MURRAY M. SINCLAIR & ASSOCIATES Murray M. Sinclair (State Bar No. 150389)	
murray@murraysinclairlaw.com	
Los Angeles, CA 90067	
Facsimile: (424) 307-8383	
Attorneys for Aggrieved Party	
Sinclair Properties I, LLC and Sinclair Retail Associates, LLC, dba	
F&H Sinclair Properties	
BEFORE THE STATE WATER R	RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD
In the Matter of Appeal of Investigative Order of Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control	Via Electronic Submission
Board to Provide Work Plans for Indoor Air,	
and Remedial Action Plan	PETITION FOR REVIEW AND REQUEST FOR STAY OF ORDER;
	DECLARATION OF MURRAY M. SINCLAIR IN SUPPORT OF REQUEST
	FOR STAY OF ORDER
	[California Water Code §13320;
	CCR Title 23, §2050]
1	
	Murray M. Sinclair (State Bar No. 150389) murray@murraysinclairlaw.com 2029 Century Park East, Suite 400 Los Angeles, CA 90067 Telephone: (310) 826-2700 Facsimile: (424) 307-8383 Attorneys for Aggrieved Party Sinclair Properties I, LLC and Sinclair Retail Associates, LLC, dba F&H Sinclair Properties BEFORE THE STATE WATER R In the Matter of Appeal of Investigative Order of Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board to Provide Work Plans for Indoor Air, Soil, Soil Vapor and Groundwater Investigations

Pursuant to Section 13320 of California Water Code and Section 2050 of Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), SINCLAIR PROPERTIES I, LLC and SINCLAIR RETAIL ASSOCIATES, LLC, dba F&H SINCLAIR PROPERTIES (collectively, "F&H" or "Petitioner"), as a person aggrieved by an action of a Regional Board, petitions the State Water Resources Control Board ("SWRCB" or "State Board") to review and vacate a directive of February 22, 2024 (the "Order") of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board for the Los Angeles Region ("Regional Board"), which ordered certain responsible parties, JI-YUNG YOU, aka JOHN JI-YUNG YOU, and NAM WHA YOU, aka NANCY NAM WHA YOU (the "YOU'S"), doing business as Golden Glo Cleaners, to prepare and submit to the Regional Board two work plans and a remedial action plan pursuant to the following requirements and time line:

- "1. By March 31, 2024, submit a workplan to collect additional indoor samples as noted in the OEHHA Memorandum, dated February 7, 2024, and prepare an update to the Site's human health risk assessment incorporating an age sensitivity factor in the risk estimation to address OEHHA's comments (see attached memo).
- "2. By April 30, 2024, submit a workplan to complete additional soil, soil vapor, and groundwater investigation to complete the vertical and lateral delineation of the subsurface impact.
 - "3. By September 31, 2024, submit a remedial action plan (RAP) to propose remedial measures to address the soil, soil vapor and groundwater impacts onsite and offsite, in accordance with the State Water Resources Control Board Resolution 92-49, Policies and Procedures for Investigation and Cleanup and Abatement of Discharges under Water Code Section 13304. Per State Board Resolution 92-49, dischargers are required to cleanup and abate the effects of discharges in a manner that promotes attainment of either background water quality or the best water quality which is reasonable if background levels of water quality cannot be restored.

The above directives issued by the Regional Board apply to certain commercial real property owned by the You's, located at 10555 West Pico Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90064 (the

"Golden Glo" Site or the "Polluting Site") which has been impacted by hazardous substances and hazardous wastes ("Pollution") caused by hazardous releases at the Polluting Site by dry cleaning operations conducted by John Ji-Yung You and other operators of the facility over a period of more than 70 years. After this Pollution was released at the Golden Glo Site, the Pollution migrated through the soil and/or groundwater onto certain immediately adjacent commercial property owned by F&H, located at 10561 West Pico Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90064 (the "F&H Property"). F&H discovered the Pollution when performing due diligence activities in 2017 in advance of entering into a commercial lease with a new tenant at that time.

The Regional Board's Order is inappropriate and improper for the following reasons:

- 1. The Order is impracticable to implement and impossible of accomplishment in light of the fact that the Responsible Parties, who previously qualified for a grant (No. SC066) funded by the Site Cleanup Subaccount Program (SCAP) of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), Division of Financial Assistance (DFA), based on the Responsible Parties' inability to pay, are incapable of complying with the Order unless the SCAP Fund reauthorizes the You's' further request for financial assistance. As such, the Order violates State Board Resolution No. 92-49, as codified by California Water Code Section 13307, which requires representatives of the Regional Water Boards who oversee investigations and cleanup and abatement activities resulting from discharges of hazardous substances to take into account, to the extent possible, the financial resources available to the person responsible for the discharge when determining reasonable schedules for investigation and cleanup, abatement, or other remedial action at a site.
- 2. The Order violates State Board Resolution No. 2023-0011 (the "Resolution"), as "additional grant funding is required" (6 on p. 3) and, despite having been designated as not fundable, the Golden Glo site should be added to the fundable list because "the project is at a critical juncture and continued funding would allow continued interim remedial measures or cost-effective near-term corrective action, to protect human health and the environment," and "additional equity information may support re-scoring for the project." (Resolution 6 on p. 5)

