



Standard Guide for Vapor Encroachment Screening on Property Involved in Real Estate Transactions¹

This standard is issued under the fixed designation E2600; the number immediately following the designation indicates the year of original adoption or, in the case of revision, the year of last revision. A number in parentheses indicates the year of last reapproval. A superscript epsilon (ε) indicates an editorial change since the last revision or reapproval.

1. Scope

1.1 *Purpose*—The purpose of this guide is to provide practical guidance and a useful process for conducting a *vapor encroachment screen (VES)* on a property parcel involved in a *real estate transaction* in the United States of America with respect to *chemicals of concern (COC)* that may migrate as vapors onto a property as a result of contaminated soil and groundwater on or near the property. This guide may be used in conjunction with Practice E1527 but does not alter or in any way define the scope of that practice. In addition, performance of this guide is not a requirement of and does not constitute, expand, or in any way define “all appropriate inquiry” as defined and approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) and the regulations there under, including 40 CFR Sec. 312.11.

1.1.1 *Vapor Encroachment Condition (VEC)*—The goal of conducting a *VES*, as established by this guide, on a parcel of property is to identify a *vapor encroachment condition (VEC)*, which is the presence or likely presence of *COC* vapors in the sub-surface of the *target property (TP)* caused by the release of vapors from contaminated soil or groundwater either on or near the *TP* as identified by Tier 1 (see Section 8) or Tier 2 (see Section 9) procedures.

1.1.2 *Federal, State, and Local Environmental Laws*—This guide does not address requirements of any federal, state, or local laws with respect to vapor intrusion. *Users* are cautioned that federal, state, and local laws, regulations, or policy may impose vapor encroachment screening or vapor intrusion assessment obligations that are beyond the scope of this guide (information is provided in Appendix X5 and Appendix X9). *Users* should also be aware that there may be other legal obligations, for example, disclosure, with regard to *COC* or *COC* vapors discovered on the *TP* that are not addressed in this guide.

1.1.3 *Documentation*—The scope of this guide includes investigation and reporting actions. Sufficient documentation of all sources, records, and resources used in the investigation procedures that are set out in this guide should be provided in the *VES report* (refer to Section 10).

1.2 *Objectives*—Objectives guiding the development of this guide are: (1) to synthesize and put into writing a practical guide for conducting a *VES* on a property involved in a *real estate transaction* and (2) to provide that the process to screen for a *VEC* is practical and reasonable.

1.3 *Considerations Outside the Scope*—The use of this guide is strictly limited to the scope set forth in this section. Section 11 of this guide identifies, for informational purposes, certain tasks (not an all-inclusive list) that may be conducted on a property that are beyond the scope of this guide but that may warrant consideration by parties to a *real estate transaction*. Whether to include an investigation of any such conditions in the *environmental professional's* scope of services should be evaluated by the *user* and should be agreed upon between the *user* and *environmental professional* as additional services beyond the scope of this guide before initiation of a *Phase I ESA* conducted in conjunction with a *VES* or initiation of an independent *VES*.

1.4 *Units*—The values stated in inch-pound units are to be regarded as the standard. The values given in parentheses are mathematical conversions to SI units that are provided for information only and are not considered standard.

1.5 *Organization of This Guide*—This guide has eleven sections and nine appendices. The appendices are included for informational purposes and are not part of the procedures prescribed in this guide.

Section 1	contains the scope of the guide.
Section 2	includes the referenced documents.
Section 3	has definitions of terms pertinent to this guide, terms used in this guide but defined in Practice E1527, and acronyms.
Section 4	is directed at the significance and use of this guide.
Section 5	discusses the relationship between this guide and Practice E1527.
Section 6	describes the <i>user's</i> responsibilities under this guide.
Sections 7-10	consist of the main body of the <i>VES</i> process, including evaluation and <i>report</i> preparation.
Section 11	provides information regarding non-scope considerations (see 1.3).
Appendix X1	provides legal background in support of vapor encroachment screening.

¹ This guide is under the jurisdiction of ASTM Committee E50 on Environmental Assessment, Risk Management and Corrective Action and is the direct responsibility of Subcommittee E50.02 on Real Estate Assessment and Management.

Current edition approved June 1, 2010. Published June 2010. Originally approved in 2008. Last previous edition approved in 2008 as E2600 – 08. DOI: 10.1520/E2600-10.

Appendix X2	provides guidance on suggested qualifications for the <i>environmental professional</i> conducting the VES.
Appendix X3	provides a sample questionnaire for the <i>environmental professional</i> to obtain pertinent information for the VES from the <i>property owner/operator/occupants</i> .
Appendix X4	provides a recommended table of contents and report format for the VES investigation when not incorporated into a <i>Phase I ESA</i> report.
Appendix X5	includes a listing of federal and state agency web sites that discuss vapor intrusion assessment policies and guidance.
Appendix X6	includes a list of typical <i>chemicals of concern</i> .
Appendix X7	provides general guidance for vapor intrusion assessment and mitigation.
Appendix X8	provides general guidance and references for data collection in the conduct of vapor intrusion investigations.
Appendix X9	provides a supplemental bibliography of federal and state vapor intrusion guidance and other publications that may assist the <i>environmental professional</i> conducting a VES or vapor intrusion assessment.

1.6 *This guide does not purport to address all of the safety concerns, if any, associated with its use. It is the responsibility of the user of this guide to establish appropriate safety and health practices and determine the applicability of regulatory limitations prior to use.*

1.7 *This guide cannot replace education or experience and should be used in conjunction with professional judgment. Not all aspects of this guide may be applicable in all circumstances. This ASTM guide is not intended to represent or replace the standard of care by which the adequacy of a given professional service must be judged, nor should this guide be applied without consideration of a project's many unique aspects. The word "Standard" in the title means only that the guide has been approved through the ASTM consensus process.*

2. Referenced Documents

2.1 ASTM Standards:²

E1527 Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process

2.2 Federal Statutes:

42 U.S.C. U.S. Code, Title 42, The Public Health and Welfare, Solid Waste Disposal, Identification and Listing of Hazardous Wastes, §6901, 6903, 6921; 42 U.S.C. U.S. Code, Title 42, Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, 9605, 9601, *et seq.*

2.3 USEPA Documents:

40 CFR Title 40, Protection of Environment, Chapter 1, Environmental Protection Agency, Parts 300, 302, 312, 355, *et seq.*

2.4 Other Documents:

NTP National Toxicology Program, "Annual Report on Carcinogens," (latest edition)

IARC International Agency for Research on Cancer "Monographs" (latest editions)

NIOSH National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, "Registry of Toxic Effects of Chemical Substances"

3. Terminology

3.1 This section provides definitions and descriptions of terms used in this guide and of terms used in this guide extracted from Practice E1527 (some of which have been modified to be consistent with this guide), and a list of acronyms for keywords used in this guide. The terms are an integral part of this guide and are critical to an understanding of the guide and its use.

3.2 Definitions of Terms Specific to This Standard:

3.2.1 *approximate minimum search distance, n*—defined in subsections 8.3.1 and 8.3.2 and is also the *area of concern (AOC)*.

3.2.2 *aquifer, n*—rock or sediment in a formation, a group of formations, or part of a formation that is saturated and sufficiently permeable to transmit water to wells or springs.

3.2.3 *area of concern (AOC), n*—defined in subsections 8.2.1, 8.3.1, and 8.3.2 and is also the *approximate minimum search distance*.

3.2.4 *biodegradation, n*—process by which microbial organisms transform or alter (through metabolic, enzymatic, or other action) the structure of chemicals present in the environment.

3.2.5 *chemical(s) of concern, COC, n*—chemical that is present in the subsurface environment and can potentially migrate as a vapor into the sub-surface of the TP.

3.2.5.1 *Discussion*—COC generally meet specific criteria for *volatility* and *toxicity* and include volatile organic compounds, semi-volatile organic compounds, petroleum hydrocarbons, and volatile inorganic analytes (such as mercury). Common COC are presented in Appendix X6.

3.2.6 *conduit, n*—preferential pathway along which vapors released from contaminated soil or groundwater may migrate onto the TP.

3.2.7 *contaminant, n*—any physical, chemical, biological, or radiological substance or matter that has an adverse effect on air, water, or soil.

3.2.8 *contaminated plume, n*—plume in which concentrations of COC are known to be present in the soil or groundwater or both at concentrations exceeding levels that generally would be the subject of an enforcement action if brought to the attention of appropriate governmental agencies.

3.2.8.1 *Discussion*—A *contaminated plume* can take the form of a groundwater *contaminated plume* or a soil *contaminated plume*. In a groundwater *contaminated plume*, COC are conveyed as *solutes* away from the point at which they were introduced into groundwater. They move with the migrating groundwater mass in the direction of groundwater flow. When dispersion within the groundwater *contaminated plume* brings a dissolved COC to the groundwater-soil gas interface, the COC may transition from the dissolved state to the vapor state and migrate from groundwater into soil gas in the vadose zone. Once a COC gets into soil gas in the vadose zone, its migration may no longer be dependent on or related to groundwater movement. In a soil *contaminated plume*, COC volatilized from the soil mix freely with soil gas that exists within soil voids in the vadose zone. COC in the soil gas can also be introduced from underlying contaminated groundwater, as a result of a liquid spill into vadose zone soils, or by the direct

² For referenced ASTM standards, visit the ASTM website, www.astm.org, or contact ASTM Customer Service at service@astm.org. For *Annual Book of ASTM Standards* volume information, refer to the standard's Document Summary page on the ASTM website.

release of vapors from a leaking underground source. Migration of the *COC* contaminated soil gas through the vadose zone may be in any direction; however, it preferentially follows the path of least resistance. Fluctuations in barometric pressure may cause movement of air and vapors into and out of the vadose zone through preferential pathways.

3.2.9 *contaminated property, n*—property on which soil or groundwater or both contains *chemicals of concern (COC)* at concentrations exceeding levels that generally would be the subject of an enforcement action if brought to the attention of appropriate governmental agencies.

3.2.10 *critical distance, n*—defined in subsection 9.2.

3.2.11 *dwelling, n*—structure or portion thereof used for residential habitation.

3.2.12 *environmental professional, n*—person meeting the education, training, and experience requirements as set forth in 40 CFR 312.10(b), which is the requirement set forth in Practice E1527 (see subsection 3.3.5).

3.2.13 *findings, n*—defined in subsection 10.2.2.

3.2.14 *fracture, n*—break in a rock formation.

3.2.14.1 *Discussion*—Faults, shears, joints, and planes of fracture cleavage are all types of fractures.

3.2.15 *groundwater, n*—water contained in the pore spaces of saturated geologic media.

3.2.16 *Henry's law, n*—relationship between the partial pressure of a compound in air and the concentration of that compound in water under equilibrium conditions; *Henry's law* constants are temperature dependent.

3.2.17 *hydrocarbon, n*—chemical compound composed only of carbon and hydrogen atoms.

3.2.18 *moisture content (of soil), n*—amount of water lost from soil upon drying to a constant weight expressed as the weight per unit weight of dry soil or as the volume of water per unit bulk volume of the soil.

3.2.18.1 *Discussion*—For a fully saturated medium, moisture content expressed as a volume fraction equals the porosity.

3.2.19 *nonaqueous phase liquid, NAPL, n*—substances that do not dissolve readily in water and that remain in the original bulk liquid form in the subsurface.

3.2.19.1 *Discussion*—Light NAPL (LNAPL), such as gasoline, is less dense than water and can accumulate above the water table, while dense NAPL (DNAPL), such as many chlorinated solvents, including trichloroethylene and perchloroethylene, are more dense than water and can penetrate into the water table.

3.2.20 *permeability, n*—qualitative description of the relative ease with which rock, soil, or sediment will transmit a fluid (that is, a liquid or gas).

3.2.21 *petroleum, n*—crude oil or any fraction thereof that is liquid at standard conditions of temperature and pressure (60°F at 14.7 psia).

3.2.21.1 *Discussion*—The term includes substances comprised of a complex blend of hydrocarbons derived from crude oil through the process of separation, conversion, upgrading, and finishing, such as motor fuels, jet oils, lubricants, and petroleum solvents, and also includes used oils.

3.2.22 *petroleum hydrocarbon chemicals of concern, n*—for the purpose of this guide, those volatile petroleum hydrocarbon compounds that are a subset of *COC* and that readily biodegrade to carbon dioxide and water by soil microbes in aerated environments.

3.2.22.1 *Discussion*—*Petroleum hydrocarbon chemicals of concern* may be present in several forms in environmental media, including adsorbed to soil, as constituents of LNAPL above the water table, as dissolved solutes in groundwater, or as vapors in soil gas.

3.2.23 *Phase I environmental site assessment, ESA, n*—process described in Practice E1527.

