



Michelle Lujan Grisham
Governor

Howie C. Morales
Lt. Governor

NEW MEXICO
ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT
Hazardous Waste Bureau

2905 Rodeo Park Drive East, Building 1
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505-6313
Phone (505) 476-6000 Fax (505) 476-6030
www.env.nm.gov



James C. Kenney
Cabinet Secretary

Jennifer J. Pruett
Deputy Secretary

CERTIFIED MAIL - RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

March 4, 2021

John Moore
Environmental Superintendent
Western Refining, Southwest Inc., Gallup Refinery
92 Giant Crossing Road
Gallup, New Mexico 87301

RE: **DISAPPROVAL**
RAIL CAR LOADING AREA RELEASE SOIL SAMPLING INVESTIGATION WORK PLAN
WESTERN REFINING SOUTHWEST INC., GALLUP REFINERY
EPA ID # NMD000333211
HWB-WRG-21-001

Dear Mr. Moore:

The New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) has reviewed the *Rail Car Loading Area Release Soil Sampling Investigation Work Plan* (Work Plan), dated January 8, 2021, submitted on behalf of Marathon Petroleum Company dba Western Refining Southwest Inc., Gallup Refinery (the Permittee). NMED hereby issues this Disapproval with the following comments.

Comment 1

In the Executive Summary, page 3 of 10, the Permittee states, “[d]iesel leaked across the railroad tracks into a culvert carrying product into the stormwater system.” Figure 2, *Proposed Sample Locations*, does not depict the location of the culvert and the stormwater system. Present the location of the culvert and the stormwater system in a revised figure. In addition, it is necessary to collect soil samples from the stormwater collection ditch where native soils are

exposed immediately downstream of the culvert in order to verify whether the diesel release affected the soils in the ditch, if applicable. Revise the Work Plan accordingly.

Comment 2

In the Background Section, page 5 of 10, the Permittee states, “[o]n March 13, 2019, an estimated 1,765 gallons of diesel were released in the same area. Of the 42 barrels (1,765 gallons) released, approximately 40 barrels (1,680 gallons) were recovered via vacuum truck. Approximate locations of both releases are shown in Figure 2.” Figure 2 shows three non-contiguous affected areas where the extent of the diesel release is estimated. It is not clear how the diesel spread into three non-contiguous areas. Provide an explanation in the revised Work Plan. In addition, one of areas affected by the release is shown 2,000 feet northeast of the rail loading rack sump in Figure 2; however, the northern boundary of the area is not defined. Revise the figure to depict the northern boundary of the release. Furthermore, it is necessary to collect soil samples in the vicinity of the northern boundary to verify whether the diesel release affected the area. The soil samples must be collected in topographically low areas where the released diesel could potentially accumulate. Revise the Work Plan accordingly.

Comment 3

In the Scope of Activities Section, page 6 of 10, the Permittee states, “[s]oil samples will be collected at four locations within the gasoline release excavated area with a hand trowel and/or a hand auger, at 6-inches bgs and 1-ft bgs. In addition, soil borings will be completed with a Geoprobe at seven locations outside of the bermed area to 8 ft bgs.” Figure 2 shows the extent of the gasoline release; however, it is not clear whether the excavated area overlaps with the extent of the gasoline release. Provide a clarification in the revised Work Plan. If the extent of the gasoline release is not consistent with the excavated area, Figure 2 must be revised to present the excavated area. In addition, the location of the berms presumably overlaps with the boundary of each diesel release extent; however, it is not clear from Figure 2. Present the location of the berms in the revised figure. Furthermore, provide information regarding the maximum depth of the excavation in the revised Work Plan. If the maximum depth of the excavation exceeded eight feet below ground surface (bgs), propose to advance the soil borings to the equivalent maximum depth outside of the bermed area. Revise the Work Plan, where applicable.

Comment 4

In the Scope of Activities Section, page 7 of 10, the Permittee states, “[a]nalytical results will be screened by comparison to NMED Industrial Soil Screening Levels (SSLs).” Since some soil samples will be collected below one foot bgs, analytical results must also be screened by comparison to NMED Residential and Construction Worker Soil Screening Levels (SSLs). Revise the Work Plan accordingly.

Comment 5

In the Investigation Methods Section, page 7 of 10, the Permittee states, “[t]he proposed locations include four locations collected at two depths (0.5 ft bgs and 1 ft bgs) within the gasoline release excavation footprint and seven soil borings outside the bermed area, sampled every 2.5 ft beginning with a surface sample,” and “[s]amples will be field screened at regular intervals via photoionization detector (PID) for evidence of hydrocarbon impacts and will be recorded in the boring logs.” If the highest PID readings and/or visual and olfactory signs of contamination are recorded at depths outside of the proposed sampling intervals, modify the sampling depths to propose to collect potentially more contaminated soil samples. Revise the Work Plan accordingly.

Comment 6

The Investigation Methods Section, *Sample Collection Procedures*, page 8 of 10, proposes PAH analysis using EPA Method 8310. Use of EPA Method 8310 presupposes a high expectation of finding the specific compounds of interest with lower method detection limits. However, some semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs) potentially released at the site may not be detected by EPA Method 8310 alone. SVOC analysis using EPA Method 8270 may also be required for the purpose of this investigation. Provide a justification to propose EPA Method 8310 in lieu of EPA Method 8270 in a response letter or revise the Work Plan to propose both EPA Methods 8270 and 8310.

The Permittee must submit a revised Work Plan that addresses all comments contained in this letter. Two hard copies and an electronic version of the revised Work Plan must be submitted to the NMED. The Permittee must also include a redline-strikeout version in electronic format showing where all revisions to the Work Plan have been made. The revised Work Plan must be accompanied with a response letter that details where all revisions have been made, cross-referencing NMED’s numbered comments. The revised Work Plan must be submitted to NMED no later than **April 30, 2021**.

Mr. Moore
March 4, 2021
Page 4

If you have questions regarding this Disapproval, please contact Michiya Suzuki of my staff at 505-476-6046.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dave Cobrain".

Dave Cobrain
Program Manager
Hazardous Waste Bureau

cc: M. Suzuki, NMED HWB
C. Chavez, OCD
L. King, EPA Region 6 (6LCRRC)

File: Reading File and WRG 2021 File