



---

## Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

April 1, 2021

Mr. Christian Darville  
Lisi Aerospace/Hi-Shear Corporation  
2600 Skypark Drive  
Torrance, California 90509-2975

Certified Mail  
Return Receipt Requested  
**Claim No. 7019 2970 0001 1914 5679**

Mr. Richard Doyle  
Magellan Aerospace, Middletown, Inc.  
2320 Wedekind Drive  
Middletown, Ohio 45042-2390

Certified Mail  
Return Receipt Requested  
**Claim No. 7019 2970 0001 1914 5686**

Mr. Bailey Su  
Excellon Technologies, LLC  
20001 S. Rancho Way  
Rancho Dominguez, California 90220

Certified Mail  
Return Receipt Requested  
**Claim No. 7019 2970 0001 1914 5693**

CT Corporation System  
c/o Esterline Technologies Corporation  
500 – 108th Avenue NE, Suite 1500  
Bellevue, Washington 98004

Certified Mail  
Return Receipt Requested  
**Claim No. 7019 2970 0001 1914 5709**

Mr. Tim A. Goetz  
Robinson Helicopter Company  
2901 Airport Drive  
Torrance, California 90505

Certified Mail  
Return Receipt Requested  
**Claim No. 7019 2970 0001 1914 5716**

Mr. Ward Olson  
Dasco Engineering Corporation  
24747 Crenshaw Boulevard  
Torrance, California 90505

Certified Mail  
Return Receipt Requested  
**Claim No. 7019 2970 0001 1914 5723**

Mr. Aram Chaparyan  
City Manager  
City of Torrance  
3031 Torrance Boulevard  
Torrance, California 90503

Certified Mail  
Return Receipt Requested  
**Claim No. 7019 2970 0001 1914 5730**

---

LAWRENCE YEE, CHAIR | RENEE PURDY, EXECUTIVE OFFICER

**SUBJECT: REVIEW OF TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM – RESPONSE TO  
COMMENTS AND REQUIREMENTS PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA  
WATER CODE SECTION 13267**

**SITE: SKYPARK COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES (ASSESSOR PARCEL NO.  
7377-006-906), 24701 – 24777 CRENSHAW BOULEVARD AND 2530,  
2540, AND 2600 SKYPARK DRIVE, TORRANCE, CALIFORNIA (SCP  
NO. 1499)**

Dear Mr. Darville, et al.:

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region (Regional Water Board) is the state agency with primary responsibility for the protection of groundwater and surface water quality within major portions of Los Angeles and Ventura counties. To accomplish this, the Regional Water Board oversees the investigation and cleanup of discharges of waste that may affect the quality of waters of the state as authorized by the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (California Water Code [CWC], Division 7).

On November 20, 2020, the Regional Water Board required revisions to, and resubmittal of the Decision Flow Charts (DFCs) and the submittal of a plan, sequence, and schedule for requesting access to the properties located in the current Evaluate Need for Action zone (ENA Plan) for the subject site (Site). On February 2, 2021, the Regional Water Board approved a time extension for revisions and proposal of alternate response actions to the DFCs but denied the postponement request for the submittal of the ENA Plan.

On February 4, 2021, the Regional Water Board received the technical memorandum titled “Requests for Extension” (Tech Memo), prepared by Genesis Engineering & Redevelopment (GER) on behalf of Hi-Shear Corporation for Site. The Tech Memo provides response to the comments and requirements set forth in the Regional Water Board’s CWC Section 13267 Order, amended on November 20, 2020 (Letter).

A summary of the Tech Memo followed by Regional Water Board comments and requirements are included below.

**Summary of Technical Memorandum**

For the purposes of this letter, the summary excludes GER’s responses that are in explicit concurrence with the comments and requirements set forth in the Letter. The Tech Memo provided the following responses to the Letter:

1. GER noted that Comment 1a and Comment 1b of the Letter are inconsistent with the following vapor intrusion guidance documents:

- a. "Guidance for the Evaluation and Mitigation of Subsurface Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air," Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), California Environmental Protection Agency, October 2011 (DTSC 2011 Guidance); and
- b. "Draft – Supplemental Guidance: Screening and Evaluating Vapor Intrusion," DTSC and California Water Resources Control Boards, February 2020 (Supplemental Guidance)

Such that the DTSC 2011 Guidance and the Supplemental Guidance allow consideration of multiple potential response actions for vapor intrusion risk management decisions for current and future risk. GER contends that Comment 1a and Comment 1b in the Letter do not consider other response actions as they mandate mitigation, which is only one of the potential response actions.

