



COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
Board of Registration
of
Hazardous Waste Site Cleanup
Professionals

ONE WINTER STREET, 3rd Floor

BOSTON, MA 02108

PHONE: 617-556-1091 FAX: 617-292-5872

SUMMARY OF INITIAL BOARD ACTIONS

Updated
November 19, 2009

For additional information contact:
Terry Wood, General Counsel
(617) 292-5814
terry.wood@state.ma.us.

This page informs the public of those open disciplinary matters in which the Board has concluded preliminary investigations and initiated formal disciplinary proceedings against an LSP. The Board initiates these proceedings by issuing the LSP an Order To Show Cause. In each instance, this Order summarizes the results of the preliminary investigation and directs the LSP to show cause why sufficient factual grounds do not exist to impose discipline upon the LSP. Upon receipt of an Order, an LSP can request an adjudicatory hearing to contest whether sufficient factual grounds exist to impose discipline against him/her, or, alternatively, can opt not to contest this and can seek to address the Board regarding what, if any, form or level of discipline is appropriate.

As a result of a regulation change in January 2003, when the Board concludes a preliminary investigation, it no longer makes a tentative decision regarding the form or level of discipline to impose. The decision regarding the form or level of discipline is now made at a later stage in the disciplinary process after the Board has finally determined that sufficient factual grounds exist to impose discipline and has reached final conclusions regarding those facts.

- LSP Board Complaint [Numbers 99C-11 and 00C-14](#)

LSP Board Complaint No. 99C-11 and 00C-14

On October 9, 2003, the Board voted to commence formal disciplinary proceedings against an LSP. In the Order to Show Cause served on the LSP, the Board described the findings of the Board's preliminary investigation and concluded that these findings constituted sufficient grounds to discipline the LSP. This action resulted from two complaints, one filed by the Department of Environmental Protection ("DEP") and the other by a private party.

Summary of Findings

Based on the preliminary investigation, the Board determined that the LSP had violated the following Board Rules of Professional Conduct:

- I. The LSP failed to comply with the Board's Rule of Professional Conduct at 309 CMR 4.02 (1) by failing to act with reasonable care and diligence in regard to the disposal sites outlined below. Examples of conduct that violated this regulation included, without limitation, the following:
 - i. In the case of the three Downgradient Property Status Opinions for three separate sites, failing to disclose and explain known available information regarding each site's history that may have tended to have supported or led to a contrary or significantly different opinion; and failing to provide adequate support for the LSP's opinion that each site was not the source of any of the contamination found there.
 - ii. In the case of the RAO Opinions for three separate sites, failing to identify that groundwater at issue should have been classified as GW-1.
 - iii. In the case of the RAO Opinions for four separate sites, failing to determine the direction of groundwater flow, failing to define nature and extent of releases, and/or failure to adequately characterize risks posed by those releases.
 - iv. In the case of the RAO Opinion for one site, opining without adequate support that the vinyl chloride and NAPL detected on site were all migrating from an upgradient property.
- II. The LSP failed to comply with the Board's Rule of Professional Conduct at 309 CMR 4.03(3)(b) by failing to follow the requirements and procedures set forth in the applicable provisions of M.G.L. c. 21E and 310 CMR 40.0000.
- III. The LSP failed to comply with the Board's Rule of Professional Conduct at 309 CMR 4.03(3)(c) by, among other things, in the case of RAO Opinions for five separate sites, failing to collect sufficient data to define the nature and extent of the releases and to adequately characterize the risks posed by those releases.
- IV. The LSP failed to comply with the Board's Rule of Professional Conduct at 309 CMR 4.03(3)(d) by, among other things, in the case of the DPS Opinions for three separate sites, failing to disclose and explain known available information that may have tended to have supported or led to a contrary or significantly different opinion.

Background of Case

In its initial investigation, the Board determined that, based on the poor quality of the LSP's work, the LSP did not adhere to the fundamental principles of site assessment or risk characterization. The Board also concluded, based on review of a number of the LSP's submissions, that certain fundamental problems repeated themselves throughout the LSP's work and had not been corrected even with two complaints pending before the Board. The fundamental problems identified by the Board were: 1) filing Downgradient Property Status Opinions without adequate data or in the face of contrary data, 2) failing to identify that the

groundwater at issue should have been classified as GW-1, 3) failing to determine the direction of groundwater flow, and 4) failing to define the nature and extent of releases or to adequately characterize the risks posed by the releases.

