

State Water Resources Control Board

UST CASE CLOSURE SUMMARY

Agency Information

Agency Name: San Mateo County- Heath System (County)	Address: 2000 Alameda de las Pulgas, Suite 100, San Mateo, CA 94403
Agency Caseworker: Marc Mullaney	Case No.: 110032

Case Information

USTCF Claim No.: 6283	Global ID: T0608100446
Site Name: Honda of San Mateo	Site Address: 101 East 25 th Avenue, San Mateo, CA 94403 (Site)
Petitioners: John Dimascio & John O'Hara	Address: P.O. Box 6391 San Mateo, CA 94403
USTCF Expenditures to Date: \$144,140	Number of Years Case Open: 24

URL: http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report.asp?global_id=T0608100446

Summary

The Low-Threat Underground Storage Tank 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 Site meets all of the required criteria of the Policy. A summary evaluation of compliance with the Policy is shown in **Attachment 1: Compliance with State Water Board Policies and State Law**. The Conceptual Site Model upon which the evaluation of the case has been made is described in **Attachment 2: Summary of Basic Site Information**. Highlights of the Conceptual Site Model of the Site follow:

The release at this Site was discovered when the USTs were removed in June 1988. The Site previously distributed burner oils and diesel oil and is currently a motorcycle sales/ service outlet. There are no USTs currently on-site. A 70-foot wide railroad right of way with two active tracks is located 200 feet northeast, down-gradient. During the 1988 and 1998 UST removals, approximately 155 to 170 cubic yards (cy) of contaminated soil were removed. Soil sampling conducted in 1998 and 1999 indicated elevated levels of petroleum constituents located immediately next to the former USTs. Petroleum constituents were not detected in the off-site soil borings and the off-site down-gradient monitoring well (MW) MW-5. Due to intermittent free product, product recovery could only be accomplished using oil skimmer and oil absorbent pads from 2002 to 2006. In 2012, petroleum sheen was removed by purging.

The petroleum release is limited to the shallow soil and groundwater. The affected groundwater is not currently being used as a source of drinking water or for any other designated beneficial use, and it is highly unlikely that the affected groundwater will be used as a source of drinking water or any other

beneficial use in the foreseeable future. Public supply wells are usually constructed with competent sanitary seals. Production intervals are in deeper protected aquifers. Remaining petroleum constituents are limited, stable, and declining. Remedial actions have been implemented and further remediation would be ineffective and expensive. Additional assessment/monitoring will not likely change the conceptual model. Remaining petroleum constituents do not pose significant risk to human health, safety, or the environment.

Rationale for Closure under the Policy

- General Criteria – Site meets all eight general criteria under the Policy.
- Groundwater – Site meets the Policy Groundwater-Specific Class “3”.
- Petroleum Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air – Site meets the Policy Class “b”. A site-specific risk assessment for the vapor intrusion pathway was conducted and demonstrates that human health is protected.
- Direct Contact and Outdoor Air Exposure – Site meets the Policy Class “a”. Maximum concentrations of petroleum constituents in soil are less than or equal to those listed in Table 1 of the Policy. The estimated naphthalene concentrations in soil meet the thresholds in Table 1 for direct contact by a factor of eight. It is highly unlikely that naphthalene concentrations in the soil, if any, exceed the threshold.

Objections to Closure

County staff objected to UST case closure because:

1. Free product has not been properly delineated and removed to the extent practicable.

Response: Measurable free product at this Site is intermittent; therefore, consistent removal techniques are ineffective and costly. Cost effective free product removal cannot be performed because the free product does not exist in a readily removable state. During the most recent groundwater monitoring event in April 2012, it was reported that product sheen was no longer present in well MW-4 after removing 12.6 gallons of water on April 17, 2012 and 15 gallons of water on April 20, 2012. Therefore, free product has been removed to the extent practicable.

2. The Site appears to not be properly delineated and has missed one key historical operational area (pump house).

Response: Given the Site low permeable soils, lithology, hydrology, and the length of time since the release was discovered, contamination migration has been adequately investigated and assessed. Five monitoring wells and sixteen soil borings have been constructed at the Site. Monitoring well MW-2 was removed as part of the UST excavation activities in 1998. Groundwater monitoring has been conducted at the Site since 1990.

Based on the information available in the record, soil boring GP-8 was drilled in the immediate proximity of the former pump house. Soil samples collected in 1999 showed that elevated levels of total petroleum hydrocarbons as diesel (TPHd) and total petroleum hydrocarbons as gasoline (TPHg) were detected in the boring GP-8 at 10 feet below ground surface (bgs); however,