: Dissolved Phase Benzene Concentrations in Gro	a un divinta			
Sites without oxygen data or where oxygen is <4% and Denzene concentrations < 100 µg/l (Figure A)	Yes	□No	■ NE	□ NA
The bioattenuation zone is a continuous zone that provides a eparation of at least 5 feet vertically between the dissolved shase benzene and the foundation of existing or potential buildings; and	Yes	No	■ NE	□NA
Contains total TPH (TPH-g and TPH-d combined) < 100 mg/kg proughout the entire depth of the bioattenuation zone	Yes	□No	■ NE	□NA
sites without oxygen data or where oxygen is <4% and enzene concentrations ≥ 100 μg/L but < 1,000 μg/L (Figure B)	Yes	□No	• NE	□NA
The bioattenuation zone is a continuous zone that provides a eparation of at least 10 feet vertically between the dissolved hase benzene and the foundation of existing or potential uildings	Yes	No	■ NE	□NA
Sites with oxygen ≥ 4% and benzene concentrations < 1,000 g/L (Figure C)	Yes	□No	• NE	□NA
continuous zone that provides a separation of at least 10 feet ertically between the dissolved phase benzene and the bundation of existing or potential buildings	Yes	□ No	■ NE	□NA
Contains total TPH (TPH-g and TPH-d combined) < 100 mg/kg proughout the entire depth of the bioattenuation zone	Yes	□ No	• NE	□NA

lo Bioattenuation Zone)				
		- No	LINE	LINA
Were soil gas samples obtained from the required locations?	Yes	No	• NE	□ NA
Beneath or adjacent to an existing building: Soil gas	Yes	□No	• NE	ПNА
samples collected at least 5 feet below the bottom of the				
building foundation				
Future construction: Soil gas samples from at least five feet	Yes	☐ No	■ NE	☐ NA
below ground surface				1.25
Were soil gas samples collected in accordance with DTSC	Yes	No	■ NE	☐ NA
Advisory with DTSC Advisory – Active Soil Gas				
Investigations (April 2012)?				
Ave all of the following suitoric for a bigottomosticu	I Vac	INIO	• NE	LINIA
Are <u>all of the following criteria</u> for a bioattenuation zone satisfied?	Yes	No	I INE	□ NA
There is a minimum of five vertical feet of soil between the soil	Yes	□No	• NE	ΠNA
vapor measurements and the foundation of an existing building				
or ground surface of future construction; and				
TPH (TPHg + TPHd) is less than 100 mg/kg (measured in at	Yes	No	• NE	□NA
least two depths within the five-foot zone; and				
Oxygen is ≥ 4% measured at the bottom of the five-foot zone	Yes	□No	■ NE	☐ NA
If the bioattenuation zone criteria are all satisfied, then	Yes	☐ No	■ NE	☐ NA
do soil gas concentrations meet the following criteria?				
Residential	Yes	No	• NE	☐ NA
Benzene <85,000 μg/m <sup>3</sup>	Yes	□ No	NE NE	□ NA
Ethylbenzene <1,100,000 µg/m³	Yes	No	• NE	NA NA
Napthalene <93,000 μg/m <sup>3</sup>	Yes Yes	No No	• NE	NA NA
Commercial	Yes	No	• NE	NA NA
Benzene <280,000 μg/m³ Ethylbenzene <3,600,000 μg/m³	Yes	No	• NE	H NA
Napthalene <310,000 μg/m³	Yes	No	• NE	NA
Napthalene 15 10,000 μg/m				
If the bioattenuation zone criteria are not satisfied, then	Yes	No	• NE	□ NA
do soil gas concentrations meet the following criteria?				
Residential	Yes	No	NE NE	☐ NA
Benzene <85 µg/m³	☐ Yes	☐ No	■ NE	☐ NA
Ethylbenzene <1,100 μg/m³	Yes	☐ No	■ NE	☐ NA
Napthalene <93 μg/m³	Yes	☐ No	■ NE	☐ NA
Commercial	Yes	☐ No	■ NE	☐ NA
Benzene <280 μg/m³	Yes	No	• NE	☐ NA
Ethylbenzene <3,600 µg/m³	Yes	No	• NE	□ NA
Napthalene <310 μg/m³	Yes	☐ No	■ NE	☐ NA