A. Filing Downgradient Property Status Opinions without Adequate Data or in the Face of Contrary Data

In the case of three Downgradient Property Status (DPS) Opinions, the Board found that at each site the LSP did not include known information that suggested the site was the source or at least a contributing source of the release. The Board also concluded that, in the case of each of these three DPS Opinions, the LSP did not provide adequate support for his/her opinion that the site was not the source of any of the contamination found there.

a. DPS Opinion No. 1

On December 19, 1996, the LSP submitted a DPS Opinion regarding a release of chlorinated solvents at a property. The text of the LSP's opinion was only 2½ pages long. In the opinion, the LSP opined that the chlorinated solvents originated from an upgradient source. The LSP concluded that the sump pump located near the center of the property was drawing the chlorinated solvents vertically upward and that this was the reason levels of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) had been highest in the center of the site rather than on the upgradient border. The Board found that the LSP failed to provide adequate support for his/her opinion regarding the sump pump and that s/he failed to take any steps to investigate or confirm this theory. Two VOCs, tetrachloroethylene and trichloroethylene, were detected in a downgradient well but not in the upgradient wells. The LSP did not offer an explanation in the DPS submittal for this result.

In the text of the DPS opinion, the LSP referenced a June 1996 assessment report prepared by another consulting firm. This report indicated that reportable concentrations of chlorinated solvents were present in groundwater at the site, and described a long history of industrial operations at the site dating back to approximately 1919. The report concluded that it was likely that former industrial and manufacturing uses of the site had materially affected subsurface conditions there.

After DEP informed the property owner that DEP believed insufficient information had been provided in support of the DPS opinion, the site owner retracted the DPS submittal on March 24, 1999. In a letter submitted as part of the DPS termination, the LSP stated that newly discovered assessment reports had documented industrial use of the site that was previously not known. While the LSP stated in the letter that this historical information regarding past industrial uses of the property had just come to light, this same information had been included in the 1996 report referenced in the DPS submittal.

b. DPS Opinion No. 2

This DPS Opinion was received by DEP on June 4, 1996. The text of the opinion was only two pages long and no analytical data was included with the submittal. The LSP opined in the submittal that the source of VOCs detected in groundwater at the site was one of four properties that the LSP alleged were upgradient. The LSP did not calculate the direction of groundwater flow at the site but stated: “groundwater flow in the vicinity of the site appears to be in an easterly to southerly direction.” As pointed out by the LSP in the DPS submittal, the site was located in a Zone II Aquifer Protection Area.

The LSP stated in the DPS that, during site assessments conducted at the site in 1984 and 1985, petroleum hydrocarbons had not been detected in groundwater near the location where the VOCs at issue in the DPS were found. The Respondent also stated: “Although the site had been occupied by a gasoline station and fuel storage depot, both operations were closed in 1984 and the 1970’s, respectfully.” The Respondent stated that the VOCs were consistent with a recent gasoline-related release but no analysis was performed to ascertain whether this theory was correct. The site plan included with the DPS submittal indicated only a single groundwater monitoring well on the site and, as stated above, no analytical data was included with the report. The plan also did not indicate the locations of either the former ASTs or USTs or the locations where contaminated soil had previously been detected. However, a comparison between the site plan included with the DPS and the site plan in a 1984 assessment report suggests that the single monitoring well was located in the vicinity of the former gasoline USTs and pump islands.

The Board noted that the 1984 assessment report regarding the site stated that the site had been used as a gasoline station since 1949. The 1984 report also stated that, while no volatiles were detected in groundwater samples collected from a single borehole at the site, “the lab noted that contamination is present that is too heavy to show up on the volatile scan.” The 1984 report concluded that the source of this groundwater contamination was likely number 2 fuel oil associated with a spill from a former fuel oil tank on the site. The Board also noted that a 1991 assessment report stated that, during a May 1985 study to determine the extent of petroleum contamination at the site based on its past use as a gasoline station, “common constituents were detected in the groundwater at the location of the former tanks, but not elsewhere.” The 1991 report stated that “the largest area of concern [on the site] is the area where the four 20 foot high vertical above ground tanks were previously located.” The report suggested the installation of additional soil borings and groundwater monitoring wells to “ascertain the levels and extent of petroleum subsurface contamination due to the location of former above ground petroleum and underground storage tanks at [the site].”

c. DPS Opinion No. 3

The LSP filed a DPS Opinion dated August 16, 1996 regarding gasoline detected at a site. While not discussed in the DPS Opinion, the site had been used for auto sales and service since 1931 and underground storage tanks had been located there. DEP had issued a release tracking number for this site in 1991 when free product was observed in a monitoring well near the location where two 3,000-gallon USTs had been previously removed. This monitoring well was located on the southern edge of the property adjacent to a street.