3.2.24 *porosity, n*—volume fraction of a rock or unconsolidated sediment not occupied by solid material but usually occupied by liquids, gas, and/or air.

3.2.25 *preferential pathway, n*—pathway that has the least amount of constraint on the migration of *COC* vapors.

3.2.25.1 *Discussion*—Preferential pathways are natural or man-made and may provide direct contact between the subsurface of a property and the vapor contaminant source (that is, the location on a property where the contaminated vapor intersects the preferential pathway). Natural preferential pathways may include, for example, vertically fractured bedrock where the fractures are interconnected and in direct contact with the subsurface of a property and the vapor contaminant source. Man-made preferential pathways may include, for example, utility conduits and sewers.

3.2.26 *real estate, n*—undeveloped real property, real property used for industrial, retail, office, agricultural, other commercial, medical, or educational purposes, or property used as a single family or multi-family residential *dwelling*.

3.2.27 *real estate transaction, n*—transfer of title to or possession of real property or receipt of a security interest in real property.

3.2.28 *report, n*—document prepared by an *environmental professional* pursuant to Section 10.

3.2.29 *saturated zone, n*—zone in which all of the voids in the rock or soil are filled with water at a pressure that is greater than atmospheric.

3.2.29.1 *Discussion*—The *water table* is the top of the *saturated zone* in an unconfined aquifer.

3.2.30 *semi-volatile organic compound, n*—general term for an organic compound that has sufficient vapor pressure at standard temperature (20°C) and pressure (1 atm) to vaporize (albeit at a slower rate than *volatile organic compounds*) and enter the atmosphere.

3.2.31 *solute, n*—substance such as a contaminant that is dissolved in another substance such as groundwater.

3.2.32 *target property, TP, n*—property involved in the *real estate transaction* that is the subject of the *VES* defined by this guide.

3.2.33 *toxic chemical, n*—chemical whose vapor concentration of the pure component poses either an incremental lifetime cancer risk (ILCR) or a noncancer hazard quotient greater than acceptable values established by applicable federal, state, or local regulatory agencies.

3.2.34 *toxicity, n*—effect on human health that is exhibited by a *toxic chemical*.

3.2.35 *user, n*—party who commissions the performance of a VES pursuant to this guide.

3.2.35.1 *Discussion*—Commonly, the *user* is the prospective purchaser of a parcel of property.

3.2.36 *vadose zone (or unsaturated zone), n*—zone between the land surface and the water table within which moisture content is less than saturation (except in the capillary fringe) and pressure is less than atmospheric.

3.2.36.1 *Discussion*—Soil pore space typically contains air or other gases. The capillary fringe is included in the *vadose zone*.

3.2.37 *vapor encroachment condition, VEC, n*—presence or likely presence of COC vapors in the subsurface of the TP caused by the release of vapors from contaminated soil or groundwater or both either on or near the TP as identified by the Tier 1 (see Section 8) or Tier 2 (see Section 9) procedures in this guide.

3.2.38 *volatile organic compound, VOC, n*—general term for an organic compound that has sufficient vapor pressure (for example, greater than 0.5 to 1 mm Hg) at standard temperature (20°C) and pressure (1 atm) to significantly vaporize and enter the atmosphere.

3.2.39 *volatility, n*—chemical is considered to be sufficiently *volatile* if its Henry's law constant is greater than 10^{-5} atm·m³·mol⁻¹ and its vapor pressure is greater than 1 mm Hg at room temperature.

3.2.40 *water table, n*—top of the *saturated zone* in an unconfined *aquifer*.

3.3 *Practice E1527 Terms Used in This Guide*—Some terms have been modified to be consistent with this guide.

3.3.1 *adjoining properties, n*—any real property or properties the border of which is contiguous or partially contiguous with that of the *target property*, or that would be contiguous or partially contiguous with that of the *target property* but for a street, road, or other public thoroughfare separating them.

3.3.2 *business environmental risk, n*—risk that can have a material environmental or environmentally driven impact on the transaction or the business associated with the current or planned use of a parcel of *real estate*, not limited to environmental issues that are investigated pursuant to this guide. Consideration of *business environmental risk* issues may involve addressing one or more non-scope considerations, some of which are identified in Section 11 of this guide.

3.3.3 *Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS), n*—list of sites compiled by EPA that EPA has investigated or is currently investigating for potential *hazardous substance* contamination and for possible inclusion on the *National Priorities List*.

3.3.4 *CORRACTS list, n*—list of *hazardous waste* treatment, storage, or disposal facilities and other RCRA-regulated facilities (because of past interim status or storage of *hazardous waste* beyond 90 days) that have been notified by the EPA to undertake corrective action under RCRA. The *CORRACTS list* can be derived from the EPA database that manages RCRA data.

3.3.5 *environmental professional, n*—person meeting the education, training, and experience requirements as set forth in

40 CFR 312.10(b). The person may be an independent contractor or an employee of the *user*.

3.3.6 *environmental site assessment, ESA, n*—process by which a person or entity seeks to determine if a particular parcel of real property (including improvements) is subject to *recognized environmental conditions* (see subsection 3.3.22).

3.3.7 *fire insurance maps, n*—maps produced for private fire insurance map companies that indicate uses of properties at specified dates and that encompass the property. These maps are often available at local libraries, historical societies, private resellers, or from the map companies who produced them.

3.3.8 *hazardous substance, n*—substance defined as a *hazardous substance* pursuant to CERCLA 42 U.S.C. 9601(14), as interpreted by EPA regulations and the courts.

3.3.9 *hazardous waste, n*—any *hazardous waste* having the characteristics identified under or listed pursuant to Section 3001 of RCRA, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6921) (but not including any waste the regulation of which under RCRA (42 U.S.C. 6901-6992k) has been excluded by Act of Congress). RCRA defines a *hazardous waste*, at 42 U.S.C. 6903, as: “a solid waste, or combination of solid wastes, which because of its quantity, concentration or physical, chemical or infectious characteristics may (A) cause, or significantly contribute to an increase in mortality or an increase in serious irreversible or incapacitating reversible illness; or (B) pose a substantial present or potential hazard to human health or the environment when improperly treated, stored, transported or disposed of, or otherwise managed.”

3.3.10 *landfill, n*—place, location, tract of land, area, or premises used for the disposal of solid wastes as defined by state solid waste regulations. The term is synonymous with the term *solid waste disposal site* and is also known as a garbage dump, trash dump, or similar term.

3.3.11 *local government agencies, n*—those agencies of municipal or county government having jurisdiction over the *target property*. Municipal and county government agencies include but are not limited to cities, parishes, townships, and similar entities.

3.3.12 *local street directories, n*—directories published by private (or sometimes government) sources that show ownership, occupancy, and/or use of sites by reference to street addresses. Often *local street directories* are available at libraries, or historical societies, and/or local municipal offices.

3.3.13 *National Priorities List, NPL, n*—list compiled by EPA pursuant to CERCLA 42 U.S.C. §9605(a)(8)(B) of properties with the highest priority for cleanup pursuant to EPA's Hazard Ranking System. See 40 C.F.R. Part 300.

3.3.14 *obvious, adv*—that which is plain or evident; a condition or fact that could not be ignored or overlooked by a reasonable observer while visually or physically observing the property.

3.3.15 *occupants, n*—those tenants, subtenants, or other persons or entities using a property or a portion of the property.

3.3.16 *operator, n*—person responsible for the overall operation of a facility.

3.3.17 *owner, n*—generally the fee *owner* of record of the property.

3.3.18 *petroleum products*, *n*—those substances included within the meaning of the petroleum exclusion to CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. §9601(14), as interpreted by the courts and EPA, that is: petroleum, including crude oil or any fraction thereof which is not otherwise specifically listed or designated as a *hazardous substance* under Subparagraphs (A) through (F) of 42 U.S.C. §9601(14), natural gas, natural gas liquids, liquefied natural gas, and synthetic gas usable for fuel (or mixtures of natural gas and such synthetic gas). (The word fraction refers to certain distillates of crude oil, including but not limited to gasoline, kerosene, diesel oil, jet fuels, and fuel oil, pursuant to Standard Definitions of Petroleum Statistics.³)

3.3.19 *publicly available*, *adv*—information that is *publicly available* means that the source of the information allows access to the information by anyone upon request.

3.3.20 *practically reviewable*, *adv*—information that is *practically reviewable* means that the information is provided by the source in a manner and in a form that, upon examination, yields information relevant to the property without the need for extraordinary analysis of irrelevant data. The form of the information should be such that the *user* can review the records for a limited geographic area. Records that cannot be feasibly retrieved by reference to the location of the property or a geographic area in which the property is located are not generally *practically reviewable*. Most databases of public records are *practically reviewable* if they can be obtained from the source agency by the county, city, zip code, or other geographic area of the facilities listed in the record system. Records that are sorted, filed, organized, or maintained by the source agency only chronologically are not generally *practically reviewable*. Listings in *publicly available* records that do not have adequate address information to be located geographically are not generally considered *practically reviewable*.

3.3.21 *reasonably ascertainable*, *adv*—information that is (1) *publicly available*, (2) obtainable from its source within reasonable time and cost constraints, and (3) *practically reviewable*.

3.3.22 *recognized environmental condition*, *REC*, *n*—presence or likely presence of any *hazardous substances* or *petroleum products* on a *target property* under conditions that indicate an existing release, a past release, or a material threat of a release of any *hazardous substances* or *petroleum products* into structures on the *target property* or into the ground, groundwater, or surface water of the *target property*. The term includes *hazardous substances* or *petroleum products* even under conditions in compliance with laws. The term is not intended to include *de minimis conditions* that generally do not present a material risk of harm to public health or the environment and that generally would not be the subject of an enforcement action if brought to the attention of appropriate governmental agencies. Conditions determined to be *de minimis* are not *RECs*.

3.3.23 *records review*, *n*—that part that is contained in Section 8 of this guide that addresses which records should or may be reviewed.

3.3.24 *solid waste disposal site*, *n*—place, location, tract of land, area, or premises used for the disposal of solid wastes as defined by state solid waste regulations. The term is synonymous with the term *landfill* and is also known as a garbage dump, trash dump, or similar term.

3.3.25 *solvent*, *n*—chemical compound that is capable of dissolving another substance and may itself be a *hazardous substance*, used in a number of manufacturing/industrial processes including but not limited to the manufacture of paints and coatings for industrial and household purposes, equipment clean-up, and surface degreasing in metal fabricating industries.

3.3.26 *standard environmental record sources*, *n*—those records specified in subsection 8.3.1 of this guide.

3.3.27 *standard historical sources*, *n*—those sources of information about the history of uses of a property as specified in subsection 8.4 of this guide.

3.4 Acronyms:

3.4.1 *CERCLA*—Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§9601 *et seq.*)

3.4.2 *CFR*—Code of Federal Regulations

3.4.3 *COC*—Chemical(s) of concern

3.4.4 *DNAPL*—Dense nonaqueous phase liquid (often referred to as a “sinker” that can penetrate the water table)

3.4.5 *EPA*—United States Environmental Protection Agency

3.4.6 *ESA*—Environmental site assessment

3.4.7 *LNAPL*—Light nonaqueous phase liquid (often referred to as a “floater” that can accumulate on the water table)

3.4.8 *NAPL*—Nonaqueous phase liquid

3.4.9 *NPL*—National Priorities List

3.4.10 *REC*—Recognized environmental condition

3.4.11 *TP*—Target property

3.4.12 *USC*—United States Code

3.4.13 *USGS*—United States Geological Survey

3.4.14 *VEC*—Vapor encroachment condition

3.4.15 *VES*—Vapor encroachment screen

3.4.16 *VOC*—Volatile organic compound

4. Significance and Use

4.1 *Uses*—This guide is intended for use on a voluntary basis by parties who wish to conduct a *VES* on a parcel of *real estate* to determine if a *VEC* is identified for the *TP* (that is, the presence or likely presence of *COC* vapors in the subsurface of the *TP* caused by the release of vapors from contaminated soil and/or groundwater either on or near the *TP* as identified by the Tier 1 or Tier 2 procedures in this guide). The process defined in this guide is a screening process that requires information similar to information generally collected as part of a Practice E1527 *Phase I ESA* as well as additional information described in subsection 5.3 and Section 8 of this guide. If a *VEC* is identified by this screening process, the *user* may conduct further investigation. This guide, however, defines a procedure for identifying in connection with a property involved in a *real estate transaction* whether a *VEC* exists, likely exists, cannot be ruled out, or can be ruled out because a *VEC* does not or is not likely to exist. The guide can be applied to property with

³ *Standard Definitions of Petroleum Statistics*, American Petroleum Institute, Fourth Edition, 1988.

existing structures, property with structures that will be substantially rehabilitated, property without existing structures but having planned structures (for example, property in development), or property without existing structures and with no planned structures (for example, undeveloped property with no planned development).