1 Therefore, Petitioner requests that the State Board vacate, or in the alternative, revise the 2 requirements of the Order so that the Order will be suspended or continued until the Responsible 3 Parties are placed back onto the current SCAP funding list, and that the Deputy Director exercise 4 his or her discretion to place the You's back on the list at the earliest opportunity. (See Declaration 5 of Murray M. Sinclair in Support of Request for Stay of Order) 6 The issues raised in this petition were raised in a prior Draft Petition, accompanied by 7 correspondence, directed to Regional Board Case Manager Paul Cho and Regional Board Executive 8 Officer Susana Arredondo on March 4, 2024, which requested a telephone conference or Zoom-9 styled meeting with Regional Board staff and counsel. As detailed below, the Zoom conference 10 took place on March 19, 2024, in advance of the 30 day deadline for filing this Petition. In the 11 conference, Petitioner requested that the Regional Board stay the Order and assist Petitioner in 12 lobbying the State Board to place the Golden Glo Site back on the current SCAP funding list 13 because the project is at a critical juncture. Although the Regional Board representatives concurred 14 regarding Petitioner's critical juncture opinion, they refused to either stay the order or assist 15 Petitioner or the Responsible Parties in any way. 16 1. NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE PETITIONER: 17 SINCLAIR PROPERTIES I, LLC and SINCLAIR RETAIL ASSOCIATES, LLC, 18 dba F&H SINCLAIR PROPERTIES (collectively, "F&H"), owners of adjacent 19 property located at 10561 West Pico Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90064. 20 Please provide a copy of all materials related to this matter to counsel for F&H: 21 MURRAY M. SINCLAIR & ASSOCIATES Murray M. Sinclair 22 murray@murraysinclairlaw.com 2029 Century Park East, Suite 400 23 Los Angeles, CA 90067 24 Telephone: (310) 826-2700 Facsimile: (424) 307-8383 25 //// 26 //// 27 //// 28

PETITION FOR REVIEW AND REQUEST FOR STAY OF ORDER

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	

1. The Order is impracticable to implement and impossible of accomplishment in light of the fact that the Responsible Parties, who previously qualified for a grant (No. SC066) funded by the Site Cleanup Subaccount Program (SCAP) of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), Division of Financial Assistance (DFA), based on the Responsible Parties' inability to pay, are incapable of complying with the Order unless the SCAP Fund reauthorizes the You's' further request for financial assistance. In this regard, on or about May 5, 2023, the You's received notice that their SCAP project had been excluded from the 2023-2024 Fundable List. As such, the Order violates State Board Resolution No. 92-49, as codified by California Water Code Section 13307, which requires representatives of the Regional Water Boards who oversee investigations and cleanup and abatement activities resulting from discharges of hazardous substances to take into account, to the extent possible, the financial resources available to the person responsible for the discharge when determining reasonable schedules for investigation and cleanup, abatement, or other remedial action at a site. In this instance, the Regional Board knew already that an official determination had been made that the Responsible Parties were unable to fund investigation and cleanup activities at the Golden Glo site, and yet on the eve of the expiration of the Responsible Parties' grant under the SCAP Fund, the Regional Board ordered said parties to perform new work which will cost hundreds of thousands of dollars, if not more. This work is critically important, but will never take place unless the grant is extended.

2. The Order violates State Board Resolution No. 2023-0011 (the "Resolution"), as "additional grant funding is required" (6 on p. 3) and, despite having been designated as not fundable, the Golden Glo site should be added to the fundable list because "the project is at a critical juncture and continued funding would allow continued interim remedial measures or cost-effective near-term corrective action, to protect human health and the environment," and "additional equity information may support re-scoring for the project." (Resolution 6 on p. 5)

Petitioner submits that the Responsible Parties have provided ample information and reports to the Deputy Director of the Division to enable the Deputy Director to exercise his or her

28

20

21

22

23

24

25

discretion, as allowed under the Resolution, to add the Golden Glo Site back onto the fundable list.
In this regard, the Resolution requires the Deputy Director to consider, evaluate and give certain
deference to "whether a project previously has received SCAP funding" and the "funding
applicant's timely and responsive provision of documentation required by the Division" in deciding
whether to reconsider placing a prior recipient of funds back onto the current funding list.
(Resolution 4 on p. 4)

Therefore, Petitioner requests that the State Board vacate, or in the alternative, revise the requirements of the Order so that the Order will be suspended or continued until the Responsible Parties are placed back onto the current SCAP funding list, and that the Deputy Director exercise his or her discretion to place the You's back on the list at the earliest opportunity.

