

#### **Western Refining Southwest LLC**

A subsidiary of Marathon Petroleum Corporation I-40 Exit 39 Jamestown, NM 87347

October 31, 2023

Mr. Ricardo Maestas, Acting Chief New Mexico Environment Department, Hazardous Waste Bureau 2905 Rodeo Park Drive East, Bldg. 1 Santa Fe, NM 87505-6313

RE: Second Response to Approval with Modifications
2021 Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report
Western Refining Southwest LLC, D/B/A Marathon Gallup Refinery
EPA ID# NMD000333211, HWB-WRG-22-006

Dear Mr. Maestas:

Please find enclosed the response to comments from the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) Response to Approval with Modifications letter dated July 18, 2023. A timeline of the 2021 Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report (Report) is provided below:

- Report, submitted to NMED on March 31, 2022.
- Approval with Modifications, received from NMED dated August 23, 2022.
- First Response to Approval with Modifications, submitted to NMED on December 15, 2022.
- Second Approval with Modifications, received from NMED dated July 18, 2023.

If you have any questions or comments regarding the information contained herein, please do not hesitate to contact Ms. Kateri Luka at (714) 713-1218.

#### Certification

I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction of supervision according to a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations.

Sincerely,

Western Refining Southwest LLO, Marathon Gallup Refinery

Timothy J. Peterkoski

Director of Environment and Climate Strategy

Marathon Petroleum Company LP

Enclosure

cc: L. Andress, NMED HWB

L. Tsinnajinnie, NMED

M. Suzuki, NMED

K. Luka, MPC

H. Jones, Trihydro Corporation

## ATTACHMENT A RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

NMED Comments Refinery Responses				
Comment 1:	Response 1:			
In the response to NMED's Approval with Modifications Comment 5, the Permittee states, "[a]s stated in Section IV.L.4.h of the 2017 RCRA Post-Closure Permit (Modified September 2017): "A table summarizing the laboratory analytical data, QA/QC data, applicable cleanup levels, and modifications to the sampling program can be substituted for this section." The data validation reports included as Appendix D of the Report provide the data qualifiers and the reasons for the qualifications, which is summarized in the Data Qualification Summary (i.e., QA/QC data) tables provided at the end of each data validation report. No revisions to the Report were made." The tables listing the analytes where analytical results were rejected must not be included in the appendices. These tables must be included in the main body of the Report and the results discussed in the appropriate section(s) of the Report. As stated in Approval with Modifications Comment 5, the Permittee is required to identify the analytes where analytical results were rejected and discuss the cause of rejection within the text of the Report. Include the revised tables and discussion in the main body of the revised Report and provide replacement pages.	This comment is acknowledged. New tables (Table 5-8 and Table 5-9) summarizing the rejected data points and the reasons for rejection have been added to the report. The new tables can be reviewed in Attachment B-1 (red-line, strike-out [RLSO] version) and Attachment B-2 (clean version). Additionally, Section 5.3.1, first paragraph has been revised to state, "[r]ejected data are listed in Table 5-8, and reasons for rejection are summarized in Table 5-9. Additionally, rejected data are presented in their respective tables and explanations of the qualifiers can be found in the data validation reports provided in the following appendices:  • Appendix D-1 – Reports 2103532, 2103142, and 2103470  • Appendix D-2 – Reports 2106B77, 2106D55, 2106B14, 2106976, 2106895, and 2106646  • Appendix D-3 – Reports 2109709, 2109D30, and 2109C62  • Appendix D-4 – Reports 2112902, 2112740, 2112658, 2112634, 2112997, and 2112B70  Explanations for rejected data points are listed below:  • The sample was analyzed outside of the method holding time.  • The sample was extracted outside of the method holding time.  • The laboratory control spike (LCS) and/or laboratory control spike duplicate (LCSD) percent recovery was			

NMED Comments Refinery Responses			
	less than the lower acceptable limit, indicating a possible low bias.		
	• The surrogate percent recovery was less than the lower acceptable limit, indicating a possible low bias.		
	• The percent difference between the initial calibration relative response factor (RRF) and the opening continuing calibration verification RRF was outside the acceptable limits.		
	Table 5-9 summarizes the tally of rejected data points by location, analyte, sampling event, and reason for rejection. The majority of the data points (126 of 192 data points) were rejected due to extremely low surrogate recoveries for Method 8270 analyses and primarily affected the acid extractable surrogates. The related target compounds are the phenolic compounds. There are many factors that can affect the surrogate recoveries, including:  • Sample matrices may affect the surrogates negatively.		
	<ul> <li>High pH in the sample may result in loss of some phenols, including the surrogates.</li> </ul>		
	• The acid fraction surrogates are known to be more temperature sensitive. Early during the extraction process for Method 8270, if the temperature of the concentrator is too high, decomposition (losses) of those surrogates and the related target compounds can occur.		
	Contaminated glassware may be used that actively chemically bonds to the phenol compounds and inhibits the recoveries."		