4.2 Clarifications on Use:

4.2.1 *Use in Conjunction with Practice E1527 Phase I ESA*—This guide, when used in conjunction with Practice E1527 Phase I ESA, may assist the *user* and *environmental professional* in developing information about VECs associated with a TP. This guide has utility for a wide range of persons, including those who may not be involved in a *real estate transaction*.

4.2.2 *Independent Use*—This guide may be used independent of a Practice E1527 Phase I ESA to determine if a VEC exists, likely exists, cannot be ruled out, or can be ruled out because a VEC does not or is not likely to exist.

4.2.3 *Site-Specific*—This guide is property specific in that it relates to screening of VECs associated with a specific parcel of *real estate*. Consequently, this guide does not address many additional issues raised in transactions such as purchases of business entities or interests therein, or of their assets, that may well involve environmental liabilities pertaining to properties previously owned or operated or other off-site environmental liabilities. The guide does not replace a Phase I ESA conducted by an *environmental professional* or any obligation of the *environmental professional* under Practice E1527 to identify all recognized environmental conditions (RECs) related to the TP.

4.3 *Who May Conduct*—A VES should be performed by an *environmental professional*. No practical standard can be designed to eliminate the role of professional judgment and the value and need for experience in the party performing the investigation. The professional judgment of an *environmental professional* is, consequently, vital to the performance of this screening.

4.4 *Additional Services Contracted For*—Additional services may be contracted for between the *user* and the *environmental professional*. Such additional services may include business environmental risk issues not included within the scope of this guide (see subsection 11.3 for some possible examples).

4.5 *Principles*—The following principles are an integral part of this guide and are intended to be referred to in resolving any ambiguity or exercising such discretion as is accorded the *user* or *environmental professional* in performing a VES.

4.5.1 *Uncertainty Not Eliminated in Screening*—No vapor encroachment screen, such as included in Sections 8 and 9 of this guide, can wholly eliminate uncertainty regarding the identification of VECs in connection with a TP. Screening is intended to reduce, but not eliminate, uncertainty regarding whether or not a VEC exists in connection with a property.

4.5.2 *Not Exhaustive*—The guide is not meant to be an exhaustive screening. There is a point at which the cost of information obtained or the time required to gather it outweighs the usefulness of the information and, in fact, may be a material detriment to the orderly completion of *real estate transactions*. One of the purposes of this guide is to identify a

balance between the competing goals of limiting the costs and time demands inherent in performing a VES and the reduction of uncertainty about unknown conditions resulting from additional information.

4.5.3 *Level of Investigation is Variable*—Not every property will warrant the same level of screening. The appropriate level of screening should be guided by the type of property subject to screening and the information already available or developed in the course of the investigation.

4.5.4 *Comparison with Subsequent Investigation*—It should not be concluded or assumed that an investigation was not adequate because the investigation did not identify VECs in connection with a property. The VES must be evaluated based on the reasonableness of judgments made at the time and under the circumstances in which they were made. Subsequent VESs should not be considered valid bases to judge the appropriateness of any prior screening if based on hindsight, new information, use of developing technology or analytical techniques, or similar factors.

4.6 *Continued Viability of VES*—Subject to subsection 4.7, a VES conducted according to the procedures presented in this guide and completed less than 180 days before the date of acquisition of the property or, for transactions not involving an acquisition, the date of the intended use of the VES, is presumed to be valid. Subject to subsection 4.7 and the *user's* responsibilities set forth in Section 6, a VES conducted according to the procedures presented in this guide and for which the information was collected or updated within one year before the date of acquisition of the property or, for transactions not involving an acquisition, the date of the intended use of the VES may be used provided that the following components of the investigation were conducted or updated within 180 days of the date of purchase or the date of the intended transaction:

4.6.1 Reviews of federal, tribal, state, and local government records;

4.6.2 Update on the operations existing at the TP;

4.6.3 Evaluation of any new significant potential preferential pathways for vapor migration;

4.6.4 Screening of any new contaminated plume migration that might cause a VEC on the TP; and

4.6.5 Screening of any new contaminant releases in the AOC that might cause a VEC on the TP.

4.7 *Use of a Prior VES Screen*—This guide recognizes that VESs performed in accordance with this guide will include information that subsequent *users* may want to use to avoid undertaking duplicative screening procedures. Therefore, this guide describes procedures to be followed to assist *users* in determining the appropriateness of using information in VESs performed more than one year prior to the date of acquisition of the property or, for transactions not involving an acquisition, the date of the intended use of the VES. The use of a prior VES is based on the following principles that should be adhered to in addition to the specific procedures set forth elsewhere in this guide:

4.7.1 *Use of Prior Information*—Subject to the criteria set forth in subsection 4.6, *users* and *environmental professionals* may use information in a prior VES provided such information

was generated as a result of procedures that are consistent with the procedures presented in this guide. However, such information should not be used without current investigation of conditions likely to affect *VECs* in connection with the *TP*. Additional investigation may be necessary to document conditions that may have changed materially since the prior *VES* was conducted.

4.7.2 Contractual Issues Regarding Use of a Prior *VES*—The contractual and legal obligations between prior and subsequent *users* of a *VES* or between *environmental professionals* who conducted the prior *VES* and those who would like to use such a prior *VES* are beyond the scope of this guide.

4.8 Actual Knowledge Exception—If the *user* or *environmental professional* conducting a *VES* has *actual knowledge* that the information being used from a prior *VES* is not accurate or if it is *obvious*, based on other information obtained by means of a Phase I and/or Phase II *ESA* or known to the person conducting the Phase I and/or Phase II *ESA*, that the information being used is not accurate, such information from a prior *VES* may not be used.

4.9 Rules of Engagement—The contractual and legal obligations between an *environmental professional* and a *user* (and other parties, if any) are outside the scope of this guide. No specific legal relationship between the *environmental professional* and the *user* is necessary for the *user* to implement the procedures presented in this guide.

5. Relationship to Practice E1527 Phase I *ESA*

5.1 Identification of a *REC* Pursuant to a Phase I *ESA*—*RECs* are identified only through the performance of a Practice E1527 Phase I *ESA*. Thus, a finding pursuant to this guide that a *VEC* exists or likely exists at the *TP* or that a *VEC* cannot be ruled out for the *TP* is not a determination that a *REC* is identified at the *TP*. Whether a *REC* exists at a *TP* as a result of the impact of possible vapor migration to the subsurface of the *TP* is a separate determination to be made by the *environmental professional* pursuant to Practice E1527. This guide does not constitute or meet the requirements for conducting “all appropriate inquiry” or any part of “all appropriate inquiry” as defined by U.S. EPA under CERCLA and the regulations there under, including 40 CFR Sec. 312.11.

5.2 *VES*—The *VES* established by this guide is intended to be used independently of or in conjunction with Practice E1527 Phase I *ESA*.

5.2.1 The *VES* may be conducted concurrently with the Practice E1527 Phase I *ESA*.

5.2.2 The *VES* may be conducted independent of a Practice E1527 Phase I *ESA*. When conducting a *VES* pursuant to this guide, the data collection actions specified in this guide should be implemented (see subsection 5.3 and Section 8).

5.3 Use of Information Collected in a Phase I *ESA* Conducted in Accordance with the Practice E1527 Standard—The screening (see Section 8) identified in this guide makes use of information similar to information generally collected as part of a Practice E1527 Phase I *ESA* as well as additional information described in the following and Section 8 of this guide. The information that should be collected includes, but is not limited to, federal, state, local, and tribal government records, chemical use and historical records of prior uses on the

TP and within the *AOC* surrounding the *TP* as determined by the procedures set out in Section 8, soil characteristics, geological characteristics, contaminant characteristics, *contaminated plume* migration, significant conduits that might provide preferential pathways for vapor migration, groundwater depth and groundwater flow direction data, and property information data.

5.4 Assumptions Made in the Practice E1527 Phase I *ESA*—Any assumptions or limitations made in the conduct of a Phase I *ESA* on the *TP* and that are applicable in the *VES* process as described in this guide should be specifically identified.

6. User’s Responsibilities

6.1 Scope—The purpose of this section is to describe tasks that should be performed by the *user* that will help the *environmental professional* identify the possibility for a *VEC* to exist in connection with the *TP*. These tasks do not require the technical expertise of an *environmental professional*, although a *user* could ask the *environmental professional* to perform those tasks that could be performed by an *environmental professional*. In a *real estate transaction*, it is common to find the *user* to be the prospective property purchaser (although the *user* could be a lender or other entity with an interest in conducting a screening pursuant to this guide), with the *environmental professional* working for the *user*. Although the property owner (that is, the seller), *operator*, and/or *occupants* may possess information that would be useful to the *VES* established by this guide, absent an applicable legal requirement, the property owner, *operator*, and/or *occupants* are not required to provide the *user* with information about the *TP*. The *user* or the *environmental professional* or both need to determine the best methods for obtaining information that may be useful in the conduct of the *VES*. recognizing that, absent an applicable legal requirement, the property *user*, *operator*, and/or *occupants* are not required to provide such information to the *user* or the *environmental professional*. Subsection Appendix X3 provides a sample questionnaire that identifies information on the *TP* that may be useful in conducting a *VES* and identifying *VECs* in connection with the *TP*.

6.2 Specialized Knowledge or Experience of the User—The *environmental professional* conducting the *VES* should ask the *user* if the *user* has any specialized knowledge or experience that may be important to the screening of *VECs* in connection with the *TP*. It is the *user’s* responsibility to respond to the questions asked by the *environmental professional* with information based on such specialized knowledge or experience. The *user* should respond to the *environmental professional’s* questions before the *environmental professional* conducts the *VES*. Such specialized knowledge might include, for example, tenant odor complaints or occupancy-related health issues.

6.3 Commonly Known or Reasonably Ascertainable Information—The *environmental professional* conducting the *VES* should ask the *user* if the *user* is aware of any information commonly known or *reasonably ascertainable* within the local community about the *TP* that the *environmental professional* informs the *user* may be important to the screening of *VECs* in connection with the *TP*. It is the *user’s* responsibility to respond to questions asked by the *environmental professional*.

The *user* should respond to the *environmental professional's* questions before the *environmental professional* conducts the VES. Such information might include, for example, the existence locally of publicized area-wide *contaminated plumes*.

6.4 Requests for Information from the Property Owner, Operator, and/or Occupants—Because, absent an applicable legal requirement, the property owner, operator, and/or occupants do not have an obligation to provide information about the TP to the user or the environmental professional or both, any requests for information about the TP submitted by the user or the environmental professional or both to the property owner, operator, and/or occupants should not suggest or imply that such persons are under any obligation to provide the information, unless an applicable legal requirement applies. Accordingly, the user or environmental professional or both should identify and be prepared to pursue methods for obtaining information about the TP relevant to the VES other than by obtaining such information from the property owner, operator, and/or occupants.

6.5 Other—Either the user should make known to the environmental professional the reason why the user wants to have the VES performed or, if the user does not identify the purpose of the VES, the environmental professional should assume the purpose is to identify whether a VEC exists at the TP. The user and the environmental professional may also need to modify the scope of services performed under this guide for special circumstances, including, but not limited to, unique local or site-specific conditions.

7. General Vapor Encroachment Screening Process

7.1 The purpose of a VES is to identify, to the extent feasible pursuant to the procedures presented in this guide, if a VEC exists at the TP. The VES process is intended to be used independently of, or in conjunction with, but not as a replacement of, the existing Practice E1527 Phase I ESA. It is possible that the VES process described in this guide may complement requirements of existing federal, state, local, or other applicable vapor encroachment or intrusion laws, regulations, policies, or guidance. Subsections Appendix X5 and Appendix X9 identify selected federal, state, local, and other vapor encroachment and intrusion evaluation resources.

7.2 General VES Process—The VES process is a two-tiered screening process. The information to conduct a Tier 1 screen is similar to information generally collected as part of a Phase I ESA investigation and includes additional information described in subsection 5.3 and Section 8 of this guide and is typically focused on known or suspect contaminated properties that may exist in the AOC but should not necessarily be so limited. Tier 2 focuses on characteristics of the contaminated plume resulting from contaminated properties and the proximity of the contaminated plume to the TP. The information to conduct a Tier 2 screen is often found in state regulatory files and may also be obtained from other available documents or may be collected via sampling in the field or both.

7.3 Report—A separate report should be prepared (see Section 10), unless the VES is being performed in conjunction with a Phase I ESA conducted on the TP, in which case the VES findings and conclusions can be provided with the report prepared pursuant to the Phase I ESA.

7.4 Coordination of Parts:

7.4.1 Parts Used in Concert—The government and historical records review, and other information collected, such as from the Phase I ESA, are intended to be used in concert with each other. If information from one source indicates the need for more information, other sources may be available to provide information.