2. In response to Comment 3, GER acknowledges that a monitoring plan will be developed should mitigation be warranted.
3. In response to Comment 4, GER states that a monitoring plan should be developed to address all aspects of actual and potential exposure for vapor intrusion.
4. GER contends that Comment 5 in the Letter is contrary to the Supplemental Guidance, and that it would be inappropriate to include ambient air volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in the cumulative risk calculations as some of the VOCs detected in indoor air did not originate from the Site.
5. Comment 7 states that decisions and response actions to scenarios not explicitly defined within the DFCs should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis by the Regional Water Board and the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). In response, GER states that these decisions and response actions should also be made in consultation with all stakeholders in the investigation.
6. In response to Comment 8, which required the submittal of a plan, sequence and schedule for requesting access to the properties located in the current ENA Zone, GER concludes that no further action is warranted in the ENA Zone. GER's reasons include the following:
  - a. No vapor intrusion has been identified in the testing of the accelerated response zone (ARZ) to date.
  - b. VOC soil vapor concentrations in the ENA Zone are at least 10 times lower than in the ARZ.

- c. VOC soil vapor concentrations on the private properties are uniformly lower than soil vapor concentrations from public right of ways on which the “Vapor Intrusion Response Plan” (VIRP) and the “Soil, Soil Vapor, and Groundwater Delineation – Module I” (Module I Report) were based; therefore, overestimating concentrations present on the private properties. GER hypothesizes that VOCs build up beneath low permeability pavement (i.e., public right of ways) while VOCs escape to the atmosphere from more permeable landscaped surfaces on private properties.
  - d. VOC soil vapor concentrations from a December 2020 sampling event on the public right of ways are lower than the previous round. This data has not been submitted to the Regional Water Board.
7. Regarding Comment 9, GER states that without a plan in place for the ENA Zone, status reports documenting the implementation and results of the response zone on a tri-annual basis is premature. GER suggests that reporting should be associated with milestones in the ENA Plan instead of a specific frequency.

### **Regional Water Board Comments and Requirements**

Based on the information provided in the Tech Memo, the Regional Water Board has the following comments and requirements:

1. The Regional Water Board remains concerned that the DFCs do not adequately address future vapor intrusion risks and hazards; however, the Regional Water Board has considered the rationale provided by GER and concurs that other potential response actions may be considered to address future vapor intrusion risks and hazards. Therefore, the Comment 1a and Comment 1b in the Letter are revised as follows:
  - a. If a volatile organic compound (VOC) of concern is detected above the screening level in the crawl space sample, and it has been determined that the source of the VOC is from the subsurface, then appropriate response actions (such as additional investigation, monitoring, refining the risk assessment, mitigation, and/or remediation) will be determined in consultation with the Regional Water Board and OEHHA. The “Mobile Home Decision Flow Chart” should be updated with this note.
  - b. If a VOC of concern is detected in sub-slab and/or soil vapor samples at concentrations that exceed the corresponding San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board Environmental Screening Levels (SFRWQCB ESLs), then appropriate response actions (such as additional investigation, monitoring, refining the risk assessment, mitigation, and/or remediation) will be determined in consultation with the Regional Water Board and OEHHA.

The “Residential (Slab-on-Grade Foundation) and Commercial Soil Vapor Decision Flow Chart” should be updated with this note.

2. The Regional Water Board concurs that a monitoring program shall address all aspects of actual and potential exposures for vapor intrusion.
3. The Regional Water Board acknowledges that common VOCs may be present in the ambient air and that measured indoor air concentrations may be similar and/or identical to ambient levels. The objective of Comment 5 in the Letter is to be most conservative and protective of the occupants’ health such that “No additional indoor air sampling” is not considered prematurely. Consistent with the DTSC’s “Vapor Intrusion Mitigation Advisory,” dated October 2011, a sufficient number of ambient air samples should be collected to provide a meaningful comparison between indoor air and outdoor air concentrations; the comparison(s) should be considered when determining the additivity or cumulative risk associated with the VOCs of concern. In areas without known and/or suspected sources (i.e., release points of contamination), subsurface sources (i.e., associated contaminated soil [including soil vapor] or groundwater, a.k.a. secondary sources) should be considered in evaluating risk. The ratio between concentrations of VOCs from subsurface sources and concentrations of VOCs in indoor air should be determined to help distinguish contributions from ambient air versus vapor intrusion from the subsurface. Evaluations and calculations for cumulative risk attributable to vapor intrusion should be performed in accordance with Step 3 and Step 4 of the Supplemental Guidance.