The issues raised in this petition were raised in correspondence directed to the Regional Board on March 4, 2024, which was followed by a Zoom conference with Regional Board staff and counsel on March 19, 2024 in which Petitioner requested that the Regional Board reconsider the Order (see detailed explanation below in Section 9 on page 11).

5. THE MANNER IN WHICH THE PETITIONER IS AGGRIEVED.

Petitioner is aggrieved because Petitioner's research has confirmed that numerous dry cleaners have occupied the Golden Glo Property since at least 1945, and that for the vast majority of the time that said dry cleaners have occupied the property, from approximately 1945 until 2019, perchloroethylene ("PCE") was used on the premises as a dry cleaning chemical in all of the permitted dry cleaning machines which have been operated there..

As corroborated by site investigation reports prepared by F&H's environmental consultant, concerning investigations performed in 2017, "the highest concentrations of TCE and PCE were detected in the samples collected along the eastern portion of the subject property near the adjacent dry cleaning facility, and southwest of the dry cleaning facility. . . Based on the locations of the highest detected concentrations, it is likely that the source of the VOC contamination beneath the subject property is the adjacent dry cleaning facility." (See Rincon Phase II Environmental Site

1	Assessment – Additional Assessment, dated February 23, 2017) In addition, Rincon's initial Phase
2	II Environmental Assessment report, dated January 4, 2017, states that the PCE and TCE soil vapor
3	contamination levels discovered on the F&H Property are well above the California Human Health
4	Screening Levels (CHHSLs) established by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
5	(OEHHA) on behalf of Cal/EPA. Further, testing of interior air in the premises of the F&H Property
6	from 2017 through 2018 revealed the presence of PCE in the air inside said premises.
7	To date, Petitioner has incurred more than \$150,000 in response costs and attorneys' fees
8	related to the investigation of the hazardous release(s) at or in the vicinity of the F&H Property.
9	There were no prior uses of PCE or TCE on the F&H Property. As such, based on the data
10	Petitioner has accumulated, there is but one source for the contamination that F&H has discovered:
11	the Golden Glo Property.
12	The Polluting Site and the F&H Property, including, but not limited to, soil and groundwater
13	adjacent to it, is now known to contain hazardous wastes and hazardous substances. These
14	hazardous wastes and substances on the Polluting Site constitute an imminent and substantial
15	endangerment to both human health and the environment and constitute a nuisance. Petitioner fears
16	that if the migrating contamination is not cleaned up in the immediate future, the contamination will
17	jeopardize Petitioner's ability to continue leasing its commercial store front to its present and future
18	tenants. In addition, the F&H Property can neither be sold nor refinanced in its present condition.
19	Further, single family homes in the area are currently being affected and the health of residential
20	inhabitants, invitees and commercial guests visiting the area is in the process of being threatened.
21	6. THE SPECIFIC ACTION BY THE STATE OR REGIONAL BOARD WHICH
22	PETITIONER REQUESTS.
23	The Petitioner seeks an immediate stay of the Order, while the State Board reviews this
24	Petition.
25	Further, the Petitioner seeks the following action:
26	1) The Petitioner respectfully requests that the Board vacate the Order until such time

1	as the State Board places the You's and/or the Golden Glo site back on the eligible funding			
2	list and funds the work required by the Order.			
3	2) Per	titioner requests that the State Board act at the earliest opportunity, based on the		
4	appropriat	e exercise of discretion allowed under the Resolution and the following evidence		
5	presented	by the Responsible Parties (available on the GeoTracker website:		
6	https://geo	stracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report?global_id=T10000012040):		
7	a.	Response to Letter dated May 5, 2023: Submission of additional information		
8		in support of request to add Golden Glo Quality Cleaners to the Fundable Lis		
9		Pursuant to Resolved 6 of Resolution 23-0011, by Rincon Consultants, dated		
10		June 13, 2023;		
11	b.	Response to Letter dated May 5, 2023: Submission of additional information		
12		in support of request to add Golden Glo Quality Cleaners to the Fundable Lis		
13		Pursuant to Resolved 6 of Resolution 23-0011, by William You, dated June		
14		14, 2023;		
15	c.	Limited Feasibility Study and Corrective Action Plan (CAP), dated		
16		December 29, 2023, by Rincon Consultants;		
17	d.	Site Assessment Report – Stage 4 (SAR), dated December 29, 2023, by		
18		Rincon Consultants, Inc.; and		
19	e.	Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA), dated December 22, 2023, by		
20		by Rincon Consultants, Inc.		
21	7. ST	ANDARD OF REVIEW AND LEGAL AUTHORITIES SUPPORTING		
22	AC	CTION BY STATE BOARD		
23	Pursuant t	o California Water Code Section 13320(a), an aggrieved person may petition the		
24	State Board to rev	riew a Regional Board order, within 30 days of such order. The State Board may		
25	find that the actions of a Regional Board were inappropriate or improper and direct the Regional			
26	Board to take the	appropriate action, refer the issue to another state agency with jurisdiction, or take		
27				