7.4.2 User's Obligations—The environmental professional should note in the report whether or not the user has reported to the environmental professional information pursuant to Section 6 of this guide.

7.5 Who May Conduct a VES:

7.5.1 Environmental Professional's Duties—The VES should be performed by an environmental professional or conducted under the supervision of an environmental professional. This can be the same individual(s) responsible for conducting the Practice E1527 Phase I ESA. The individual(s) conducting the VES should possess sufficient training and experience necessary to conduct the screening and evaluation in accordance with this guide and have the ability to identify issues relevant to VECs in connection with the TP. At a minimum, the environmental professional should be involved in planning the screening scope of work and in reviewing and interpreting information upon which the report is based.

7.5.2 Information Obtained From Others—Information for the records review needed for completion of a VES may be provided by a number of parties including government agencies, third-party vendors, the user, and present and past owners, operators, and occupants of the property, provided that the information is obtained by or under the supervision of an environmental professional or is obtained by a third-party vendor specializing in retrieval of the information. Prior Phase I ESAs may also contain information that could be appropriate for use in a current VES. The environmental professional(s) responsible for the report should review all of the information provided.

7.5.3 Reliance—An environmental professional is not required to verify independently the information provided by others and may rely on the information provided unless in the exercise of professional judgment it would be unreasonable to do so or the environmental professional has actual knowledge that certain information is incorrect or unless it is obvious that certain information is incorrect based on other information obtained in the VES or otherwise actually known to the environmental professional.

8. Tier 1 Screening

8.1 Introduction:

8.1.1 Objective—The purpose of Tier 1 is to conduct a screen using Phase I ESA-type information to determine if a VEC exists at the TP. Tier 1 may be performed in conjunction with a Practice E1527 Phase I ESA or stand on its own if not conducted in conjunction with a Phase I ESA. When used in conjunction with a Phase I ESA, the environmental professional should use to the maximum extent possible information collected in the Phase I ESA and should also use additional information as described in subsection 5.3 and this section. If the Tier 1 screen cannot rule out the possibility of a VEC existing at the TP, then a Tier 2 screen can be conducted.

8.1.2 Tier 1 screening begins with collection of specific data (see subsection 8.1.3). If the VES is conducted in conjunction with a Practice E1527 Phase I ESA, Tier 1 uses information collected during the Phase I ESA process and additional information as described in subsection 5.3 and this section.

8.1.3 The minimum information needed to conduct a Tier 1 screen includes:

8.1.3.1 Existing/planned use of the TP (that is, developed, undeveloped, industrial, commercial, or residential), if it can be ascertained. If the future use is uncertain, then the *environmental professional* should assume the most conservative use for the category in which the property is zoned. If zoning information is not available, then the *environmental professional* should assume residential use.

8.1.3.2 Type of structures existing or planned on the TP (for example, single-family residential, multifamily residential, office, industrial, retail, hotel, warehouse, institutional, and so forth).

8.1.3.3 Surrounding area description.

8.1.3.4 Federal, state, local, and tribal government records on the TP and for the AOC to identify known or suspect potentially contaminated property sources with COC on or within the AOC (see subsection 8.2).

8.1.3.5 Historical records related to prior use of the TP and surrounding properties within the AOC to identify known or suspect potentially contaminated property sources having COC within the AOC, including the TP (see subsection 8.4).

8.1.3.6 General physical setting information including local soil type, and geological, hydrological, hydrogeological, and topographical information.

8.1.3.7 Significant natural or man-made conduits that can serve as preferential pathways, such as utility corridors, sewers, storm drains, Karst terrain, and so forth, that may provide a more direct path for vapors to encroach upon the TP.

8.1.3.8 User-specialized knowledge, experience, and commonly known or reasonably ascertainable information related to the TP and the area within the AOC that has been provided to or collected by the *environmental professional*.

8.1.3.9 If the VES is conducted in conjunction with a Phase I ESA, all of the information collected in the Phase I ESA investigation as well as additional information collected pursuant to this guide (see subsection 5.3 and this section), including information collected in site reconnaissance and interviews and actual or probable chemical usage on the TP or within the AOC, should be considered in conducting the VES. If the VES is not conducted in conjunction with a Phase I ESA, the *environmental professional* should collect and review the information identified in subsections 8.1.3.1-8.1.3.9 on the TP and within the AOC, including information (such as COC usage and the potential for release) obtained from site reconnaissance and as a result of interviews of knowledgeable site personnel.

8.1.4 Prior VESs associated with the TP should be considered and evaluated by the *environmental professional* consistent with the provisions of Section 4.

8.2 Government Records Review:

8.2.1 Area of Concern (defined by the Approximate Minimum Search Distance)—Records to be reviewed pertain to the

TP and to properties within the AOC (that is, within the approximate minimum search distance). The AOC is one third of a mile around the TP, unless the use of a shorter distance as provided by subsection 8.3.2 (such as for petroleum hydrocarbon COC) and section 8.5.2 is appropriate. The AOC is measured from the TP to a contaminated property with known or suspect COC contamination of soil or groundwater or both (for example, a dry cleaner site using perchloroethylene as the cleaning solvent). The term *approximate minimum search distance* is used in lieu of radius to include irregularly shaped properties.

8.2.2 Accuracy and Completeness—Accuracy and completeness of record information varies among information sources, including governmental sources. Record information is often inaccurate or incomplete. The user or *environmental professional* is not obligated to identify mistakes or insufficiencies in information provided. However, the *environmental professional* reviewing records should make a reasonable effort to compensate for mistakes or insufficiencies in the information reviewed that are obvious in light of other information that the *environmental professional* has actual knowledge.

8.2.3 Reasonably Ascertainable/Standard Sources—Availability of record information varies from information source to information source, including governmental jurisdictions. The user or *environmental professional* is not obligated to identify, obtain, or review every possible record that might exist with respect to a property. Instead, this guide identifies record information that should be reviewed from standard sources, and the user or *environmental professional* should review only record information that is reasonably ascertainable from those standard sources except as provided in subsections 8.2.4-8.2.6. Record information that is reasonably ascertainable means (1) information that is publicly available, (2) information that is obtainable from its source within reasonable time and cost constraints, and (3) information that is practically reviewable.

8.2.3.1 Publicly Available—Information that is publicly available means that the source of the information allows access to the information by anyone upon request.

8.2.3.2 Reasonable Time and Cost—Information that is obtainable within reasonable time and cost constraints means that the information will be provided by the source within 20 calendar days of receiving a written, telephone, or in-person request at no more than a nominal cost intended to cover the source's cost of retrieving and duplicating the information. Information that can only be reviewed by a visit to the source is reasonably ascertainable if the visit is permitted by the source within 20 days of request.

8.2.3.3 Practically Reviewable—Information that is practically reviewable means that the information is provided by the source in a manner and in a form that, upon examination, yields information relevant to the property without the need for extraordinary analysis of irrelevant data. The form of the information should be such that the user can review the records for a limited geographic area. Records that cannot be feasibly retrieved by reference to the location of the property or a geographic area in which the property is located are not generally practically reviewable. Most databases of public

records are *practically reviewable* if they can be obtained from the source agency by the county, city, zip code, or other geographic area of the facilities listed in the record system. Records that are sorted, filed, organized, or maintained by the source agency only chronologically are not generally *practically reviewable*. Listings in *publicly available* records that do not have adequate address information to be located geographically are not generally considered *practically reviewable*.

8.2.4 Alternatives to Standard Sources—Alternative sources may be used instead of standard sources if they are of similar or better reliability and detail or if a standard source is not *reasonably ascertainable*.

8.2.5 Coordination—If records are not *reasonably ascertainable* from standard sources or alternative sources, the *environmental professional* should attempt to obtain the requested information by other means specified in this guide.

8.2.6 Sources of Standard Source Information—Standard source information or other record information from government agencies may be obtained directly from these government agencies or from commercial services. Government information obtained from nongovernmental sources may be considered current if the source updates the information at least every 90 days or, for information that is updated less frequently than quarterly by the government agency, within 90 days of the date the government agency makes the information available to the public.

8.2.7 Documentation of Sources Checked—The *report* should document each source that was used, even if a source revealed no findings. Sources should be sufficiently documented, including name, date request for information was filled, date information provided was last updated by source, and date information was last updated by original source (if provided other than by original source). Supporting documentation should be included in the *report* or adequately referenced to facilitate reconstruction of the screening by an *environmental professional* other than the *environmental professional* who conducted it.

8.2.8 Significance—If a *standard environmental record source* (including, if relevant, a source used in the course of conducting a *Phase I* ESA on the *TP*) identifies the *TP* or a *contaminated property* within the *approximate minimum search distance* defined by subsections 8.2.1, 8.3.1, 8.3.2, 8.5.2.1, and 8.5.3.2, the *report* should include the *environmental professional's* judgment about the significance of the listing with respect to analysis of *VECs* in connection with the *TP*.

8.3 Environmental Information:

8.3.1 Standard Environmental Record Sources—The following *standard environmental record sources* should be reviewed, subject to the conditions of subsections 8.2.1-8.2.8, to identify if there are known or suspect sources of contamination within the area of concern (AOC), which is defined by the *approximate minimum search distances* as established by subsection 8.3.2. The *approximate minimum search distance* is based upon the type of *COC*, that is, petroleum hydrocarbons versus nonpetroleum hydrocarbons, and the location of the known or suspect source of contamination with respect to the *TP*. The search radii for the *approximate minimum search distance* (or the AOC) are defined in subsection 8.3.2 and

should be measured from the nearest *TP* boundary. The *VES* process to be followed using these criteria is described in subsection 8.5.2. The *approximate minimum search distance* may be expanded or reduced in the up-gradient, down-gradient, and/or cross-gradient directions by the *environmental professional* conducting the *VES* based upon experience in the local area and applying professional judgment to factors such as groundwater flow direction, hydrogeological and hydrologic considerations, subsurface geologic features, topographical gradients, and/or available groundwater flow information, which factors (1) are known to the *environmental professional* and/or (2) have been collected in an ESA Phase I on the *TP*, in a *Phase II* delineation of contamination *reports* associated with the *TP*, and/or with contaminated properties within the AOC and upon subsections 8.5.2.1 and 8.5.2.2. If there are known or suspect property sources of contamination within the AOC, the *environmental professional* should evaluate whether *COC* may be present at the *TP*. *Petroleum hydrocarbon chemicals of concern* are distinguished from other *COC* because petroleum hydrocarbons often undergo more rapid biodegradation in the vadose zone in the presence of oxygen.

8.3.2 Approximate minimum search distances surrounding the *TP* to identify the AOC are:

Standard Environmental Record Sources (where available)	Approximate Minimum Search Distance—Surrounding the Target Property, miles	
	Chemicals of Concern	Petroleum Hydrocarbon Chemicals of Concern
Federal NPL site list	1/3	1/10
Federal CERCLIS list	1/3	1/10
Federal RCRA CORRACTS facilities list	1/3	1/10
Federal RCRA non-CORRACTS TSD facilities list	1/3	1/10
Federal RCRA generators list	property only	property only
Federal institutional control/engineering control registries	property only	property only
Federal ERNS list	property only	property only
State and tribal lists of hazardous waste sites identified for investigation or remediation:		
State- and tribal-equivalent NPL	1/3	1/10
State- and tribal-equivalent CERCLIS	1/3	1/10
State and tribal landfill and/or solid waste disposal site lists	1/3	1/10
State and tribal leaking storage tank lists	1/3	1/10
State and tribal registered storage tank lists	property only	property only
State and tribal institutional control/engineering control registries	property only	property only
State and tribal voluntary cleanup sites	1/3	1/10
State and tribal Brownfield sites	1/3	1/10

8.3.3 Physical Setting Characteristics—Information about the geologic, hydrologic, hydrogeologic, and topographic characteristics of a site should be considered to assist in the screening for the possibility of *COC* vapors to migrate from contaminated soil or groundwater or both to the *TP*.

8.4 Current and Historical Use Information:

8.4.1 Objective—The objective of reviewing current property use and consulting historical sources is to develop a history of the uses of the *TP* and the AOC to help identify the likelihood of uses leading to *VECs* in connection with the *TP*. The boundaries of the AOC (defined by the *approximate minimum search distance*) for evaluating past uses involving

COC should be set consistent with subsections 8.2.2, 8.3.1, 8.3.2, 8.5.2.1, and 8.5.2.2. Current or past uses such as gas stations (using petroleum hydrocarbons), dry cleaning establishments (using chlorinated volatile organic compounds), former manufactured gas plant sites (using volatile and semi-volatile organic compounds) and former industrial sites such as those that had vapor degreasing or other parts cleaning operations (using chlorinated volatile organic compounds) are of particular concern for a *VES*.