A 1990 site assessment report prepared by a different consultant stated that the well was located in the vicinity of two 3,000-gallon former USTs and that it was possible that the contamination detected in the well represented residual contamination from the previous tanks, or a regional condition. The report stated that the two 3000-gallon USTs had been removed from the site in April 1988 and “small amounts of gasoline were noted around the two tanks.” A 1991 report prepared by a different consultant stated that petroleum product had been detected in the monitoring well on several different days in June 1991, and each time approximately 16 ounces of product was bailed from the well. The site map included with the 1991 report indicates that the well is located near the location of two former 3,000-gallon USTs.

In 1995, a new RTN was assigned to the site after one inch or more of non-aqueous phase liquid (“NAPL”) gasoline was detected in this same monitoring well. In December 1995, the LSP had two monitoring wells installed in the street adjacent to the site. NAPL was identified in these two wells in January 1996.

The text of the LSP’s 1996 DPS opinion was only two pages long. The LSP opined in the submission that the NAPL detected in the on-site well was from a gasoline station located across the street from and due south of the site. The LSP stated that the NAPL found in the on-site well appeared to be “fresh and unweathered,” that sources of gasoline had been removed from the site, and that gasoline had not been stored at the site for many years. The LSP also wrote: “Hydrogeologic data suggested that regional groundwater flow is in a northerly direction.” Therefore, the LSP concluded that, considering the discovery of NAPL in the two wells placed in the street to the south of the on-site well, the source of the contamination in the on-site well was the upgradient gasoline station. The LSP also indicated that there were several other gasoline stations in the vicinity with listed gasoline releases.

No analytical data was included in the DPS opinion. Groundwater flow direction was not calculated but was inferred. No analysis was done to test the LSP’s theory that the gasoline detected in the on-site monitoring well was “fresh and unweathered.” The DPS opinion included only a very limited site history and did not indicate that the monitoring well on site was located near the location of the two former 3,000-gallon gasoline USTs. Similarly, the site figure included in the DPS opinion did not indicate the location of the former tanks. No monitoring wells were placed within the tank excavation area to determine if any contamination was present.

B. Failing to Identify that Groundwater at Issue Should have been Classified as GW-1

In the case of three RAO Opinions reviewed by the Board, the LSP failed to identify that the groundwater at issue should have been classified as GW-1.

a. RAO Opinion No. 1

On October 21, 1998, the LSP filed a Release Abatement Measure (RAM) Completion Report and Class A-2 Response Action Outcome Statement for a 2.4-acre former manufacturing property. The submission included only 5¼ pages of text. The site was located within a

Potentially Productive Aquifer, a DEP-approved Zone II and a town-designated Aquifer Protection District.

Even though the site was located within a DEP-approved Zone II, the LSP opined in the RAO Opinion that the site was not within a GW-1 groundwater classification area but rather that groundwater classifications GW-2 and GW-3 applied. The LSP opined: “The boundary of the Zone II is incorrect and should be modified based on model flaws, Site geology, and lack of contaminant transport.” The LSP wrote that, based on a 1996 report regarding the town wells, “the Site is located at a point of stagnation between two wells. Therefore, groundwater from the Site will not move toward either well even during worst case pumping and drought conditions.” The Class A-2 RAO was based on a Method 1 Risk Assessment. The LSP opined that no significant risk existed at the site because soil contaminant concentrations were below the Method 1 S-1 cleanup standards and groundwater contaminant concentrations were below the Method 1 GW-2 and GW-3 standards. Several compounds, including 1,1-dichloroethane, cis-1,2-dichloroethene, and trichloroethene, were detected at concentrations above Method 1 GW-1 standards. In addition, groundwater samples were collected from only three of the on-site monitoring wells prior to the filing of the RAO. The RAO report did not discuss groundwater flow direction, well depths or historic well data. The report stated: “Based on assessments and reports on file at the DEP, contaminants have not migrated from beneath the building, let alone the site, in more than 20 years.”

