

**State Water Resources Control Board**

**REVIEW SUMMARY REPORT – ADDITIONAL WORK  
FOURTH REVIEW – JUNE 2017**

**Case Information**

Cleanup Fund (Fund) Claim No.: 14228	GeoTracker Global ID: T0600101043
Site Name: Palace Garage	Address (Site): 14336 Washington Ave San Leandro, CA 94578
Responsible Parties (RP): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jeffery &amp; Dolores Kerry ETAL Attn: Jeffery and Dolores Kerry</li> <li>MF Donnelly TR &amp; Kerry Jeff &amp; Dolore ETAL Attn: Morris and Lucia Donnelly</li> </ul>	Address (RP): Private Residences
Fund Expenditures to Date: \$494,088	Number of Years Case Open: 26
Fund Budget Category: VM – Verification Monitoring	

**Agency Information**

Agency Name: Alameda County Environmental Health Department (County)	Address: 1131 Harbor Bay Parkway, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor Alameda, CA 94502-6777
Agency Caseworker: Mark Detterman	Case No.: RO0000208

**Consultant History**

Consultant: Innovex Signatory: Thomas Sparrowe, PG	Years: 2008 – Present Office Phone: (925) 566-8567
Consultant: PSI Signatory: Brand Burfield, RG	Years: 2002 – 2003 Office Phone: (510) 434-9200
Consultant: ALLCAL Environmental Signatory: John V. Mrakovich, PhD, RG	Years: 1999 – 2000 Office Phone: Not Available

This Review Summary Report is based on documents available in GeoTracker. To view the public documents for this case available in GeoTracker, use the following URL:

[http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile\\_report.asp?global\\_id=T0600101043](http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report.asp?global_id=T0600101043)

**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 does not meet all of the required criteria of the Policy. Highlights of the case follow:

The Site is a 6,000 square foot auto repair facility that formerly utilized a petroleum fueling system. An unauthorized release was reported in February 1991 following the removal of one gasoline UST. An unknown volume of affected soil was reportedly excavated to a depth between 18 and 20

feet below ground surface (bgs) and disposed offsite, during the UST removal. Dual-phase extraction was conducted for 44 hours in 2012, which removed 104 pounds of total petroleum hydrocarbons as gasoline (TPHg) and 4,320 gallons of affected groundwater. In May 2015, approximately 420 tons of affected soil were excavated to 16 feet bgs and disposed offsite in order to address potential soil vapor intrusion to indoor air. Active remediation has not been conducted at the Site since May 2015. Since 2000, six groundwater monitoring wells have been installed and regularly monitored. According to groundwater data, water quality objectives (WQOs) have been achieved or nearly achieved.

The petroleum release is limited to the soil and shallow groundwater. According to information available in GeoTracker, there are no public water supply wells or surface water bodies within 1,000 feet of the projected plume boundary. According to the Sensitive Receptor Survey (Closure Solutions, 2008), the nearest existing supply wells are two industrial supply wells, both 450 feet upgradient to the northeast from the Site. According to GeoTracker, there are no nearby or impacted wells. The unauthorized release is located within the service area of a public water system, as defined in the Policy. The affected groundwater is not currently being used as a source of drinking water, and it is highly unlikely that the affected groundwater will be used as a source of drinking water in the foreseeable future. Other designated beneficial uses of impacted groundwater are not threatened, and it is highly unlikely that they will be, considering these factors in the context of the Site setting. Remaining petroleum hydrocarbon constituents are limited 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 under current conditions.

## **Rationale for Closure under the Policy**

### **General Criteria**

The case meets all eight Policy general criteria.

### **Media-Specific Criteria**

- Groundwater Media-Specific Criteria – Site does not meet the Media-Specific Criteria for Groundwater. The plume that exceeds water quality objectives is not stable or decreasing in the areal extent. The two most recent groundwater samples collected from far downgradient wells MW-5 and MW-3 exceeded the water quality objective for benzene, despite historical results below detection limits.
- Petroleum Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air – Site meets **Criteria 2 (c)**. As a result of controlling exposure through the use of mitigation measures or through the use of institutional or engineering controls, the regulatory agency determined that petroleum vapors migrating from soil or groundwater will have no significant risk of adversely affecting human health.
- Direct Contact and Outdoor Air Exposure – Site meets **Criteria 3 (a)**. Maximum concentrations of petroleum constituents in soil from confirmation soil samples are less than or equal to those listed in Table 1 of the Policy.

**Status Update**


In email communications on June 2, 2017 between the State Water Board staff and the County staff the following statements were agreed upon.

The County will add known private water wells in GeoTracker using the "other" well designation. The County will direct the Responsible Party to continue sampling monitoring wells for plume stability. Considering years of historical groundwater analytical results below detection, the recent concentrations of benzene in downgradient monitoring wells MW-3 and MW-5 indicate that the projected plume attenuates to below water quality objectives near these locations. Additional work to delineate the plume downgradient to the southwest is not necessary at this time; therefore, sampling the private wells that were discovered during the most recent Sensitive Receptor Survey is not required. Because the plume is projected to attenuate to below water quality objectives near the downgradient monitoring wells and another petroleum distribution facility is located just downgradient of monitoring wells MW-3 and MW-5, groundwater analytical data from distant private wells would not be a representative characterization of this unauthorized release; thus, sampling of the private wells is not considered necessary. If groundwater sample results from monitoring wells MW-3, MW-4, and MW-5 display a consistent decreasing trend in future sampling events, reevaluation of Site closure using the Policy is required.


The recommended future Fund budget category for this claim is:

VM – Verification Monitoring.



  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Galvin Kauffman  
Engineering Geologist  
Technical Unit IV  
(916) 322-9685

6-5-17  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Pat G. Cullen, PG #4932  
Senior Engineering Geologist  
Chief, Technical Unit III  
(916) 341-5684

6/5/17  
Date