8.4.2 Standard Historical Sources:

8.4.2.1 *Applicable Historical Sources*—The standard historical sources (which are identified in Practice E1527 *Phase I ESA*) that will provide the most useful information for conducting the *VES* include: (1) fire insurance maps, (2) local street directories, (3) aerial photographs, and (4) USGS topographic maps.

NOTE 1—It is recognized that, depending upon the site setting, one or more of these four historical sources may not be available or useful. In addition, when conducted in conjunction with a *Phase I ESA*, at the minimum, only those historical sources relied upon in performing the *Phase I ESA* are necessary for purposes of a *VES*.

8.4.2.2 *Fire Insurance Maps*—The term *fire insurance maps* means maps produced for private fire insurance map companies that indicate uses of properties, at specified dates, that are within the *AOC*. These maps are often available at local libraries, historical societies, private resellers, or from the map companies that produced them.

8.4.2.3 *Local Street Directories*—The term *local street directories* means directories published by private (or sometimes government) sources and showing ownership and/or use of sites by reference to street addresses. Often *local street directories* are available at libraries of local governments, colleges or universities, or historical societies.

8.4.2.4 *Aerial Photographs*—Historical *aerial photographs*, typically going back to the early 1930s, may allow identification of activities on the *TP* and within the *AOC*. *Aerial photographs* are often available from government agencies, commercial aerial photography companies, and private collections unique to a local area.

8.4.2.5 *USGS Topographic Maps*—Historical USGS *topographic maps* may provide an indication of past uses of the *TP* and of properties within the *AOC*. These maps are available from the U.S. Geological Survey.

8.4.2.6 *Other Historical Sources*—The term *other historical sources* means any source or sources other than those designated in subsections 8.4.2.2–8.4.2.5 that are credible to a reasonable person and identify past uses of the *TP* and properties within the *AOC*. This category includes, but is not limited to, miscellaneous maps, newspaper archives, internet sites, community organizations, local community knowledge, local libraries, historical societies, current *owners* or *occupants* of neighboring properties, or records in the files and/or personal knowledge of the property *owner*, *operator*, and/or *occupants*, if such personal knowledge is provided to the *user* and/or the *environmental professional*.

8.5 Tier 1 Screening Evaluation:

8.5.1 The Tier 1 *VES* consists of a review of the information included in subsections 8.1.3.1–8.1.3.9 combined with the application of professional judgment.

8.5.2 The Tier 1 screening includes: (1) a search distance test to determine if there are any known or suspect *contaminated properties* in the *AOC* identified in subsections 8.3.1 and 8.3.2 and as may be revised pursuant to subsections 8.5.2.1 and 8.5.2.2 and (2) a *chemicals of concern* test to determine for those known or suspect *contaminated properties* within the *AOC* whether or not *COC* are likely to be present (see subsection Appendix X6). With respect to properties within the *AOC*, if groundwater flow direction can be estimated, for example, from the *Phase I ESA* investigation of the *TP*, the *AOC* in the down-gradient direction can be reduced (see subsection 8.5.2.1) to the area within the *critical distance*. The *AOC* in the cross-gradient direction possibly may be reduced (see subsection 8.5.2.2) depending upon the *critical distance* and the *contaminated plume* width nearest the *TP* boundary. For this guide, the *critical distance* is defined in subsection 9.2.

8.5.2.1 *Down-Gradient Off-Site Contaminated Property*—For a *contaminated property* identified in Tier 1 located down-gradient from the *TP*, it is not necessary to have information on migrating groundwater *contaminated plume* dimensions as the *critical distance* is measured from the nearest *TP* boundary to the source of contamination at the off-site down-gradient property. In this case, the *AOC* is reduced to the area within the *critical distance* (see subsection 9.2).

8.5.2.2 *Cross-Gradient Off-Site Contaminated Property*—For a *contaminated property* identified in Tier 1 located cross-gradient from the *TP*, the *AOC* will be the area within the *critical distance* plus one half of a reasonable estimation of the *contaminated plume* width (at the point nearest the closest *TP* boundary) that might be associated with the nearby known or suspect *contaminated property* (that is, the *contaminated property* where the groundwater contamination originated). The *environmental professional's* judgment and experience can be used to estimate reasonably the width of the *contaminated plume* that might be associated with the nearby known or suspect *contaminated property*. If it is not possible to estimate conservatively *contaminated plume* width, then the *AOC* cannot be reduced in the cross-gradient direction.

8.5.3 Professional judgment should be applied in Tier 1 as part of a *VEC* determination. An example would be a decision by the *environmental professional* to adjust the *AOC* (*approximate minimum search distance*) to either expand or reduce the *AOC* based on factors such as those discussed in subsection 8.3.1. At the minimum, the *environmental professional* should consider the following in performing Tier 1 screening:

8.5.3.1 Use of the *TP* (for example, the level of investigation may be different for a residential property compared to an industrial property);

8.5.3.2 Type of *COC* (for example, chlorinated VOC, petroleum hydrocarbon, and so forth);

8.5.3.3 Location of known or suspect *contaminated property* in the *AOC* having *COC*. The closer a potentially *contaminated property* containing *COC* to existing or planned structure(s) on the *TP*, the greater the probability for a *VEC*,

subsurface conditions being equal. When evaluating the location of known or suspect *contaminated properties*, the *environmental professional* should also take into consideration locations where the existing groundwater gradient can change significantly, for example, as a result of seasonal influences, tidal influences, and so forth. Soil gas migration may be independent of the groundwater gradient;

8.5.3.4 Characteristics of the Soil—Low-permeability soil, such as soil high in clay or silt content or both generally tends to restrict soil gas movement, as may soil with high-moisture content. High porosity in soil tends to enhance soil gas movement;

8.5.3.5 Depth to Groundwater—The greater the depth to potentially contaminated groundwater containing *COC*, the greater the distance *COC* vapors may have to travel, assuming there are no preferential pathways and subsurface conditions being equal;

8.5.3.6 Vapor Conduits that may Result in Significant Preferential Pathways—Man-made conduits such as major utility corridors, sanitary sewers, storm sewers, and so forth and significant natural conduits such as Karst terrain can sometimes create a sufficiently direct pathway from a vapor contaminant source to the subsurface of the *TP* such that vapor migration may be a concern. Vapor migration may also be influenced by the age and design of infrastructure features associated with these conduits. When significant preferential pathways exist, the *environmental professional* should take these into consideration in developing an opinion with respect to the potential for vapors to encroach upon the *TP* and result in a *VEC*;

8.5.3.7 Cleanup Status of Contaminated Property—Factors to consider include when the release occurred, how much *COC* was released, and what remedial action was taken. If a source has been remediated but residual contamination allowed to remain (for example, when remediation includes natural attenuation), the potential for a *VEC* should be evaluated, including an evaluation of any information provided in a remediation plan, if available.

8.6 Tier 1 Conclusions—The conclusion from the Tier 1 screening is (1) a *VEC* exists, (2) a *VEC* likely exists; (3) a *VEC* cannot be ruled out; or (4) a *VEC* can be ruled out because a *VEC* does not or is not likely to exist.

8.7 If a *VEC* Exists, Likely Exists, or Cannot Be Ruled Out:

8.7.1 If the *VES* is Conducted in Conjunction with a Phase I *ESA*—The source resulting in the *VEC* should be identified and discussed in the *Phase I ESA*. If a *VEC* exists, likely exists, or cannot be ruled out, the reasons why should be discussed in the *Phase I ESA report*. When the *environmental professional* meets with the *user* to discuss Phase I investigation results, the *user*, in consultation with an *environmental professional*, can determine if further investigation, such as conducting a Tier 2 screen, is warranted.

8.7.2 If the *VES* is Conducted Independent of a Phase I *ESA*—The *environmental professional* should submit the *VES report* to the *user* (see Section 10 and Appendix X4) with the conclusion that a *VEC* exists, likely exists, or cannot be ruled out and why. The *user*, in consultation with the *environmental professional*, can determine if further investigation, such as conducting a Tier 2 screen, is warranted.

8.8 If a *VEC* Can Be Ruled Out—A *VEC* does not exist or is unlikely to exist and the *VES* process is completed in accordance with this guide. The *environmental professional* should report in the *VES report* this conclusion and the data and reasons that support the conclusion.

9. Tier 2 Screening

9.1 Objective—If a *VEC* cannot be ruled out in the Tier 1 screen in accordance with subsections 8.7.1 or 8.7.2, the *user* can undertake more refined screening as provided in Tier 2. Tier 2 applies numeric screening criteria to existing or newly collected soil, soil gas, and/or groundwater testing results to evaluate whether or not a *VEC* can be ruled out. Tier 2 has two data collection components: one non-invasive and one invasive.

9.1.1 Non-Invasive Data Collection—If information on the source of contamination and its migration in the subsurface is available and accessible in regulatory files or other available documents, or both, the Tier 2 investigation can be non-invasive. The non-invasive investigation includes review at the appropriate regulatory agency of available extent of contamination reports (often referred to as *Phase II reports*) and/or other available documents on known or suspect *contaminated properties* within the *AOC*. The objective of the non-invasive component of the Tier 2 screen is to identify from existing *Phase II reports* and other available information in regulatory agency files and/or from other available information the status of remediation, the size of the *contaminated plume* and its behavior, the specific *COC* and their respective concentrations. Using this information, the plume test (see subsection 9.2) can be performed.

9.1.2 Invasive Data Collection—If information on the source of contamination and its migration in the subsurface is not available or accessible or if there are preferential pathways, the Tier 2 screening investigation can be invasive. An invasive investigation may include sampling of soil, soil gas, and/or groundwater on the *TP*, at the *TP* boundary, or off site. The invasive component of the Tier 2 screen requires careful planning by the *environmental professional* to ensure that an appropriate sampling strategy is implemented (see subsection 9.3.1.2).

9.2 Plume Test and Critical Distance Determination—If information related to the boundaries of the *contaminated plume* from known *contaminated properties* is available, the *critical distance* test can be conducted. The *critical distance* is the lineal distance in any direction between the nearest edge of the *contaminated plume* and the nearest *TP* boundary, and is equal to 100 ft (30.5 m) for *COC* or 30 ft (9 m) for dissolved petroleum hydrocarbon *COC*. The *critical distance* for petroleum hydrocarbon *COC* as LNAPL is the same as for nonpetroleum hydrocarbon *COC* (that is, 100 ft (30.5 m)). The *critical distance* represents an estimate of the lineal distance *COC* vapors volatilized from contaminated groundwater or contaminated soil might migrate in the vadose zone to the *TP*, which estimate the *environmental professional* should evaluate to determine if it is appropriate for the *VES* being performed (that is, whether the 100- or 30-ft (30.5- or 9-m) distances or both are appropriate or should be modified). The *environmental*

professional may modify either of the *critical distance* distances based on experience and the *environmental professional's* evaluation of relevant factors that could include, but are not limited to, the completeness of *COC*, *LNAPL*, and/or petroleum hydrocarbon delineation; site-specific conditions, such as, but not limited to, the amount of oxygen in the soil, the physical setting of the *TP* and properties within the *AOC*, and possible chemical contaminants in the soil that may impact oxygen availability for biodegradation of *COC*, *LNAPL*, and/or petroleum hydrocarbon; applicable state policy or regulation that may specifically address the distance over which vapors from *COC*, *LNAPL*, and/or petroleum hydrocarbon might encroach upon the *TP*. If the *critical distance* is modified by the *environmental professional*, the basis for this modification should be documented in the *report*. If the plume test identifies that the *TP* boundary is within the *critical distance* from the nearest edge of the *contaminated plume*, then the *environmental professional* should, through investigation and analysis of data and information compiled as part of the screening evaluation, determine if a *VEC* exists at the *TP*.

9.2.1 If the plume test identifies the distance between the nearest edge of the *contaminated plume* and the nearest *TP* boundary as equal to or greater than the *critical distance*, as determined by the *environmental professional* pursuant to subsection 9.2, then the *environmental professional* may conclude that migrating vapor from the edge of the groundwater *contaminated plume* is not likely to reach the subsurface of the *TP* and the *VES* investigation is completed in accordance with this guide, unless factors such as preferential pathways (see subsection 8.5.3.6) or other factors could result in the migration of vapors to the *TP* from a distance greater than the *critical distance*.

9.2.2 *Influence of Off-Site Contaminated Property Location on Tier 2 Screening Data Collection Requirements*—For off-site property sources (for example, a former dry cleaner property that used perchloroethylene) with known or suspect soil and/or groundwater contamination by *COC* located in the *AOC*, the specific location of such property sources will impact the data collection requirements to conduct a Tier 2 screen. Some examples associated with groundwater *contaminated plumes* are provided in subsections 9.2.2.1-9.2.2.3.

