Regulatory Perspectives on Natural Source Zone Depletion

Kyle Campbell, P.G. Colorado Dept. of Labor & Employment | Division of Oil & Public Safety

Chris Marks, Ph. D. Arizona Dept. of Environmental Quality | Waste Programs Division

NEIWPCC National Tanks Conference Sept. 14, 2022

The LNAPL Regulatory Landscape

Federally-provided flexibility yields State-level variability

<u>40 CFR §280.12 Free Product</u> - regulated substance that is present as a nonaqueous phase liquid (NAPL)

- State implementations: compound-specific regulation vs. TPH regulation
 - Example: LNAPL composed of naphthalene and tetradecane

<u>40 CFR §280.64 Free Product Removal</u> - ...to the maximum extent practicable as determined by the implementing agency...

- Wide-range of State regulation perspectives:
 - No defined recovery requirements
 - Maximum-allowable thickness
 - Recoverability limits



Images & information from ITRC (2018) TPHRisk-1 https://tphrisk-1.itrcweb.org [State Surveys (M. Pattanayek)]

NSZD: A Tale of Two Regulatory Perspectives



Image modified from: ITRC (2018) LNAPL-3 https://Inapl-3.itrcweb.org/

NSZD Assessments Throughout a LUST Investigation



Site Characterization Report & CSM

- Characterization of the LNAPL Body
 - Composition:
 - What components are regulated vs. not-regulated?
 - Are the compositional proportions changing with time?
 - Extent & Magnitude
 - Stability & Mobility
- Demonstrated NSZD acting on LNAPL body as part of natural attenuation assessment
 - Is NSZD occurring in the LNAPL Body & by what mechanisms (multiple lines of evidence)?
 - What is the overall rate of NSZD?
 - Are <u>all</u> regulated constituents attenuating?

NSZD Assessments Throughout a LUST Investigation



Corrective Action Plan

- Defined site-specific corrective action goals:
 - What is the LNAPL extent reduction required?*
 - Are there specific NAPL constituent concentration goals (e.g. [Benzene] > 100 ppb)?
- Documented proposed remedial method comparisons
 - Sole-remedy vs. multiple-remedy vs. treatment train
 - Time/cost to achieve corrective action goals
 - Proposed performance metrics & responses/contingencies
- Importance of the NSZD rate (Site Characterization)
 - Sole-remedy evaluations baseline comparison rate
 - Treatment train evaluations basis for remedy transition

NSZD Assessments Throughout a LUST Investigation



"Is it safe to walk away?"

"How long until risk-based screening levels are achieved?"

LUST Closure (Risk-based Corrective Action Standards)

- Demonstration of achieved correction action goals
- Documentation of continuing NSZD activity
- Evaluation of time remaining to achieve Tier 1 standards
- Documentation & assessment of potentially variable future site factors that might inhibit continued NSZD activity

Documenting NSZD: Lines of Evidence

- Plume Stability
- LNAPL Mass
- Electron Acceptors
- Methane Concentrations in Groundwater
- Soil Gas
- Depletion Rate
- Compositional Analysis



NSZD & Stakeholder Engagement

- Responsible Party
- Regulatory Agency
- Impacted and Potentially Impacted Property Owners
- Municipality
- Utility Companies
- Public

Providing information in the beginning is important but also given the length of time these processes can take periodic updates/reminders may also be important depending on the scenario.

The Regulator's Balancing Act

NSZD as a remedy:

- Feasibility can all LNAPL remedial objectives be achieved?
- Reasonable timeframe
 - Maintaining site control/access for continued monitoring
 - Potential changes in the use of impacted groundwater
 - Impact to surrounding property values
- Costs vs. active remedial alternative(s)

NSZD supporting a risk-based LUST closure:

- Timeframe to achieve Tier 1 Risk-based screening levels post-closure
- Assessing all potential future groundwater beneficial uses
- Potential changes to site conditions inhibiting NSZD activity
- Impact to future site/area potential development activities