NMED Comments	Refinery Responses
Comment 2:	Response 2:
In the response to NMED's Approval with Modifications	This comment is acknowledged. OW wells OW-61 and OW-65
Comment 6, the Permittee states, "[t]he discussion regarding	are included on page 3 of Table 6-3, as there is fluid recovery
fluid recovery events via vacuum truck is referencing MKTF,	data for these wells. Therefore, no revisions were made to
OW, and RW wells listed in Table 6-3, in addition to recovery in	Table 6-3, or the Report text based on NMED Comment 2.
standpipe and retention ditch and borrow pit sumps. This	Table 6-3 can be reviewed in Attachment B-2 (clean version).
information is also provided quarterly in the Hydrocarbon	
Interim Measures Seep Reports. No revisions were made to the	
Report." Table 6-3 only lists fluid recovery data for MKTF and	
RW wells. To clarify, NMED's Approval with Modifications	
Comment 6 requires the Permittee to state that fluid recovery	
events were no longer conducted for the OW wells in the Report.	
Revise the Report accordingly and provide replacement pages.	

NMED Comments	Refinery Responses
Comment 4:	Response 4:
In the response to NMED's Approval with Modifications Comment 9b, the Permittee states, "GRO and TPH (C6-C10) as well as Motor oil, ORO, and TPH (C28-40) are all included on Table 3-2 and Table 5-5 (General Chemistry and Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon Analytical Data) because they represent different historical analytical methods even though they can be viewed as repetitive. They were all included separately for clarity when referencing the tables." The presentation of the data is confusing. It is unnecessary to present GRO and TPH (C6-C10) separately in the tables. GRO and TPH (C6-C10) must be regarded as the same analyte in the tables. Similarly, it is unnecessary to present motor oil, ORO, and TPH (C28-C40) separately in the tables. Motor oil, ORO, and TPH (C28-C40) must be regarded as the same analyte in the tables. Revise all applicable sections and tables of the Report and provide replacement pages.	<ul> <li>This comment is acknowledged. Table 5-5 has been revised with the following changes:</li> <li>The previous two columns labeled "Gasoline Range Organics (μg/L)" and "TPH (C6-C10) (μg/L)" have been combined under one column labeled "Gasoline Range Organics (μg/L)".</li> <li>The previous three columns labeled "Motor oil," "Oil Range Organics (μg/L)", and "TPH (C28-40) (μg/L)" have been combined under one column labeled "Oil Range Organics (μg/L)".</li> <li>Revisions made to Table 5-5 are shown in red text in Attachment B-1.</li> <li>Additionally, the same changes were applied to Table 3-2; revisions made to Table 3-2 are shown in red text in Attachment B-1.</li> </ul>
Comment 5:	Response 5:
In the response to NMED's Approval with Modifications Comment 9b, the Permittee states, "[h]owever, this also means that TPH (C28-C40) and TPH (C6-C10) have incorrect screening levels as "NA". The screening levels for these compounds have been corrected on both Table 3-2 and Table 5-5." Attachment B containing the electronic redline strikeout (RLSO) version of the Report does not provide any tables or figures; therefore, it is not clear which information in the tables was corrected. The RLSO version of the Report must identify all revisions made to the Report, including the tables, figures, and the text. Provide an electronic RLSO version of the Report showing all revisions.	This comment is acknowledged. Revisions made to Tables 3-2 and 5-5, as requested by NMED in Comment 9b of the "Approval with Modifications, 2021 Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report" letter dated August 23, 2022, have been identified by red text in Attachment B-1.

NMED Comments	Refinery Responses	
Comment 6:	Response 6:	
In the response to NMED's Approval with Modifications	This comment is acknowledged. Table 3-2 has been revised to	
Comment 10a, the Permittee states, "[f]or the 2021 reporting	include a column that lists the analytical methods used to	
period, 1,4-dioxane was analyzed using EPA Method 8270SIM.	conduct analyses for each analyte. Revisions made to Table 3-2	
For future reference, the methods used for all analyte analyses	are shown in red text in Attachment B-1.	
can be viewed on the lab reports which are included in as		
Appendix C." Although NMED is aware that the lab reports		
included in Appendix C identify the analytical methods for		
analytes, NMED requires a table that depicts the analytical		
methods used to conduct analyses (see Comments 1 and 3		
above). Revise the Report accordingly.		
Comment 7:	Response 7:	
In the response to NMED's Approval with Modifications	This comment is acknowledged. The Refinery will incorporate	
Comment 12, the Permittee states, "[t]he health advisory level is	the screening levels of the PFAS species provided in the RAG	
for the total of three PFAS compounds, not all PFAS. The	beginning with the 2023 Annual Groundwater Monitoring	
correction is included on updated Table 5-7." NMED's	Report, due to NMED by March 31, 2024. This edit will not	
October 2022 Risk Assessment Guidance for Investigations and	apply to the 2022 Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report, as it	
Remediation (RAG) provides screening levels for per- and	has already been submitted to NMED, dated March 31, 2023.	
polyfluorinated substances (PFAS) species. Incorporate the		
screening levels of the PFAS species provided in the RAG in		
future groundwater monitoring reports. No revision is required		
to the Report.		

Sante Fe Main Office Phone: (505) 476-3441

General Information Phone: (505) 629-6116

Online Phone Directory https://www.emnrd.nm.gov/ocd/contact-us

# State of New Mexico Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Oil Conservation Division 1220 S. St Francis Dr. Santa Fe, NM 87505

CONDITIONS

Action 279492

#### **CONDITIONS**

Operator:	OGRID:
Western Refining Southwest LLC	267595
539 South Main Street	Action Number:
Findlay, OH 45840	279492
	Action Type:
	[UF-DP] Discharge Permit (DISCHARGE PERMIT)

#### CONDITIONS

Cre	ated By		Condition Date
jo	el.stone	Approved for OCD record retention purposes.	2/21/2025