

# Roundtable Meeting Minutes

## Effective Cleanup and Workload Completion-Part Two

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

### Part A - Obstacles to Closing Contamination Sites

Missouri brought up the need to have a complete site characterization before they are able to adequately assess the risk and make closure decisions and they often have difficulty getting a full characterization from their consultants.

EPA and Florida pointed out the wide variation in the definition of closure (or cleanup) used among the various states and the level of assessment and/or cleanup that may be sufficient to close a site in one state may not be adequate in others.

Montana and Florida indicated that their regulations require cleanup to drinking water standards which can be very difficult to achieve.

Kentucky discussed how their new regulations and re-sampling initiative allowed them to go out to sites with low level contamination that had been put on the back burner and re-sample them and sometimes do a small source removal and then a site closure. They also improved their database "Tempo" with tools to help identify sites within closure range and do data cleanup that found some sites that were previously considered to be low risk but should have been higher.

Kentucky and Florida indicated they have limited funds and can not work on sites below their funding priority.

Tennessee explained how their old regulations and procedures had limited coordination and tracking and closure numbers and ended up \$26 million in the hole. They then got a new Commissioner and a new Director and help from a Legislative Task Force to identify problems in their internal regulations and procedures. As a result changes were made so that all cleanup levels are now site specific with only screening levels printed in their regulations. They also developed a computer program to help them quickly derive the site specific cleanup levels. They reported a significant increase in their rate of closures and recommend using outside groups (such as the Legislative Task Force) to bring about necessary change.

Iowa said that three years ago they initiated a new program that has helped by bringing all stakeholders together to make corrective action decisions, including the regulators, the responsible parties and their contractors, so they can all agree on a course of action. They have had RBCA standards in place since 1998. They said they do not have specific procedures for shutting down remediation systems that are not effective, but they do threaten to stop future funding.

### Part B – Risk Based Corrective Action

EPA pointed out that RBCA is now 10 years old and that while the old risk assessments were complex, expensive and very difficult to review, things are much more streamlined now.

Alabama started their RBCA program in 1998 and it has been so successful that their agency has moved toward an agency wide RBCA program. They said that RBCA affect their site

assessments, their old model was too conservative (based on assumed drinking water wells within 500 feet of the site). They now site specific cleanup target levels. They issue NFA approvals with conditions but no deed restrictions and have not had a complaint over their risk decisions in the last 10 years. They have also not experienced any problems with property transactions or lenders.

Massachusetts indicated they can not close a site that has had contamination and was reduced through cleanup or monitoring until they meet 1 ppb, even though the standard for a new site without a prior release to take action is 5 ppb. Changes are coming.

Georgia advised that they have had RBCA in place since 1996. The big question they still deal with is how much contamination can you leave in the ground, even if you can demonstrate there is not risk?