As a result of a DEP audit of the RAO submission, DEP issued an NON to the site owner and an NON directly to the LSP for inappropriately classifying groundwater in a Department-approved Zone II. DEP required the site owner to Tier Classify the site or submit a Class C RAO. DEP also filed a complaint with the Board regarding the Respondent’s misclassification of groundwater at this site.

Another environmental consulting company prepared a letter opinion dated November 13, 2000 for a prospective purchaser of the site. The opinion stated that in October 2000 the firm had installed six deep overburden and shallow bedrock groundwater monitoring wells at the site. The opinion stated that one well contained high concentrations of trichloroethylene, (TCE – 44,900 ug/l) 1,1,1,-trichloroethane (1,1,1 TCA – 32,000 ug/l), and 1,1 dichloroethylene (1,1 DCE – 3,200 ug/l). These levels were approximately 2 orders of magnitude above the levels previously seen, and four orders of magnitude above drinking water standards. The firm also opined in the letter that obtaining site closure under the MCP would require significant additional expense for more site characterization, remediation, and long-term operation and maintenance of the remedial system.

b. RAO Opinion No. 2

On June 24, 1994, DEP received a Class A-3 RAO and revised Phase I report prepared by the LSP for a 17-acre industrial/commercial property. The Method 3 Risk Characterization completed for the site classified groundwater as GW-3 because the site was not within a Zone II, Interim Wellhead Protection Area, Potentially Productive Aquifer, Zone A of a Class A surface water body used for drinking water, and was not located greater than 500 feet from a public water

distribution line or less than 500 feet from a private water well. In an NOAF dated October 9, 1995, DEP stated that, in fact, the site was included in a medium yield aquifer and, therefore, groundwater at the site should have been classified as GW-1. The LSP has acknowledged that GW-1 applied to the site at the time s/he filed the RAO opinion. The LSP has also acknowledged that s/he did not check the available maps that would have indicated that the site was in a medium yield aquifer before filing the RAO submittal.

c. RAO Opinion No. 3

On May 25, 1995, the LSP filed a Class A-3 RAO for a 6.8-acre industrial and agricultural site. The LSP classified groundwater at the site as GW-2. In an NOAF dated April 16, 1996, DEP wrote that the town's Zone II map shows the site within the Zone II and, therefore, the groundwater should have been classified as GW-1. The LSP has acknowledged that the site was within an approved Zone II at the time s/he filed the RAO opinion. S/he also acknowledged that s/he neglected to research the town's aquifer protection maps before filing the RAO Opinion.

C. Failure to Determine the Direction of Groundwater Flow, Failure to Define Nature and Extent of Releases and/or Failure to Adequately Characterize Risks Posed by Those Releases

The Board concluded that the following RAO reports were characterized by a failure to determine the direction of groundwater flow, failure to define nature and extent of releases and/or failure to adequately characterize risks posed by those releases.

a. RAO Opinion No. 4

DEP received an RAO Statement dated April 18, 1995 for a property that had been occupied in the past by a research and development firm. The RAO Statement addressed a 1990 release of an unknown quantity of solvents that had leaked from 55-gallon drums in a fenced area outside the main building on the property and had stained soil.

The RAO Statement was only 1.5 pages long. The document stated that approximately 10 cubic yards of soil contaminated with trace concentrations of toluene and xylene were excavated on February 4, 1991. The document also stated that assessment included a soil gas survey and the installation of groundwater monitoring wells. However, the site map included with the RAO indicated that only a single monitoring well had been installed. The RAO stated that due to the confined nature of the site (closely spaced buildings and bedrock outcrops) the monitoring well had been installed downgradient of the spill on an adjacent property. The direction of groundwater flow was not calculated. In the NOAF, DEP required installation of additional monitoring wells on site and collection of additional soil data.

The RAO Statement stated that analysis of a sample collected from this single monitoring well indicated VOCs were not present at detectable concentrations. No confirmatory soil samples were collected after the removal of the contaminated soil. Also, no other soil samples were collected during the installation of the single monitoring well on the adjacent property or at any other point during the site investigation. The Board concluded that insufficient soil and

groundwater data had been collected to define the nature and extent of the release or to adequately characterize risk. The Board also concluded that the RAO submittal failed to include sufficient information about the site and the investigation activities undertaken there.

b. RAO Opinion No. 5

A Class A-2 RAO Statement was received by DEP on November 9, 1998. The RAO statement addressed a sudden release of approximately 3,000 gallons of No. 6 fuel oil at a manufacturing facility. The text of the report was only five pages long.