9.2.2.1 *Up-Gradient Off-Site Contaminated Property*—For a *contaminated property* located up-gradient of the *TP*, it is necessary to have information on the length and depth of the groundwater *contaminated plume* for the *critical distance* determination. Such information is needed to determine the lineal distance (in any direction) from the groundwater *contaminated plume* edge to the nearest *TP* boundary.

9.2.2.2 *Cross-Gradient Off-Site Contaminated Property*—For a *contaminated property* located cross-gradient from the *TP*, the *critical distance* determination requires knowledge of the width and depth of the *contaminated plume* nearest the *TP* boundary. Groundwater *contaminated plume* length information may not be necessary for the evaluation.

9.2.2.3 *Down-Gradient Off-Site Contaminated Property*—For a *contaminated property* located down-gradient from the *TP*, it is not necessary to have information on *contaminated plume* dimensions as the *critical distance* is measured from the

nearest *TP* boundary directly to the source on the off-site down-gradient property that is the origin of the contamination (with the contamination migrating away from the *TP*).

9.3 *Data Needs*—Data needs for the Tier 2 investigation include:

9.3.1 Soil, soil gas, and/or groundwater testing results associated with the known or suspect source(s) of contamination as determined in the Tier 1 investigation and (1) obtained from regulatory agency records review (for example, review of *Phase II reports* on the delineation of contamination or ongoing groundwater monitoring *reports*) or obtained from other sources, (2) collected by field sampling; or (3) obtained from a combination thereof.

9.3.1.1 If the regulatory records review or review of other available documents identifies the existence of a *report* on the delineation of contamination, the following information should be reviewed and evaluated by the *environmental professional*: data adequacy, the specific contaminants and their respective concentrations in soil, soil gas, and/or groundwater at the *contaminated plume* boundaries closest to the *TP* and points within the *critical distance*; the depth to the contamination; the direction of groundwater flow; the length and width of the *contaminated plume*; and the status of remedial activity.

9.3.1.2 If sampling of soil, soil gas, and/or groundwater is part of the Tier 2 investigation, an appropriate sampling strategy (typically at the perimeter of the *TP* closest to the off-site source of *COC* vapors, for example, a groundwater-*contaminated plume*) should be developed to determine if a *contaminated plume* or *COC* vapors have reached the *TP*.

9.4 *Tier 2 Conclusions*—The conclusion from the Tier 2 screening is: (1) a *VEC* exists, (2) a *VEC* likely exists, (3) a *VEC* cannot be ruled out, or (4) a *VEC* can be ruled out because a does not or is not likely to exist at the *TP*.

10. Evaluation and Report Preparation

10.1 *Report Format*—The *report* for the *VES* should generally follow the recommended *report* format provided in Appendix X4 for presenting the results of the *VES* conducted pursuant to this guide unless otherwise required by the *user*. A separate vapor encroachment *report* is not necessary for either Tier 1 or Tier 2 if the *VES* is conducted in conjunction with the *Phase I ESA*, in which case all of the *VES* developed information, findings, opinions, and conclusions (including, as appropriate, other information described in the following and Appendix X4) can be included as a supplement or an appendix to the *report* prepared pursuant to the *Phase I ESA*.

10.2 *Contents of Report*—The *report* should include information that the *environmental professional* develops from implementing this guide's procedures and provisions, including information that is described in specific provisions of this guide as appropriate for inclusion in the *report* and the information that is described in Appendix X4 ("Recommended Table of Contents and Report Format"), which information includes but is not limited to the following:

10.2.1 *Scope of Services*—The *report* should describe the specific scope of services conducted, including which tiers of the evaluation process have been completed. The *report* should describe all services performed and assumptions made (for example, assumptions carried over from a *Phase I ESA*

investigation) in sufficient detail to permit another party to reconstruct the analysis conducted.

10.2.1.1 *Additional Services Contracted for*—Any additional services contracted for between the *user* and the *environmental professional*, including a broader scope of screening, a detailed vapor intrusion assessment, more detailed conclusions, liability/risk evaluations, recommendation for additional testing, remediation techniques, and so forth, are beyond the scope of this guide and should be included in the *report* only if so specified in the terms of the engagement letter between the *user* and the *environmental professional*.

10.2.2 *Findings*—The *report* should have a findings section that summarizes the results of the investigation, including whether a *VEC* exists, likely exists, cannot be ruled out, or can be ruled out because a *VEC* does not or is not likely to exist (collectively, the “*findings*”).

10.2.3 *Opinion*—The logic and reasoning used by the *environmental professional* in evaluating information collected during the course of the investigation related to the *environmental professional’s findings* should be discussed. The opinion should specifically include the *environmental professional’s* rationale for the *findings*.

10.2.4 *Conclusions*—The *report* should include a conclusions section that summarizes the *findings*.

10.2.5 *Deviations*—All deletions and deviations from this guide’s procedures (if any) should be listed individually and in detail in the *report*, including *user-imposed* constraints, and all additions should be listed.

10.2.6 *Documentation*—The *findings*, opinions, and conclusions in the *VES report* should be supported by documentation. If the *environmental professional* has chosen to exclude certain documentation from the *report*, the *environmental professional* should identify in the *report* the reasons for doing so (for example, a confidentiality agreement). Supporting documentation should be included in the *report* or adequately referenced to facilitate reconstruction of the screening by an *environmental professional* other than the *environmental professional* who conducted the screening. Sources that revealed no *findings* also should be documented.

10.2.7 *References*—The *report* should include a references section to identify published referenced sources (for example, groundwater plume dimensions from different types of sources, groundwater flow direction, and so forth) relied upon in preparing the *VES*. Each referenced source should be adequately annotated to facilitate retrieval by another party.

10.2.8 *Signature*—The *environmental professional(s)* responsible for the *VES* should sign the report.

10.2.9 *Appendices*—The *report* should include an appendix section containing supporting documentation and the qualifications of the *environmental professional* and the qualifications of the personnel conducting the *VES*.

11. Non-Scope Considerations

11.1 *General*—There may be environmental issues or conditions at a *TP* that parties may wish to assess in connection with a *real estate transaction* that are outside the scope of this guide (that is, non-scope considerations).

11.2 *Other Standards*—There may be standards or protocols for the assessment of non-scope considerations developed by governmental entities, professional organizations, or other private entities. The *environmental professional* should be aware of any requirements related to vapor encroachment screening or vapor intrusion assessment or both, for example, as identified by federal, state, local, or other applicable guidance, policy, or regulation.

11.3 *List of Additional Issues*—Following are several non-scope considerations that persons may want to assess in connection with a *real estate transaction*. No implication is intended as to the relative importance of investigation into such non-scope considerations, and this list of non-scope considerations is not intended to be all inclusive:

11.3.1 Indoor air quality;

11.3.2 Explosion hazard assessment, such as may be appropriate for the case of methane intrusion and buildup. Methane, for example, is a common landfill gas (produced by the bacterial decomposition of organic waste within the landfill) that if not properly vented at the landfill site may migrate to nearby structures and present a health and safety problem. Depending on the nature of the subsurface geology, methane can travel over distances greater than ¼ mile from a landfill;

11.3.3 Naturally occurring gases such as radon associated with certain types of subsurface geology and hydrogen sulfide and methane from oil fields;

11.3.4 Vapor intrusion assessment at the *TP* and/or vapor mitigation system selection, design, and implementation at the *TP* (see [Appendix X7](#), Generalized Guidance on Vapor Intrusion Assessment and Mitigation Alternatives);

11.3.5 Health threat assessment notification or communication; and

11.3.6 Vapor encroachment or intrusion assessment not at the *TP*.

APPENDIXES

(Nonmandatory Information)

X1. LEGAL BACKGROUND IN SUPPORT OF VEC SCREENING PRACTICE

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this legal appendix is to describe the relationship between this *Standard Guide for Vapor Encroachment Screening on Property Involved in Real Estate Transactions, E2600-10* (“VE Standard Guide”) and “all appropriate inquiries” under the federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 9601, *et seq.* (“CERCLA”), at 9601(35)(B) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (“USEPA”) regulations promulgated to provide the standards and practices that comprise “all appropriate inquiries” under CERCLA, 40 CFR Part 312 (“AAI Rules”). This legal appendix also discusses the relationship between the VE Standard Guide and ASTM’s *Standard Practice for Environmental Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process* (E1527-05).

X1.1 Introduction and Summary

X1.1.1 “All appropriate inquiries” under CERCLA are conducted to evaluate whether hazardous substances **(1)**⁴ from a release are or may be present at the property that is the subject of the proposed acquisition **(2)**. The term hazardous substance in CERCLA is not limited to solids and liquids and USEPA has consistently taken the view that the vapor phase of volatile hazardous substances shall be considered and addressed under CERCLA. Therefore, the potential presence of volatile chemicals in gas or vapor form in the subsurface of a property (from a CERCLA release at the property itself or a nearby property) is appropriately considered in the conduct of all appropriate inquiries under CERCLA, the AAI Rules, and a Phase I environmental site assessment (“Phase I ESA”) pursuant to E1527-05 **(3)**.

X1.1.2 The stated objectives for the development of the VE Standard Guide include synthesizing and putting in writing a practical guide and a reasonable screening process to assess whether a volatile chemical **(4)** from a release may encroach upon a property that is the target of a proposed acquisition **(5)**.

X1.1.3 The VE Standard Guide does not hold itself out as a “good commercial or customary” standard or practice for determining whether a CERCLA hazardous substance is or is likely present at the target property. The good commercial and customary standards and practices that constitute “all appropriate inquiries” are those that USEPA establishes by regulation. USEPA has not determined that the VE Standard Guide is appropriate or necessary to satisfy all appropriate inquiries under CERCLA, nor that it satisfies any requirement of the AAI Rules.

X1.1.4 The VE Standard Guide also is not part of E1527-05, nor is it a supplement to, amendment of, or replacement for any part of E1527-05.

X1.1.5 In summary, the VE Standard Guide is not a requirement or component of all appropriate inquiries, and its results are not determinative of whether hazardous substances from a release are or may be present at the property for the sake of all

appropriate inquiries or E1527-05. However, conducting a VE Standard Guide vapor encroachment screen may be helpful to the prospective buyer and the environmental professional in conducting an environmental site assessment of a target property.

X1.2 Background: Owner Liability and Liability Protections

X1.2.1 In general, a building or property at which a hazardous substance has been disposed or at which a hazardous substance has otherwise come to be located is a “facility” subject to CERCLA **(6)**. The owner of a facility is a party liable for response costs and natural resource damages under CERCLA **(7)**, unless the owner can establish by a preponderance of evidence each of the elements of one of the limited defenses or the landowner liability protections that the statute provides **(8)**.

X1.2.2 CERCLA provides three core “defenses” to liability that, stated generally as to an owner, are that the release and damages from the release were caused by: (1) act of God; (2) act of war; or (3) act of a third party unaffiliated (including by contractual relationship) with the owner if the owner (a) exercised due care with regard to the hazardous substance and (b) took precautions against foreseeable acts and omissions of third parties and the related consequences (this third defense is referred to hereafter as “Third Party Defense”) **(9)**.

X1.2.3 For the purposes of the Third Party Defense, a land contract or deed is a contractual relationship **(10)**. To provide some relief to unwitting, “innocent” buyers of property at which releases had occurred in the past, Congress established the so-called “innocent landowner” or “innocent purchaser” provision. This provision makes the Third Party Defense potentially available to buyers of properties at which releases occurred before they acquired the properties if the buyers meet each of the innocent landowner requirements in the definition of “contractual relationship” at Section 9601(35), including having no reason to know of the presence of the hazardous substance at the property after performing pre-acquisition all appropriate inquiries.

X1.2.4 An owner of property that is affected by a hazardous substance migrating from a release at a separate, nearby property often has had no contractual or other relationship with

⁴ The boldface numbers in parentheses refer to the list of references at the end of this standard.

the party that caused the release. This “off-site” landowner would be the owner of a CERCLA facility but may be eligible for the Third Party Defense, if he or she can establish the exercise of due care as to the hazardous substance at issue and the taking of precautions against foreseeable acts of others. Note that where no contractual relationship exists with the person who caused the release the Third Party Defense does not include a requirement that the landowner perform pre-acquisition all appropriate inquiries (11).

X1.2.5 In addition, in 2002, Congress added a provision (referred to as the “contiguous property provision”) to CERCLA that provides that owners (and operators) of property to which hazardous substances have migrated from a nearby release will not be considered “owners or operators” for CERCLA liability purposes if they meet a number of criteria. These criteria include having no reason to know of the presence of the hazardous substance at the properties after performing pre-acquisition all appropriate inquiries (12).