Additional questions for sites that do not meet the LTCP Criteria (a,	b, or c):	
		Montelle
Soil Gas Samples		
Insufficient number to be representative		Yes
Temporal variability not evaluated		Yes
No soil gas samples	<b>D</b>	Yes
Taken incorrectly		Yes
Not taken at two depths within 5 foot zone		Yes
High spatial or temporal variability		Yes
Insufficient analytes		Yes
Exposure Type		
Residential		Yes
Commercial		Yes
Free Product		
In groundwater	- Instruction -	Yes
In soil		Yes
Unknown		Yes
TPH in the Bioattenuation Zone		
< 5 feet (No Biozone)		Yes
≥ 5 feet and < 10 feet		Yes
≥ 10 feet and < 30 feet		Yes
≥ 30 Feet		Yes
30 Feet BioZone compromised (TPH>100 μg/L)		Yes
Unknown	п '	Yes
Oxygen Data in Bioattenuation Zone		
No oxygen data		Yes
Oxygen < 4%		Yes
Oxygen ≥ 4%		Yes
Benzene in Groundwater		
≥ 100 µg/L and < 1,000 µg/L		Yes
≥ 1,000 µg/L		Yes
Unknown		Yes
Soil Gas Benzene		7-3
≥ 85 µg/m³ and < 280 µg/m³		Yes
≥ 280 µg/m³ and < 85,000 µg/m³		Yes
≥ 85,000 µg/m³ and < 280,000 µg/m³		Yes
$\geq$ 280,000 µg/m <sup>3</sup>		
Unknown		Yes
Soil Gas Ethylbenzene		
≥ 1,100 µg/m <sup>3</sup> and < 3,600 µg/m <sup>3</sup>		Yes
≥ 3,600 µg/m³ and < 1,100,000 µg/m³		Yes
≥ 1,100,000 μg/m³ and < 3,600,000		Yes
≥ 3,600,000 µg/m³		Yes
Unknown		Yes
Soil Gas Napthalene		
≥ 93 μg/m³ and < 310 μg/m³		Yes
≥ 310 µg/m³ and < 93,000 µg/m³		Yes
≥ 93,000 μg/m³ and < 310,000 μg/m³		Yes
≥ 310,000 µg/m³		Yes
Unknown		

Has the minimum required information listed below been provided in the CSM for evaluation of case compliance with the Media Specific Criteria for Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air?	☐ Yes	■ No	
Sufficient data to demonstrate that site characterization is complete and that the data demonstrate that the site-specific conditions satisfy all the assumptions, characteristics, and screening criteria of scenarios 1 through 3, or all the assumptions, characteristics, and screening criteria of scenario 4?	☐ Yes	■ No	□N
Evidence of unweathered LNAPL in soil or groundwater?	☐ Yes	■ No	
Soil data to demonstrate that total TPH concentrations (TPH-g and TPH-d combined) in soil are < 100 mg/kg throughout the specified bioattenuation zone depth?	Yes	□ No	□ N/
Depth of foundation of existing or potential buildings?	☐ Yes	■ No	□ N/
Soil gas data to demonstrate that a continuous bioattenuation zone is or is not present?	Yes	■ No	□ N
Concentrations of benzene in groundwater?	• Yes	☐ No	□ N/
Oxygen data in the bioattenuation zone?	Yes	■ No	□ N
Results and evaluation of preferential pathway and utility conduit surveys o determine whether a continuous bioattenuation zone is present?	Yes	■ No	□ N
Evaluation of data representativeness, quality, spatial distribution, and emporal variability relative to current or potential receptors and sources?	Yes	☐ No	■ N
Evaluation to assess whether nearby facilities potentially may be impacted by petroleum vapor intrusion?	Yes	■ No	□ N
Sufficient data to demonstrate that through the use of mitigation measures or institutional controls, exposure to petroleum vapors migrating from soil or groundwater will have no significant risk of adversely affecting human nealth?	Yes	■ No	□ N
9	Yes	□No	□ N
	Yes	☐ No	□ N
	Yes	☐ No	□ N
8	Yes	☐ No	□ N
	Yes	☐ No	□ N

ase Notes				
				F. 3
	nd of Vapor Intru	P.		