The fuel oil release had been reported on September 8, 1998 and resulted from the failure of a pressurized bleed line. The product was released within the on-site building and onto the facility floor. According to the RAO Statement, the released product migrated outside of the building and onto the concrete tank pad area for the 12,000-gallon UST that originally stored the product, onto a paved area, and onto an unpaved gravel driveway. The report also stated that the release migrated into a storm water catch basin that discharged to a wooded area north of the building.

During response actions carried out at the site between September 8 and September 17, 1998, approximately 7,500 gallons of No. 6 fuel oil and rinse water were collected from the site using a vacuum truck and high pressure cleaning equipment. Approximately 36.82 tons of oil-contaminated gravel/soil were removed from the site.

Sampling of soil to determine residual petroleum impacts was not performed following soil removal. Surface water was also not sampled even though petroleum impacts to a catch basin and soil at the associated outfall were documented. The Respondent wrote in the RAO Statement that the release was contained at the stormwater outfall, and surface water was not affected by the release. A soil sample was collected from the storm drain outfall. Analysis of the sample detected Extractable Petroleum Hydrocarbons (EPH) below S-1/GW-2/GW-3 Method 1 Risk Characterization standards. Concentrations of EPH target analytes were not detected.

After an audit inspection on February 18, 1999, DEP required that additional soil and surface water sampling be conducted. On April 5, 1999, DEP received correspondence from the LSP regarding the new sampling data. Soil samples were collected from five locations: two in the gravel driveway and three from discrete oil seep areas. The results of all five samples were used to calculate average exposure point concentrations. Laboratory results on one of the samples collected from an oil seep area adjacent to the southeast wall of the on-site building revealed exposure point concentrations of EPH of 2,250 ppm C₁₁-C₂₂ Aromatics. This concentration was above applicable S-2/GW-2/GW-3 Method 1 Risk Characterization standards.

In an NOAF dated April 30, 1999, DEP stated that areas of contamination that are not contiguous must be considered as separate exposure points and, therefore, based on the analysis of this one soil sample, a condition of No Significant Risk had not been achieved at the site.

On February 26, 1999, two surface water samples (one upgradient and one downgradient) were collected. Laboratory analytical results of the downstream sample detected polynuclear aromatic

hydrocarbons (PAHs). In the April 1999 letter to DEP, the LSP wrote that the PAHs may not be associated with the outfall and that additional sampling would be undertaken to evaluate the condition. DEP required that the RAO Statement be retracted.

The Board concluded that insufficient soil, groundwater and surface water data had been collected to define the nature and extent of the release or to adequately characterize risk. The Board also concluded that the RAO submittal failed to include sufficient information about the site and the investigation activities undertaken there.

c. RAO Opinion No. 6

On July 25, 2000, DEP received a Class B-1 RAO by the LSP. The RAO was based upon a Method 1 risk characterization. Soil was classified as S-1 and groundwater was classified as GW-2 and GW-3. The RAO applied to a release tracking number issued by DEP in response to a release of gasoline from former gasoline underground storage tanks that were removed from the property on April 1, 1999. The LSP's RAO report stated that an abandoned 275-gallon fuel oil UST was also removed from the site on March 31, 1999.

The data included in the RAO report indicated that laboratory analysis of soil and groundwater samples collected on May 20, 1999, in the vicinity of the former fuel oil UST detected concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons in excess of RCS-1 and RCGW-2 reportable concentrations. This condition required notification to the Department within 120 days, but no such notification to the Department was ever made.

The text of the RAO report was only 4½ pages long, including the Method 1 risk characterization. The report did not indicate the direction of groundwater flow at the site, and it included no information regarding migration pathways, human and environmental receptors, current and reasonably foreseeable site uses, exposure points for contamination, disposal site history, or site hydrogeological characteristics.

The Method 1 risk characterization concluded that a condition of no significant risk with respect to groundwater contamination existed at the site even though a May 20, 1999, groundwater sample from a monitoring well located in the vicinity of the fuel oil UST excavation contained a concentration of C9-C18 aliphatic hydrocarbons (6,100 ppb) in excess of the Method 1 GW-2 standard of 1,000 ppb, and only one confirmatory analysis had been performed (on March 10, 2000) and found to be below the Method 1 GW-2 standard. The text of the RAO report did not discuss the May 20, 1999 groundwater result.