Generally, an "aggrieved person" for standing purposes "is one whose rights or interests are injuriously affected by the decision in an immediate and substantial way, and not as a nominal or remote consequence of the decision." *In re K.C.* (2011) 52 Cal.4th 231, 236. F&H clearly qualifies in this regard, as the F&H Property is literally inches away from the Golden Glo site where the hazardous releases originated, and it is beyond dispute that the hazardous contamination originating from the Golden Glo site has migrated, and continues to migrate, onto the F&H Property.

The State Board is not subject to the standards which bind a court, and the scope of the State Board's review is "closer to that of independent review." *In the Matter of the Petition of Exxon Company*, Order No. WQ 85-7, at p. 10. In reviewing a Regional Board action, the State Board shall consider the record before the Regional Board, and any other relevant evidence which it wishes to consider. Water Code Section 13320(b); *In the Matter of the Petition of Exxon Company*, *U.S.A.*, et al. of the Adoption of the Cleanup and Abatement Order No. 85-066, Order No. WQ 85-7, at p. 10. However, any findings made by an administrative agency in support of an action must be based on substantial evidence in the record. (*Id.*, citing *Topanga Association for a Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles* (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506).

This petition was filed by Petitioner, an aggrieved party, within 30 days of the issuance of the Order and is therefore timely filed for review by the State Board. Pursuant to Water Code Section 13320, the State Board should independently review the record and any other materials that it wishes to consider. The State Board should vacate the Order because it is inappropriate and improper, the burden of compliance with the Order is not reasonably related to the benefits of the work plan to be produced, and the Regional Board has not produced evidence that the work plan is necessary.

8. THE PETITION HAS BEEN SENT TO THE APPROPRIATE REGIONAL BOARD AND TO THE RESPONSIBLE PARTIES

A true and correct copy of this Petition and all supporting documentation were sent

1	electronically to:			
2				
3		1)	State Water Resources Control Board	
			Office of Chief Counsel Adrianna M. Crowl	
4			P.O. Box 100	
5			Sacramento, CA 95812-0100	
6			waterqualitypetitions@waterboards.ca.gov	
7		2)	Regional Water Quality Control Board	
,			Los Angeles Region	
8			Susana Arredondo Executive Officer	
9			320 West 4th Street, Suite 200	
			Los Angeles, CA 90013	
10			Susana.Arredondo@waterboards.ca.gov	
11		3)	Regional Water Quality Control Board	
12		,	Los Angeles Region	
12			Mr. Paul Cho, P.G.	
13			Site Cleanup Unit V 320 West 4th Street, Suite 200	
14			Los Angeles, CA 90013	
15			paul.cho@waterboards.ca.gov	
16		4)	William You	
			c/o John Ji Yung You & Nancy Nam Wha You	
17			10182 Maxine Street Ellicott City, MD 21042	
18			wsyou1@gmail.com	
19				
20	9.	A STA	ATEMENT THAT THE ISSUES RAISED IN THE PETITION WERE RAISED	
21		BEFC	ORE THE REGIONAL BOARD, OR AN EXPLANATION OF WHY THE	
22	PETITIONER COULD NOT RAISE THOSE OBJECTIONS BEFORE THE			
23	REGIONAL BOARD.			
24		This P	Petition in draft form was presented to Paul Cho, the Regional Board case manager	
25	respons	sible fo	or oversight activities concerning the Golden Glo site, and Susana Arredondo,	
26	Execut	ive Of	ficer of the Regional Board, at which time the cover letter which accompanied the	
27	draft P	etition	requested a telephone conference or Zoom call to discuss the matter in detail. A Zoom	
20			11	
28	-		PETITION FOR REVIEW AND REQUEST FOR STAY OF ORDER	

_	
2	
3	

call was scheduled for, and took place on, March 19, 2024. The undersigned participated in a 30 minute call on that with Mr. Cho, Bizuayehu Ayele, Senior Engineering Geologist (supervisory) on the project, and Adrianna Nunez, counsel for the Regional Board.

In the course of the March 19, 2024 Zoom call, the undersigned explained the basis for the Petition, including, but not limited to, the fundamental unfairness of encouraging impecunious responsible parties to voluntarily investigate and clean up contaminated properties, but leaving them in the lurch and subject to Draconian orders with which they cannot comply when further State-authorized funding is denied to them, despite having gotten their project to a critical juncture requiring a further phase of work (backed up by data supporting continued remedial action in the professional opinion of the RP's consultant). Although the Regional Board representatives concurred that the project had reached a critical juncture, they refused to contact the State Board to advocate or lobby on the Responsible Party's behalf to have the Golden Glo site reinstated on the SCAP Fund list for further funding. When pressed, the Regional Board representatives offered that an investigative order under Section 13267 of the Water Code or a Cleanup and Abatement Order under Water Code Section 13304 may eventually be issued and an enforcement action pursued if compliance is not forthcoming.