nha /he	<b>EP Statement:</b> "This policy describes conditions where dire lation of contaminants volatized to outdoor air poses a low re human exposure may occur satisfy the media-specific crosure and shall be considered low-threat if they meet <u>any</u> or	threat to h iteria for d	uman hea irect conta	lth. Releas	e sites
a.	Maximum concentrations of petroleum constituents in soil Table 1 for the specified depth below ground surface (bgs) feet bgs protect from ingestion of soil, dermal contact with emissions and inhalation of particulate emissions. The 5 to protect from inhalation of volatile soil emissions. Both the 0 the 5 to 10 feet bgs concentration limits for the appropriate Commercial/Industrial) shall be satisfied. In addition, if exp trench workers is reasonably anticipated, the concentration satisfied; or	on the condition of the	centration nhalation of gs concen bgs conce ification (Fountion of the construction)	limits for 0 of volatile s tration limit entration lim Residential n workers o	to 5 oil is nits and or or utility
b.	Maximum concentration of petroleum constituents in soil a risk assessment demonstrates will have no significant risk				
c.	As a result of controlling exposure through the use of mitig institutional or engineering controls, the regulatory agency petroleum constituents in soil will have no significant risk o	determine	s that the	concentrat	ions of
хр	s the site qualify for an EXEMPTION from Direct Contac osure Criteria (i.e., is the upper 10 feet of soil free of pe		tdoor Air	□Yes	□No
xp on th	osure Criteria (i.e., is the upper 10 feet of soil free of pe tamination)? e site does not qualify for the exemption, then does the lia-specific criteria (a, b, <u>or</u> c) for direct contact and out	troleum site satis		☐ Yes	
xp on th ned xp	osure Criteria (i.e., is the upper 10 feet of soil free of pe tamination)? e site does not qualify for the exemption, then does the	troleum site satis			
th ned xpo	osure Criteria (i.e., is the upper 10 feet of soil free of petamination)? e site does not qualify for the exemption, then does the lia-specific criteria (a, b, or c) for direct contact and out osure?  Are maximum concentrations of petroleum constituents in soil less than or equal to those listed in Table 1 for the	troleum site satis door air	afy the		□ No

### Maximum Concentrations of Petroleum Constituents in Soil (Scenario a)

### Table 1 – Concentrations of Petroleum Constituents in Soil That will Have No Significant Risk of Adversely Affecting Human Health

	Resi	dential	tial Commercial/Industrial Utility		Utility Worker
Chemical	0 to 5 ft bgs (mg/kg)	5 to 10 ft bgs (mg/kg)	0 to 5 ft bgs (mg/kg)	5 to 10 ft bgs (mg/kg)	0 to 10 ft bgs (mg/kg)
Benzene	1.9	2.8	8.2	12	14
Max Soil Conc <sup>1</sup>	U.bb/nsert	U.Z.I Insert	U.b\pnsert	U.Z/Insert	U.bb/nsert
Ethylbenzene	21	32	89	134	314
Max Soil Conc <sup>1</sup>	U.12Insert	U.Ub4nsert	U.T4nsert	U.Ubfhsert	U.12Insert
Napthalene	9.7	9.7	45	45	219
Max Soil Conc <sup>1</sup>	Insert	Insert	Insert	Insert	Insert
PAH	0.063	NA	0.68	NA	4.5
Max Soil Conc <sup>1</sup>	Insert	Insert	Insert	Insert	Insert

#### Notes:

- The <u>maximum concentrations of petroleum constituents in soil</u> should be compared to those listed in Table 1 (Technical Justification for Soil Screening Levels for Direct Contact and Outdoor Air Exposure Pathways, SWRCB)
- Based on the seven carcinogenic poly-aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) as benzo(a)pyrene toxicity equivalent [BaPe]. Sampling and analysis for PAHs is only necessary where soil is affected by either waste oil or Bunker C oil.

Are both the 0 to 5 feet bgs concentration li concentration limits for the appropriate site				Yes	□ No	■ NE
Residential: 0 to 5 feet bgs	Yes	☐ No	☐ NE			
Residential: 5 to 10 feet bgs	Yes	☐ No	☐ NE			
Commercial/Industrial: 0 to 5 feet bgs	Yes	No	☐ NE			
Commercial/Industrial: 5 to 10 feet bgs	Yes	☐ No	☐ NE			
If exposure to construction or utility trench anticipated, are the concentration limits for satisfied?	the Utility	Worker		Yes	□No	■ NE
Have the requirements for using the screen satisfied (i.e., have the model assumptions document entitled "Technical Justification for Direct Contact and Outdoor Air Exposur	presented for Soil Sc	in the S\ reening l	NRCB Levels	☐ Yes	□ No	• NE
Is the area of impacted soil where a particular exposure occurs ≤ 82 feet by 82 feet?	Yes	□No	□NE			
Is the receptor located at the downgradient edge for inhalation exposure?	☐ Yes	□No	□NE			
Is the wind speed < 2.25 meters per second (7.38 feet per second) on average?	Yes	□No	□NE			
Are there different exposure scenarios than residential, commercial/industrial, utility worker) at the site?	Yes	□No	□ NE		2	