X1.2.6 A more significant protection for landowners (both for owners of lands that are the sources of releases and those to which the hazardous substances have migrated) added by Congress in 2002 is the *bona fide* prospective purchaser provision, which provides liability protection even when property is purchased with knowledge of contamination, if pre-acquisition all appropriate inquiries are performed and all of the other requirements of the protection are satisfied (13).

X1.2.7 Innocent landowner, contiguous property owner, and *bona fide* prospective purchaser are commonly referred to as CERCLA’s landowner liability protections. As noted above, an element of each of the landowner liability protections (note that this does not include the Third Party Defense in which no contractual relationship exists) is that a buyer of commercial or industrial property has conducted pre-acquisition “all appropriate inquiries” to determine whether the property is a place at which a hazardous substance is present or is likely to be present as a result of a CERCLA release (14). In other words, if a buyer of real property hopes to qualify for a landowner liability protection, the buyer shall have conducted all appropriate inquiries to determine whether the property he or she is buying may be a “facility” as defined by CERCLA because of a CERCLA release before completing the purchase (15).

X1.3 AAI under CERCLA Is Pre-Acquisition Inquiry into the Presence of Hazardous Substances from a Release at a Property

X1.3.1 As noted above, a prerequisite for each of the landowner liability protections is that the owner conduct “all appropriate inquiries” into the previous ownership and uses of the target property “in accordance with generally accepted good commercial and customary standards and practices” (“AAI”), as established by USEPA by regulation, before buying the property.

X1.3.2 The object of these pre-acquisition inquiries is to determine whether the target property is a CERCLA “facility” as to which CERCLA liability may arise, that is, whether “any hazardous substance that is the subject of the release or threatened release was disposed of on, in, or at the [property].” (16)

X1.3.3 *AAI Rules Establish Standards and Practices for the Inquiry into the Presence of Hazardous Substances from a Release at a Property:*

X1.3.3.1 Congress established interim criteria for meeting the “all appropriate inquiries” standard under CERCLA but mandated that USEPA promulgate regulations to establish “standards and practices” for how all appropriate inquiries would be performed (17). USEPA’s AAI Rules were issued November 2005 and became effective on November 1, 2006 (18).

X1.3.3.2 According to USEPA, and consistent with CERCLA, the scope of the AAI Rules is:

“In the case of persons claiming one of the CERCLA landowner liability protections, the scope of today’s rule includes the conduct of all appropriate inquiries for the purpose of identifying releases and threatened releases of hazardous substances on, at, in or to the property that would be the subject of a response action” Preamble to the Final AAI Rules, 70 Fed. Reg. at 66076.

X1.3.3.3 The environmental professional hired to perform AAI shall provide:

An opinion as to whether the inquiry has identified *conditions indicative of releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances . . . on, at, in, or to the subject property*. 40 CFR 312.11(C)(I). (Emphasis added.)

X1.3.3.4 Therefore, all appropriate inquiries, under CERCLA and the AAI Rules, is a process for determining whether hazardous substances have been released at the target property through the application of good commercial and customary standards and practices established by USEPA in the AAI Rules.

X1.3.4 *AAI Is Not Limited to Releases that Originate at the Target Property:*

X1.3.4.1 Consistent with CERCLA’s requirements, USEPA has provided that AAI includes consideration by the environmental professional of environmental conditions at properties adjoining or nearby the subject property that could result in the presence of hazardous substances at the subject property. CERCLA required USEPA to include in the AAI Rules the review of records concerning “contamination at or near the facility” and visual inspections of “adjoining properties.” (19)

X1.3.4.2 Similarly, CERCLA includes in the definition of “facility” sites where hazardous substances have “otherwise come to be located,” (20) and the contiguous property owner landowner liability protection in the statute expressly requires that the landowner has conducted all appropriate inquiries and “did not know or have reason to know that the property was or could be contaminated by a release . . . from other real property not owned or operated” by the landowner (21).

X1.3.4.3 The AAI Rules establish distances from the target property within which the environmental professional should gather and consider information on environmental conditions (22). According to the AAI Rules, these distances can be modified based on a number of factors, including, “potential migration pathways (for example, groundwater flow direction, and prevalent wind direction).” (23)

X1.3.4.4 Therefore, the overall objective of AAI is to determine whether, in the environmental professional's judgment, any hazardous substance is present at the target property as a result of a CERCLA "release" (24) at or near the property.

X1.3.5 *ASTM's Standard Practice E1527-05 Can Be Used to Conduct All Appropriate Inquiries:*

X1.3.5.1 In promulgating the AAI Rules, USEPA determined that ASTM's E1527-05 could be used to satisfy AAI (25).

X1.3.5.2 The express purpose of E1527-05 is to set forth a practice that constitutes "all appropriate inquiries into the previous ownership and uses of the property consistent with good commercial or customary practice" as defined at 42 USC § 9601(35)(B) (26). Consistent with CERCLA and the AAI Rules, the express goal of the process established by E1527-05 is to identify "the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products on a property under conditions that indicate an existing release, a past release, or a material threat of a release of any hazardous substances or petroleum products into structures on the property or into the ground, ground water, or surface water of the property." (27)

X1.3.5.3 E1527-05 labels the presence or likely presence of a hazardous substance (or petroleum) a determination of a "recognized environmental condition" ("REC") (28).

X1.3.5.4 In other words, the environmental professional's determination pursuant to an AAI procedure that a hazardous substance (or petroleum) from a release is or is likely to be present at the property results in the identification of a REC under E1527-05.

X1.4 Chemicals in a Gas or Vapor Form Are Hazardous Substances Subject to All Appropriate Inquiries

X1.4.1 *Chemicals in Gas or Vapor Form May Be Hazardous Substances:*

X1.4.1.1 The definition of "hazardous substance" in CERCLA is broad and it is not limited to chemicals in solid or liquid forms (29). For example, the term hazardous substance specifically includes hazardous air pollutants listed under Section 112 of the Clean Air Act (30). Hazardous air pollutants include benzene, trichloroethylene ("TCE"), and tetrachloroethylene ("PCE"), common groundwater contaminants that may migrate to a property in groundwater and in soil gas (31).

X1.4.1.2 In addition, the definition of "release" in CERCLA includes "emitting" and "escaping" into the "environment," which is itself defined to include ambient air (32).

X1.4.2 *Migration of Hazardous Substances as Vapors Is Subject to CERCLA Assessment and Remediation:*

X1.4.2.1 USEPA has long recognized that CERCLA hazardous substances can volatilize and migrate from releases as vapor. For example, USEPA addressed that potential as part of the CERCLA risk assessment process (33). Courts have included costs of investigation and remediation of hazardous substance vapors as potentially recoverable response costs under CERCLA (34).

X1.4.2.2 USEPA's issuance of its *Draft Guidance for Evaluating the Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air Pathway from Groundwater and Soils*, (35) confirms USEPA's determination that hazardous substances that migrate from CERCLA releases are subjects for risk assessment and potentially other response

actions under CERCLA. That guidance was intended by USEPA as an aid in evaluating the potential for human exposure via the vapor intrusion pathway based on the state of the science in 2002 (36).

X1.4.3 *All Appropriate Inquiries and the AAI Rules Are Not Limited to Solid and Liquid Forms of Hazardous Substances or to Particular Migration Pathways:*

X1.4.3.1 The language in CERCLA does not limit all appropriate inquiries only to certain types, phases, or forms of hazardous substances. In addition, while recognizing that the hazardous substance might originate at an adjoining or nearby property, the statute does not identify only certain migration pathways to be evaluated or considered.

X1.4.3.2 Similarly, the AAI Rules use the term hazardous substance and are not expressly limited to certain types, phases, or forms of hazardous substance (37). The AAI Rules specifically include "potential migration pathways" "(for example, groundwater flow direction, prevalent wind direction)" (38) among the factors an environmental professional may consider in adjusting search distances.

X1.4.3.3 No basis appears to exist for excluding the gaseous or vapor form of a chemical from the definition of hazardous substances under CERCLA or from the hazardous substances whose presence in the subsurface of a property could cause the property to be considered a facility under CERCLA. Similarly, no basis appears to exist for excluding the evaluation of the potential presence of the gaseous or vapor forms of hazardous substances in the subsurface in the performance of all appropriate inquiries.

X1.4.4 *E1527-05 Is Not Limited to Solid and Liquid Forms of Hazardous Substances or to Particular Migration Pathways:*

X1.4.4.1 E1527-05 is expressly written to meet the requirements of all appropriate inquiries and identify the presence or potential presence at a target property of hazardous substances from a release. Consistent with these objectives, nothing in E1527-05 excludes hazardous substances in vapor or gaseous phases from consideration in the conduct of a Phase I ESA.

X1.4.4.2 As discussed above, the purpose set forth in 1.1 of E1527-05 is to establish a practice for conducting an ESA to permit the user to satisfy "all appropriate inquiry," under CERCLA 42 USC 9601(35), including that the user had no reason to know that "any hazardous substance which is the subject of the release . . . was disposed of on, in, or at the facility." It would be inconsistent with the intent that E1527-05 satisfies all appropriate inquiries to exclude consideration of vapor migration from the performance of a Phase I.

X1.5 Relationship of the VE Standard Guide to a Practice E1527 Phase I ESA

X1.5.1 In the VE Standard Guide, it is made clear that it is not part of or required by CERCLA or by the AAI Rules. In addition, it is also made clear in the VE Standard Guide that performance of its screening process does not determine whether a recognized environmental condition does or does not exist at the property for the purposes of an E1527-05 Phase I (39).

X1.5.2 Section 5.1 of the VE Standard Guide states:

5.1 *Identification of a REC Pursuant to a Phase I ESA—RECs are identified only through the performance of Practice*

E1527 Phase I ESA. Thus, a finding pursuant to this guide that a *VEC* exists or likely exists at the *TP* or that a *VEC* cannot be ruled out for the *TP* is not a determination that a *REC* is identified at the *TP*. Whether a *REC* exists at a *TP* as a result of the impact of possible vapor migration to the subsurface of the *TP* is a separate determination to be made by the *environmental professional* pursuant to Practice **E1527**. This guide does not constitute or meet the requirements for conducting “all appropriate inquiry” or any part of “all appropriate inquiry” as defined by USEPA under CERCLA and the regulations thereunder, including 40 CFR Sec. 312.11.

X1.5.3 The stated objectives in the development of the VE Standard Guide were “(1) to synthesize and put into writing a practical guide for conducting a [vapor encroachment screen]... and (2) to provide that the process to screen for [vapor encroachment] is practical and reasonable.” (40)

X1.5.4 The VE Standard Guide is a guide and a screening mechanism developed by Subcommittee E50.02 for the purpose of assisting proposed property buyers and environmental professionals in determining whether volatile chemical constituents in vapor may encroach upon the property. The VE

Standard Guide identifies concepts and considerations that may be helpful in the environmental site assessment of a property. However, conduct of the VE Standard Guide does not substitute for or constitute any part of AAI.

X1.6 Conclusion

X1.6.1 The presence of a hazardous substance in vapor or gas form at a property from a CERCLA release may cause the property to be a facility under CERCLA and may subject the owner to potential CERCLA liability. Therefore, the conduct of all appropriate inquiries appropriately includes consideration of whether volatile chemicals from a CERCLA release have migrated to or encroached upon the subsurface of the property and the AAI process shall be performed in accordance with and as mandated by 40 CFR Part 312.

X1.6.2 The VE Standard Guide is not part of or required by all appropriate inquiries and does not determine whether a *REC* exists. However, it may be helpful to the environmental professional in environmental site assessment, especially in determining whether vapor migration is likely to be an issue at a property.

X2. ENVIRONMENTAL PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS AND RELEVANT EXPERIENCE

X2.1 Environmental Professional

X2.1.1 *Environmental professional* is defined in subsections **3.2.12** and **3.3.5**, which definitions are the same as the definition in Practice **E1527** and in 40 CFR § 312.10(b). The term refers to a person who possesses the education, training, and experience requirements necessary to exercise professional judgment to develop opinions and conclusions in conducting a *VES* and preparing a *VES* report (see Section 10). The person may be an independent contractor or an employee of the *user*.

X2.1.2 Specific expertise necessary to conduct a *VES* depends on the scope of work agreed upon. Thus, an *environmental professional* retained to perform a scope of work limited to Tier 1 and the non-invasive component of Tier 2 may not need as much expertise in vapor encroachment screening as would be needed to perform a scope of work that included Tier 2.

X2.1.3 An *environmental professional* should remain current in his or her field through participation in relevant continuing education or other activities such as participation in

conferences, workshops, seminars, professional organizations, and so forth dealing with vapor encroachment and intrusion issues.