10. CONCLUSION

Petitioner respectfully submits that the issuance of the Order was improper and inappropriate for the following reasons:

1. The Order is impracticable to implement and impossible of accomplishment in light of the fact that the Responsible Parties, who previously qualified for Grant No. SC066 funded by the SWRCB's SCAP Program, Division of Financial Assistance (DFA), based on the Responsible Parties' inability to pay, are incapable of complying with the Order unless the SCAP Fund reauthorizes the You's' further request for financial assistance. As such, the Order violates State Board Resolution No. 92-49, as codified by California Water Code Section 13307, which requires representatives of the Regional Water Boards who oversee investigations and cleanup and

1	abatement activities resulting from discharges of hazardous substances to take into account, to the			
2	extent possible, the financial resources available to the person responsible for the discharge when			
3	determining reasonable schedules for investigation and cleanup, abatement, or other remedial action			
4	at a site.			
5	2. The Order violates State Board Resolution No. 2023-0011 (the "Resolution"), as			
6	"additional grant funding is required" (6 on p. 3) and, despite having been designated as not			
7	fundable, the Golden Glo site should be added to the fundable list because "the project is at a			
8	critical juncture and continued funding would allow continued interim remedial measures or cost-			
9	effective near-term corrective action, to protect human health and the environment," and "additional			
10	equity information may support re-scoring for the project." (Resolution 6 on p. 5)			
11	Therefore, Petitioner requests that the State Board grant this Petition and vacate, or in the			
12	alternative, revise the requirements of the Order so that the Order will be suspended or continued			
13	until the Responsible Parties are placed back onto the current SCAP funding list.			
14	Petitioner further requests that the Deputy Director exercise his or her discretion to place the			
15	You's back on the SCAP funding list at the earliest opportunity.			
16				
17	Dated: March 20, 2024			
18	MURRAY M. SINCLAIR & ASSOCIATES			
19	MORRAT W. SINCE ARE CASSOCIATES			
20	Mille			
21	Murray M. Sinclair Attorneys for Sinclair Properties I, LLC and Sinclair			
22	Retail Associates LLC, dba F&H Sinclair Properties			
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28	DETITION FOR DEVIEW AND DECUEST FOR STAV OF ORDER			

PETITION FOR REVIEW AND REQUEST FOR STAY OF ORDER

1 2 3 4 1. 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 2. 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 3. 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

DECLARATION OF MURRAY M. SINCLAIR IN SUPPORT OF REQUEST FOR STAY OF ORDER

- I, Murray M. Sinclair, declare as follows:
- I, the undersigned, am an attorney at law in good standing. I am admitted to practice law in the State of California and am authorized to appear in all state and federal courts in the State of California. I am the principal and founder of the law firm of Murray M. Sinclair & Associates, and represent SINCLAIR PROPERTIES I, LLC and SINCLAIR RETAIL ASSOCIATES, LLC, dba F&H SINCLAIR PROPERTIES (collectively, "F&H" or "Petitioner") with regard to all environmental matters concerning certain commercial property owned by F&H located at 10561 West Pico Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90064 (the "F&H Property"). As such, I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth below, and if called as a witness I could and would competently testify to all statements which follow.
- To the east and immediately adjacent to the F&H Property is commercial real property owned by certain responsible parties, Ji-Yung You, Aka John Ji-Yung You, And Nam Wha You, Aka Nancy Nam Wha You (the "You's"), doing business as Golden Glo Cleaners, located at 10555 West Pico Boulevard (the "Golden Glo" Site) which has been impacted by hazardous releases from dry cleaning operations conducted by owner John Ji-Yung You and other operators of the Golden Glo facility over a period of more than 70 years.
- I have filed this Petition for Review and Request for Stay of Order because the environmental contamination at the Golden Glo Site has migrated onto the F&H Property. Consequently, F&H supported the You's' application to the SCAP Fund and is aggrieved because the hazardous contamination which is present at both properties is interfering with F&H's use and enjoyment of its commercial property. Petitioner fears that if the migrating contamination is not cleaned up in the

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

immediate future, the contamination will jeopardize Petitioner's ability to continue leasing its commercial store front to its present and future tenants. In addition, the F&H Property can neither be sold nor refinanced in its present condition. Further, single family homes in the area are currently being affected and the health of residential inhabitants, invitees and commercial guests visiting the area is in the process of being threatened. For these reasons, F&H submits there will be substantial harm to both the petitioner and to the public interest if a stay of the Order (which requires substantial costly work which the Responsible Parties are financially unable to perform without further SCAP funding) is not granted so that the funding of the You's' remedial site investigation and cleanup can be reactivated.