KEY: NE = Identified Data Gap - Needs Further Evaluation NA = Not Applicable

(LTCP Media Specific Criteria for Direct Contact and Outdoor Air Exposure Evaluation Continued on Next Page)

Additional Questions FOR Sites That Do Not Meet the LTCP Criteria	
Indicate only those conditions that do not meet the Direct Contact and Outdoor Air scenarios:	Exposure
Exposure Type:	
Residential	Yes
Commercial	Yes
Utility Worker	Yes
Petroleum Constituents in Soil:	
≤ 5 feet bgs	Yes
> 5 feet bgs and ≤ 10 feet bgs	Yes
Unknown	Yes
Soil Concentrations of Benzene:	TETTES
> 1.9 mg/kg and ≤ 2.8 mg/kg	Yes
> 2.8 mg/kg and ≤ 8.2 mg/kg	Yes
> 8.2 mg/kg and ≤ 12 mg/kg	Yes
> 12 mg/kg and ≤ 14 mg/kg	1 1 1 1 2 3
> 12 mg/kg and 3 14 mg/kg > 14 mg/kg	Yes
Unknown	• Yes
Soil Concentrations of Ethylbenzene:	1-1165
> 21 mg/kg and ≤ 32 mg/kg	Yes
> 32 mg/kg and ≤ 89 mg/kg	Yes
	Yes
> 89 mg/kg and ≤ 134 mg/kg	
> 134 mg/kg and ≤ 314 mg/kg	Yes
> 314 mg/kg	Yes
Unknown	■ Yes
Soil Concentrations of Naphthalene:	
> 9.7 mg/kg and ≤ 45 mg/kg	Yes
> 45 mg/kg and ≤ 219 mg/kg	Yes
> 219 mg/kg	Yes
Unknown	■ Yes
Soil Concentrations of PAH:	
> 0.063 mg/kg and ≤ 0,68 mg/kg	Yes
> 0.68 mg/kg and ≤ 4.5 mg/kg	Yes
> 4.5 mg/kg	Yes
Unknown	
Area of Impacted Soil:	
Area of Impacted Soil > 82 by 82 Feet	Yes
Unknown	■ Yes
This case should be closed in spite of <u>not</u> meeting policy criteria:	Yes
	Syl
List Reasons:	
	0.00
	NAME OF TAXABLE PARTY.

Has the minimum required information listed below been provided in the CSM for evaluation of case compliance with following Media Specific Criteria for Direct Contact and Outdoor Air Exposure?	☐ Yes	□ No	
Sufficient data to demonstrate that site characterization is complete for the prescribed depth ranges of 0 to 5 feet and 5 to 10 feet bgs in order to assess potential direct contact and outdoor air exposure?	■ Yes	□ No	□ N
Figures and tables showing the soil data for each of the prescribed depth ranges with a comparison to the screening levels for each exposure scenario?	Yes	■ No	□ N
Analytical data for all chemicals of concern including total petroleum hydrocarbons in order and an assessment of whether unique conditions not considered in the Policy may exist at the site?	Yes	■ No	□ N
Evaluation of data for data representativeness, quality, spatial distribution relative to current or potential receptors and sources, and temporal variability?	Yes	■ No	□ N
Description of the current and expected future land use, redevelopment, or construction for the site?	Yes	■ No	□ N
	Yes	□ No	□ N
	Yes	□No	□ N
	Yes	☐ No	□ N
	Yes	□No	□ N
	Yes	☐ No	□ N
	Yes	☐ No	□ N/
	Yes	☐ No	□ N
	Yes	☐ No	□ N/
	Yes	□No	□ N
	Yes	☐ No	□ N/
	Yes	□No	□ N/

Direct Contact and Outdoor Air Exposure: Case Notes	
On page 29 the Soil Concentration of Benzene Unknown "Yes" should not be checked. On page 29 the Soil Concentration of Ethylbenzene Unknown "Yes" should not be checked.	
,	