On February 14, 2001, DEP issued an NOAF to the site owners regarding the RAO Statement. The NOAF required that the RAO be retracted and either a Tier Classification Submittal or a new RAO Statement, based upon an adequate characterization of the fuel oil release at the site, be submitted.

The Board concluded that insufficient soil and groundwater data had been collected to define the nature and extent of the release or to adequately characterize risk. The Board also concluded that

the RAO submittal failed to include sufficient information about the site and the investigation activities undertaken there.

d. RAO Opinion No. 7

The site was a former bus garage and a former truck repair facility that had been renovated circa 1984 to a warehouse for the dry storage of packaged food products. In 1985, ten underground storage tanks were removed from the site, floor drains were closed, and grease traps were removed.

On October 15, 2001, DEP received a Class A-3 RAO Statement prepared by the LSP. The RAO was based on a Method 1 risk characterization. As reported in the RAO report, in 1997 one inch of light non-aqueous phase liquid (“LNAPL”) had been detected in three monitoring wells located near the southern boundary of the site. NAPL had been historically reported in this area. A concentration of 75 µg/L vinyl chloride had also been detected in one of the three monitoring wells in September 1999 (sole groundwater sampling event). This concentration exceeded the applicable Method 1, GW-2 standard of 2 µg/L. Also a groundwater sample collected from another one of the three wells in September 1999 exhibited a vinyl chloride level of 2 µg/L.

The LSP asserted in the RAO opinion that the LNAPL contamination present in the three wells and the vinyl chloride detected in two of the wells was all attributable to the upgradient property and, therefore, s/he excluded these exposure points and contaminants from the risk characterization. The LSP also asserted that extractable petroleum hydrocarbon (EPH) fractions that measured as high as 13,000 mg/Kg in on-site soil borings at two of the wells were also attributable to the upgradient property.

The LSP did not file a Downgradient Property Status Opinion. Rather, the LSP stated that the contamination detected in the southern portion of the site was attributable to the upgradient property and, therefore, was not part of the disposal site addressed in the RAO submittal. The LSP determined that the disposal site was limited to the immediate vicinity of the former USTs located near the loading dock/hardtop parking lot and excluded the areas of the former grease pits, floor drains, and midsection of the building where an underground tank used as a gas trap had existed.

The LSP stated in the opinion that in November 1996 a 3,000-gallon No.6 heating oil UST and a 5,000-gallon No.4/No.6 heating oil UST were removed from the upgradient property. The LSP stated that the tanks were deteriorated when removed and that approximately six inches of NAPL, which appeared to be No. 6 fuel oil, was detected in groundwater monitoring wells installed on the upgradient site after the tank excavation. The LSP also stated that results of a passive soil gas survey conducted at the site in 1997 supported an off-Site, upgradient source. The LSP opined in the RAO Opinion that residual contamination from potential on-site sources was “not significant in the context of Massachusetts General Law (M.G.L.) c. 21E in light of the off-Site contamination conditions affecting the Site.”

DEP conducted an audit of the RAO Opinion and issued a Notice of Audit Findings in April 2003. Among the violations noted in the NOAF, DEP stated that the LSP's assertion that the LNAPL and vinyl chloride were migrating solely from the upgradient site was not adequately supported because, among other things: two of the monitoring wells were located in the midsection of the building near the former underground concrete tank (used as a gas trap) and the floor drain system, both of which have been identified by other environmental consultants as on-site sources of contamination; a 1985 report regarding the site had identified various on-site sources of contamination such as a UST used as a gas trap and piping connecting floor drains under the building; and another consulting firm had reported in 1987 that solvents used to paint and clean automotive parts inside the building were discharged into the groundwater by the on-site floor drain system. DEP also stated in the NOAF that the limited groundwater data failed to provide sufficient information to determine if the LNAPL was acting as an on-going source to groundwater, as a consequence of intermedia transfer. The NOAF stated that the RAO also failed to demonstrate that a level of no significant risk had been achieved at the site because the risk characterization excluded vinyl chloride without sufficient technical justification. The NOAF required that additional investigation be undertaken at the property and that a revised RAO be submitted.

The Board concluded that the LSP did not provide sufficient technical justification for opining that the contamination found on-site was unrelated to past site activities. The Board also concluded that the LSP failed to collect sufficient data from the site to define the nature and extent of the release or to adequately characterize risk.

Order to Show Cause

The LSP will now have an opportunity to request a formal adjudicatory hearing to show cause why sufficient grounds do not exist to impose discipline.