- 4. There will be no substantial harm to other interested persons and to the public interest if a stay is granted. To the contrary, all remedial investigation work and planning related to cleanup have presently ceased at the Golden Glo Site because the Responsible Parties are financially unable to go forward unless they receive additional funding. A stay of the Order will enable the Responsible Parties to focus their efforts on negotiating with the State Board and gaining the support and assistance they need from their environmental consultant and Regional Board representatives to show that their project is at critical juncture and must be financed.
- 5. There are substantial questions of law regarding the disputed action. Petitioner submits that the Order violates State Board Resolution No. 92-49, as codified by California Water Code Section 13307, which requires representatives of the Regional Water Boards who oversee investigations and cleanup and abatement activities resulting from discharges of hazardous substances to take into account, to the extent possible, the financial resources available to the person responsible for the discharge when determining reasonable schedules for investigation and cleanup, abatement, or other remedial action at a site. In this instance, the Regional Board knew already that

1		an official determination had been made that the Responsible Parties were unable to
2		fund investigation and cleanup activities at the Golden Glo site, and yet on the eve of
3		the expiration of the Responsible Parties' grant under the SCAP Fund, the Regional
4		Board ordered said parties to perform new work which will cost hundreds of
5		thousands of dollars, if not more. This work is critically important, but will never
6		take place unless the SCAP grant is extended. The order is in the form of
7		correspondence to the You's from the Regional Board dated February 22, 2024.
8		Attached hereto as Exhibit 1 is a true and correct copy of that letter.
9	6.	The Order also violates State Board Resolution No. 2023-0011 (the "Resolution"), as
10		"additional grant funding is required" (6 on p. 3) and, despite having been designated
11		as not fundable, the Golden Glo site should be added to the fundable list because
12		"the project is at a <i>critical juncture</i> and continued funding would allow continued
13		interim remedial measures or cost-effective near-term corrective action, to protect
14		human health and the environment," and "additional equity information may support
15		re-scoring for the project." (Resolution 6 on p. 5, emphasis added)
16	7.	Therefore, Petitioner requests that the State Board vacate, or in the alternative,
17		revise the requirements of the Order so that the Order will be suspended or
18		continued until the Responsible Parties are placed back onto the current SCAP
19		funding list, and that the Deputy Director exercise his or her discretion to place the
20		You's back on the list at the earliest opportunity.
21	I daal	are under penalty, of perium, under the laws of the State of Colifornia and the United
22		are under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and the United
23	States	s of America that the foregoing is true and correct.
24	Execu	uted on March 20, 2024, in Los Angeles, California.
25		(da la . la .
26		MUDDAY M. GINGLAID
27		MURRAY M. SINCLAIR
28		16







Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

February 22, 2024

Mr. John J. You & Ms. Nancy N. You Golden Glo Cleaners 10555 W. Pico Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90064 **Via Email Only**

SUBJECT: REVIEW OF STAGE 4 SITE ASSESSMENT REPORT AND

CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN

CASE/SITE: GOLDEN GLO CLEANERS, 10555 W. PICO BOULEVARD, LOS

ANGELES (SCP NO. 1435)

Dear Mr. & Ms. You:

On October 12, 2018, the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board) staff issued Golden Glo Cleaners, located at 10555 W. Pico Boulevard in Los Angeles (Site), a letter requiring the responsible party to submit a soil, soil vapor, and groundwater Conceptual Site Model (CSM) together with a site assessment workplan to address soil, soil vapor and groundwater data gaps.

The responsible party for the Site has since applied to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), Division of Financial Assistance (DFA), Site Cleanup Subaccount Program (SCAP) for financial assistance to conduct the required site investigation. The application for the SCAP funding program was approved by DFA and the responsible party entered into an agreement with DFA to conduct site investigations in accordance with the proposed scope of work. The SCAP number for the Site is SC066.

Regional Board staff reviewed the following technical documents for the abovereferenced site (Site), which were submitted after rounds of SCAP-funded site assessment were conducted:

- Limited Feasibility Study and Corrective Action Plan (CAP), dated December 29, 2023, prepared by Rincon Consultants, Inc.;
- Site Assessment Report Stage 4 (SAR), dated December 29, 2023, prepared by Rincon Consultants, Inc.; and
- Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA), dated December 22, 2023, prepared by Rincon Consultants, Inc.

Rincon advanced ten soil borings during the Site's Stage 4 investigation to further delineate the extent of subsurface impact with volatile organic compounds (VOCs). Due to refusal inside the building, the total depths of soil borings were limited to between 15 feet to 50 feet below ground surface (bgs). Groundwater samples were collected from two temporary monitoring wells installed at soil boring TMW-01 and TMW-02. The screen intervals for TMW-01 and TMW-02 were from 152 to 162 feet bgs and 150 to 160 feet bgs, respectively. Perched groundwater was observed from soil boring SV-17 at 44 feet bgs and SV-19 at 36 feet bgs.