Note that, historically, sources of VOCs related to hydrocarbons have also been identified at the Site.

4. The objective of Comment 7 in the Letter is to acknowledge that the DFCs may not address all of the scenarios encountered and, in these instances, it will be evaluated on a case by case basis by the Regional Water Board and OEHHHA. While input from stakeholders will be considered, the approval of any decision will be determined by the Regional Water Board.
5. Revise the DFCs to reflect the comments and requirements 1 through 4 above and the Letter and resubmit the DFCs to the Regional Water Board by **April 30, 2021**.
6. Although data collected as part of the ongoing implementation of the VIRP indicate there is currently no vapor intrusion at the private properties tested to date, soil vapor concentrations in the public right of way remain elevated above their respective screening levels in the ENA Zone and warrant assessment of the private properties. The designation of the response zones (ARZ and ENA Zone) was for prioritization purposes and shall not be misconstrued with the necessary work to investigate and assess vapor intrusion potential. To date, one property has

been sampled in the ENA Zone and the Regional Water Board does not have enough representative data in the ENA Zone to make a determination that no further action is warranted. The soil vapor data from the recent December 2020 sampling event have not been shared with the Regional Water Board; as part of the ENA Plan submittal, the soil vapor data from the December 2020 sampling event should be included for the Regional Water Board's review.

7. Following submittal of the ENA Plan and Regional Water Board's approval of the ENA Plan, status reports in accordance with the tri-annual reporting periods and report due dates specified in the Letter shall be submitted. The tri-annual status reports shall not be limited to just the "milestones," and should also include ongoing field activities within the ENA Zone.
8. **NOTICE OF INCOMPLETE TASKS:** This letter further notifies all parties listed above that the Letter, issued by the Regional Water Board Executive Officer, required a plan, sequence, and schedule for requesting access to the properties located in the current ENA Zone. To date, an ENA Plan has not been submitted to the Regional Water Board. The ENA Plan shall be submitted **immediately**. In asking for the submittal of the ENA Plan, the Regional Water Board is not extending the original due date of December 21, 2020.

The above requirement for submittal of technical reports constitutes an amendment to the requirements of the California Water Code section 13267 Orders originally dated October 29, 2009 and May 12, 2020. All other aspects of the Orders originally dated October 29, 2009 and May 12, 2020, and the amendments thereto, remain in full force and effect. The required technical reports are necessary to investigate the characteristics of and extent of the discharges of waste at the site and to evaluate cleanup alternatives. Therefore, the burden, including costs, of the report bears a reasonable relationship to the need for the report and benefits to be obtained. Pursuant to section 13268 of the California Water Code, failure to submit the required technical report by the specified due date may result in civil liability administratively imposed by the Regional Water Board in an amount up to one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each day each technical report is not received.

**If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Mr. Kevin Lin at (213) 576-6781 or via email at [kevin.lin@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:kevin.lin@waterboards.ca.gov), or Ms. Jillian Ly, Unit IV Chief, at (213) 576-6664 or via email at [Jillian.Ly@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:Jillian.Ly@waterboards.ca.gov).**

Sincerely,

---

Renee Purdy  
Executive Officer

cc:

Dmitriy Ginzburg, State Water Board Division of Drinking Water  
Joseph Liles, Water Replenishment District  
Carla Dillon, City of Lomita  
Ryan Smoot, City of Lomita  
Travis Van Ligten, Rutan & Tucker, LLP  
Richard Montevideo, Rutan & Tucker, LLP  
Tim Wood, GSI Environmental Inc.  
Peter Scaramella, GSI Environmental Inc.  
Sonja A. Inglin, Cermak & Inglin, LLC  
Patrick L. Rendon, Lamb and Kawakami, LLP  
William J. Beverly, Law Offices of William J. Beverly  
Brian M. Ledger, Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani, LLP  
Thomas Schmidt, Hamrick & Evans, LLP  
David L. Evans, Hamrick & Evans, LLP  
Steve Van der Hoven, Genesis Engineering & Redevelopment