The Stage 4 sampling results from the collected soil vapor, soil matrix, and groundwater samples indicate that the Site's soil, soil vapor and groundwater have been impacted with VOCs. The maximum concentrations for perchloroethylene (PCE) in soil, soil vapor, and groundwater are 2.8 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg), 4,814,070 micrograms per cubic meter (μ g/m3), and 4,300 micrograms per liter (μ g/L), respectively. SAR concludes and recommends a workplan to complete additional soil, soil vapor, and groundwater investigations to complete the vertical and lateral delineation of the subsurface impact with VOCs.

Based on the subsurface investigation and indoor air sampling results, Rincon prepared the HHRA. The Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) reviewed the HHRA and provided a memorandum dated February 7, 2024 (see attached). Regional Board requests OEHHA to review the HHRA and SAR to i) evaluate potential risks to human health to onsite and offsite receptors, ii) determine whether any mitigation measures are warranted immediately, and iii) identify any data gaps for evaluating the potential risks. OEHHA recommends an additional set of indoor air samples during the cold season, preferably with at least two samples per building, to complete the review and adding an age sensitivity factor to account for the enhanced sensitivity of young children to the effects of carcinogenic exposures.

Rincon prepared the CAP proposing to implement a soil vapor extraction system for the objective to reduce concentrations of VOCs to protect onsite commercial workers and offsite receptors from vapor intrusion based on current land uses.

Based on our review of CAP, SRA, and HHRA, we have the following comments/requirements:

- 1. By **March 31, 2024**, submit a workplan to collect additional indoor samples as noted in the OEHHA Memorandum, dated February 7, 2024, and prepare an update to the Site's human health risk assessment incorporating an age sensitivity factor in the risk estimation to address OEHHA's comments (see attached memo).
- 2. By **April 30, 2024**, submit a workplan to complete additional soil, soil vapor, and groundwater investigation to complete the vertical and lateral delineation of the subsurface impact.

3. By September 31, 2024, submit a remedial action plan (RAP) to propose remedial measures to address the soil, soil vapor and groundwater impacts onsite and offsite, in accordance with the State Water Resources Control Board Resolution 92-49, Policies and Procedures for Investigation and Cleanup and Abatement of Discharges under Water Code Section 13304. Per State Board Resolution 92-49, dischargers are required to cleanup and abate the effects of discharges in a manner that promotes attainment of either background water quality or the best water quality which is reasonable if background levels of water quality cannot be restored.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact me at (213) 576-6721 or via email at paul.cho@waterboards.ca.gov or Mr. Bizuayehu Ayele at (213) 576-6623 or via email at bizuayehu.ayele@waterboards.ca.gov.

Sincerely.

Hugh Digitally signed by Hugh Marley Date: 2024.02.22 Water 11.331:33 -08'00'

for Susana Arredondo Executive Officer

Attachment: OEHHA Memorandum, dated February 7, 2024

cc: Levi Pratt, State Water Resources Control Board Bryan Stempson, Rincon Consultants, Inc.

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT

Gavin Newsom, Governor Yana Garcia, Secretary for Environmental Protection Lauren Zeise, Ph.D., Director



MEMORANDUM

TO: Paul Cho, Engineering Geologist

Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board 320 W. 4th Street, Suite 200, Los Angeles, CA 90013

FROM: Jim Carlisle, DVM, MS, Staff Toxicologist

Air and Site Assessment and Climate Indicators Branch Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment

DATE: February 7, 2024

SUBJECT: REVIEW OF HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT, GOLDEN GLO

CLEANERS, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, SCAP NO. S0066

SWRCB # R4-23-047 OEHHA # 880679-00

Document Reviewed

Human Health Risk Assessment, Golden Glo Cleaners, 10555 West Pico Boulevard, Los Angeles, California, dated December 22, 2023, by Rincon Consultants, Inc.

Stage 4 - Site Assessment Report, Golden Glo Cleaners, 10555 West Pico Boulevard, Los Angeles, California dated December 29, 2023, by Rincon Consultants, Inc.

Scope of Review

The Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) was requested by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (Waterboard) to review the technical documents to

- i) evaluate potential risks to human health to onsite and offsite receptors, including workers,
- ii) determine whether any mitigation measures are warranted immediately, and iii) identify any data gaps for evaluating the potential risks.

In this memo, risk estimates are presented in scientific notation. For example, a cancer risk of 1 in a million (0.000001) is written as 1E-6. The acceptable risk level stipulated by the Waterboard was 1 in 100,000 (1E-5) for worker exposures and 1 in a million (1E-6) for offsite residents.

Site Description and Background

The Site consists of an operating dry cleaner with a dental office to the east, single-family homes to the north, a commercial retail building to the west, and West Pico Boulevard followed by commercial businesses to the south. Tetrachloroethene (PCE)-based equipment was operated since at least 1988 until the equipment was removed in April 2019. PCE is not currently being used. The Site is under the Site Cleanup Subaccount Program (SCAP) Grant.

Site Characterization and Chemicals of Potential Concern (COPCs)

In April 2021, PCE and its daughter products (cis-1,2-dichloroethene (cis-1,2-DCE), trichloroethene (TCE), and vinyl chloride), and carbon tetrachloride and chloroform were detected in soil vapor samples collected throughout the Site at concentrations that exceed their respective commercial/industrial San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board Environmental Screening Levels (ESLs, SFBRWQCB, 2019) and generally increased with depth. Step-out soil vapor samples in January 2022 detected the same volatile organic compounds (VOCs) plus benzene.

During August and November 2023, Rincon collected a single indoor air sample in each of four buildings (two businesses and two residences). Ideally, the two sampling events should be farther apart, i.e. during the heating season and during the cooling season (DTSC, 2011). Also, one sample per building may not adequately capture spatial variability. You may wish to consider requesting an additional set of indoor air samples during the cold season, preferably with at least two samples per building.

Indoor Air Assessment

Rincon compared indoor air concentrations to the ESLs and to the Department of Toxic Substances Control Human and Ecological Risk Office HHRA Note 3 Screening Levels (DTSC, 2022). In the case that DTSC-SLs and SFBRWQCB ESLs were not established, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Regional Screening Levels (RSLs) were applied. Rincon estimated 2023 indoor air risks and hazard indices (HIs) as follows:

Rincon's Indoor Air Risk and Hazard (HI) Estimates

Site	August Risk	August HI	November Risk	November HI
Golden Glo Cleaners	7.6E-6	0.18	1.5E-5	0.32
Dental Office	5.7E-6	0.07	6.1E-6	0.11
10548 Almayo Ave. (residence)	1.7E-5	0.30	1.1E-6	0.41
10552 Almayo Ave. (residence)	1.4E-4	3.7	2.9E-6	0.24

Based on spot-checking, OEHHA was able to verify Rincon's estimates. However, OEHHA recommends adding an age sensitivity factor (ASF, OEHHA, 2009) to account

Paul Cho February 7, 2024 Page 3

for the enhanced sensitivity of young children to the effects of carcinogenic exposures If the ASF were included for residents, the risk estimates would be about 2.8-fold higher.

The elevated risk and HI estimates at 10552 Almayo Avenue in August were due to a high detected concentration of benzene that did not appear to be related to outdoor air concentrations. The source is unknown, but benzene was not detected or was detected at levels less than indoor air in nearby soil gas samples indicating that a sub-surface source is unlikely. Indoor TCE concentrations at the four addresses were less than the corresponding accelerated action levels.

Soil Vapor Assessment

Soil vapor VOC concentrations are in Appendix C Table 1 of the Stage 4 - Site Assessment Report. These data show PCE and TCE concentrations consistently exceeding their respective commercial ESLs, while cis-1,2-DCE, vinyl chloride, and chloroform concentrations occasionally exceeded their ESLs. These results indicate the potential for vapor intrusion if site use or conditions change.

Conclusions

- Rincon's commercial indoor air risk estimates are mostly below the specified threshold of 1E-5, with one sample slightly above that threshold. HIs were below the benchmark of 1. OEHHA agrees with Rincon's estimates.
- Rincon's residential indoor air risk estimates are at or above the specified threshold of 1E-6. If the OEHHA-recommended ASF were included, it would raise the residential risk by a factor of about 2.8. HIs were below the benchmark of 1 with one exception.
- OEHHA recommends an additional set of indoor air samples during the cold season, preferably with at least two samples per building.
- Soil vapor VOC concentrations exceeding ESLs indicate the potential for significant vapor intrusion if site use or conditions change.

Memo reviewed by

Hristo Hristov, MD, PhD, MEnvSc Staff Toxicologist

Carmen Milanes, M.P.H.
Chief, Climate Indicators and Site Assessment Section

Paul Cho February 7, 2024 Page 4

References

SFBRWQCB (San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board) 2019. Environmental Screening Levels. Rev 2.

DTSC (Department of Toxic Substances Control). 2022. Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) Note 3. DTSC-modified Screening Levels (DTSC-SLs). May.

DTSC (Department of Toxic Substances Control). 2011. Guidance for the Evaluation and Mitigation of Subsurface Vapor Intrusion into Indoor Air. October 2011.

OEHHA (Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment) 2009. Technical Support Document for Cancer Potency Factors: Methodologies for derivation, listing of available values, and adjustments to allow for early life stage exposures. May 2009.