X2.1.4 Use of an *environmental professional* does not preempt state professional licensing or registration requirements. Before commencing work, the *environmental professional* and *user* should determine the applicability of state professional licensing or registration laws to the activities to be undertaken as part of the *VES*.

X2.1.5 A person who does not qualify as an *environmental professional* may contribute to and participate in the *VES* on the condition that duties performed will be under the supervision or responsible charge of a person who is an *environmental professional*.

X2.2 Relevant Experience

X2.2.1 Relevant experience includes the experience described in Practice **E1527**, Appendix X2, Section X2. Relevant experience also includes experience in evaluating vapor migration of *COCs*.

X3. QUESTIONNAIRE

X3.1 Information such as that described in the following and Section 6, if available, should be provided by the *user* to the *environmental professional* selected to conduct the *VES*. If the property owner or operator is not the user, then, absent an applicable legal requirement, the property owner or operator is not required to provide any information to the user or the *environmental professional*. The information described in the following is intended to assist the *environmental professional*

in conducting the *VES*.

X3.2 Assuming the *VES* is being conducted for a prospective purchaser of a property, the following information should be collected from the prospective purchaser:

X3.2.1 The reason why the *VES* is being conducted;

X3.2.2 Current or planned use of the property;

X3.2.3 The type of property, for example, industrial, commercial, or residential, and type of property transaction, for example, sale, purchase, exchange, and so forth;

X3.2.4 The complete and correct address for the property (a map or other documentation showing property location and boundaries would be helpful;

X3.2.5 The scope of services desired for the *VES* (including whether it is being conducted in conjunction with Practice **E1527** *Phase I ESA*;

X3.2.6 Identification of all parties who will rely on the *VES* report, such as a lender;

X3.2.7 Identification of the site contact and how the contact can be reached;

X3.2.8 Any special terms and conditions (such as confidentiality) that shall be agreed upon by the *environmental professional*; and

X3.2.9 Any other knowledge or experience with the property that may be pertinent to the *environmental professional* (for example, copies of any available prior reports that have been prepared in accordance with a *Phase I ESA*, vapor intrusion reports, documents, correspondence, and so forth, concerning the property and its environmental condition).

X3.3 The following questionnaire should be completed by the user to the extent the *user* has the information requested. Absent an applicable legal requirement, the property *owner* or *operator* is not required to provide any information to a prospective purchaser. If the *VES* is being conducted on behalf of a prospective purchaser, the following questionnaire may be submitted to the *owner* or *operator* of the property, but the *owner* or *operator* should be informed that it is not obligated to provide any responses to the questionnaire, absent an applicable legal requirement.



PROJECT NAME:

QUESTIONNAIRE COMPLETED BY:

PROPERTY ADDRESS:

NAME:

TITLE:

ADDRESS:

CITY/STATE/ZIP:

TELEPHONE:

DATE OF RESPONSE :

EMAIL ADDRESS:

1	Property type	☐ Commercial	☐ Industrial	☐ Multi-Tenant	☐ Vacant Land
2	Are there any buildings/ structures on the property?	Yes ☐	No ☐	Unknown ☐	
3	Will buildings/structures be constructed on the property in the future?	If yes, type construction _____			
		Yes ☐	No ☐	Unknown ☐	
4	If buildings exist or are proposed, do/will they have elevators?	If yes, type construction _____			
5	Type of level below grade (existing or proposed)?	Yes ☐	No ☐		
		☐ Full Basement	☐ Crawl Space	☐ Slab on Grade	
		☐ Parking Garage	☐ Multi-level		
6	Ventilation in level below grade?	Yes ☐	No ☐	Unknown ☐	
7	Sump pumps, floor drains, or trenches (existing or proposed)?	Yes ☐	No ☐	Unknown ☐	
8	Radon or methane mitigation system installed?	Yes ☐	No ☐	Unknown ☐	
9	Heating system type (existing or proposed)?	(CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)			
		☐ Hot Air Circulation	☐ Electric Baseboard		
		☐ Hot Air Radiation	☐ Heat Pump		
		☐ Hot Water Radiation	☐ Wood Stove		
		☐ Kerosene Heater	☐ Steam Radiation		
		☐ Fireplace	☐ Coal Furnace		
		☐ Radiant Floor Heat	☐ Hot Water Circulation		
		☐ Fuel Oil Furnace	☐ Gas Furnace		
		☐ Other			
10	Type of fuel energy (existing or proposed)?	(CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)			
		☐ Natural Gas	☐ Electric		
		☐ Propane	☐ Fuel Oil		
		☐ Kerosene	☐ Wood		
		☐ Coal	☐ Solar		
		☐ Other			
11	Have there ever been any environmental problems at the property?	Yes ☐	No ☐	Unknown ☐	
12	Does/will a gas station or dry cleaner operate anywhere on the property?	If yes, describe _____			
		Yes ☐	No ☐	Unknown ☐	
13	Do any tenants use hazardous chemicals in relatively large quantities on the property?	If yes, describe _____			
		Yes ☐	No ☐	Unknown ☐	
14	Have any tenants ever complained about odors in the building or experienced health-related problems that may have been associated with the building?	If yes, describe _____			
		Yes ☐	No ☐	Unknown ☐	
15	Are the operations (or proposed operations to be performed) on the property OSHA regulated?	Yes ☐	No ☐	Unknown ☐	
16	Are there any existing or proposed underground storage tanks (USTs) or above ground storage tanks (ASTs)?	Yes ☐	No ☐	Unknown ☐	
17	Are there any sensitive receptors (for example, children, elderly, people in poor health, and so forth) that occupy or will occupy the property?	Yes ☐	No ☐	Unknown ☐	
		Parcel ID # _____			

X4. RECOMMENDED TABLE OF CONTENTS AND REPORT FORMAT (For a VES conducted independent of a Phase I ESA)

X4.1 Summary

X4.2 Introduction

- X4.2.1 Purpose
- X4.2.2 Detailed scope of service
- X4.2.3 Significant assumptions
- X4.2.4 Limitations and exceptions
- X4.2.5 Special terms and conditions
- X4.2.6 Additional services contracted for
- X4.2.7 User reliance

X4.3 Site Description

- X4.3.1 Location and legal description
- X4.3.2 Site and vicinity general characteristics
- X4.3.3 Current/planned use of the property
- X4.3.4 Descriptions of structures, roads, and other improvements on the site
- X4.3.5 Current/planned uses of the *adjoining* properties

X4.4 User Provided Information

- X4.4.1 Reason for conducting the VES (for example, is it part of a Practice E1527 Phase I or is it independent?)

X4.4.2 Specialized knowledge

X4.4.3 Commonly known or reasonably ascertainable information

X4.4.4 Information obtained from *User*

X4.4.5 Other provided information

X4.5 Records Review

X4.5.1 Standard environmental record sources

X4.5.2 Additional environmental record sources

X4.5.3 Physical setting source(s)

X4.5.4 Historical use information on the *TP*

X4.5.5 Historical use information on *adjoining* properties

X4.5.6 Other pertinent local information

X4.5.7 Other information obtained pursuant to Sections 7, 8, and 9, as applicable, and resources used

X4.6 Findings: Summary of Results of Investigation

X4.7 Opinion

X4.8 Conclusions

X4.9 Deviations

X4.10 References

X4.11 Signature(s) of Environmental Professional(s)

X4.12 Appendices

X4.12.1 Qualifications of *environmental professional(s)*

X4.12.2 Site (vicinity) map

X4.12.3 Site plan

X4.12.4 Regulatory records documentation

X4.12.5 Historical research documentation (fire insurance maps, city directories, and so forth)

X5. FEDERAL AND STATE AGENCY VAPOR INTRUSION WEB RESOURCES

NOTE X5.1—The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) published a draft vapor intrusion guidance in 2002. Other federal agencies have also published vapor intrusion guidance, such as the Department of Defense Vapor Intrusion Handbook (January 2009). Most states that have vapor intrusion guidance follow a tiered evaluation approach similar to that in USEPA's 2002 draft vapor intrusion guidance. As of 2007, 32 states (listed in Table X5.1) were identified as having some form of vapor intrusion guidance, including six states (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Tennessee) that effectively defer to the USEPA 2002 draft guidance. Significant differences exist among the state

guidance documents. In addition, private sector organizations have published vapor intrusion guidance documents such as the guidance published by the Interstate Technology Regulatory Council (ITRC) (listed below). *Pertinent state and local vapor intrusion guidance documents should be reviewed by the environmental professional before conducting a vapor intrusion investigation. Because federal and state agencies and private sector organizations often revise their guidance documents, the environmental professional should obtain the current guidance issued by the agency or entity whose vapor intrusion guidance the environmental professional is reviewing.*

TABLE X5.1 Vapor Intrusion Guidance

<i>Federal</i>	
U.S. EPA:	www.epa.gov/correctiveaction/eis/vapor.htm www.epa.gov/oswer/riskassessment/airmodel/johnson_ettinger.htm www.epa.gov/ATHENS/learn2model/part-two/onsite/JnE_lite.htm
U.S. EPA Region III:	www.epa.gov/reg3hwmd/risk/index.htm
U.S. EPA Region IX:	www.epa.gov/region09/waste/sfund/prg/index.htm
<i>State</i>	
AL:	www.adem.state.al.us/WaterDivision/Ground/UST%20GW/GWUSTCorrAction.htm
AK:	www.dec.state.ak.us/spar/csp/guidance/draft_vap_intr_tm_6_28.doc
CA:	www.dtsc.ca.gov/loader.cfm?url=/commonspot/security/getfile.cfm&pageid=11492
CO:	www.cdphe.state.co.us/hm/indoorair.pdf www.oil.cdle.state.co.us
CT:	www.dep.state.ct.us/wtr/regs/RvVolCri.pdf
DE:	www.dnrec.state.de.us/dnrec2000/Divisions/AWM/sirb/policy%20concern07008.pdf
FL:	www.dep.state.fl.us/waste/categories/wc/pages/cleanup/default.htm
GA:	www.gaepd.org/Documents/index_haz.html
HI:	www.hawaii.gov/health/environmental/hazard/eal2005.html
ID:	www.deq.idaho.gov/Applications/Brownfields/index.cfm?site=download.cfm&title=Download&CFID=32288&CFTOKEN=20881628
IN:	www.in.gov/idem/programs/land/risc/announcements.html#vapor
KS:	www.kdheks.gov/ber/download/Ks_VI_Guidance.pdf
LA:	www.deq.louisiana.gov/portal/Portals/0/technology/recap/2003/RECAP%202003%20Text%20-%20final.pdf
ME:	www.maine.gov/dep/rwm/petroleum/pdf/inhaexpfg.pdf
MA:	www.mass.gov/dep/cleanup/laws/vph_eph.htm
MI:	www.michigan.gov/deq/0,1607,7-135-3311_4109_9846_30022_101581--,00.html#RRD_01
MN:	www.pca.state.mn.us/publications/c-prp4-01a.pdf
NE:	www.deq.state.ne.us/Publica.nsf/780613fa1854e3b906256ab60068778a/66fdec793aefc4b286256a93005b8db8?OpenDocument
NH:	www.des.state.nh.us/desguid.htm
NJ:	www.nj.gov/dep/srp/guidance/vaporintrusion/vig.htm
NY:	www.health.state.ny.us/environmental/investigations/soil_gas/svi_guidance/
NC:	www.wastenotnc.org/sfhome/VaporIntGuide.pdf
OH:	www.epa.state.oh.us/derr/rules/vapor.pdf
OK:	www.epa.gov/earth1r6/6pd/rcra_c/pd-n/screen.htm
OR:	www.deq.state.or.us/lq/pubs/docs
PA:	www.depweb.state.pa.us/landrecwaste/cwp/view.asp?A=1243&Q=465356
RI:	www.dem.ri.gov/pubs/regs/regs/waste/remreg04.pdf
SC:	www.scdhec.gov/eqc/lwm/index.html
TN:	www.state.tn.us/environment/dor/sfdregs.shtml
VA:	www.deq.virginia.gov/vrprisk/tables.html www.deq.state.va.us/vrprisk/raguide.html
WA:	www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/tcp/policies/VaporIntrusion/vig.html
WI:	http://dhfs.wisconsin.gov/eh/air/pdf/VI_guide.pdf
<i>Other</i>	
ITRC:	www.itrcweb.org/Documents/VI-1.pdf
Post Office:	www.optexcorp.com/uspsess/Documents/Vapor%20Intrusion%20Doc.pdf

X6. TYPICAL CHEMICALS OF CONCERN FOR THE VAPOR ENCROACHMENT SCREEN

NOTE X6.1—Methane may be of concern to environmental professionals conducting property due diligence because of safety issues related to a potential explosion hazard. However, explosion hazard assessment is beyond the scope of this guide. Petroleum hydrocarbons (such as gasoline,

diesel, fuel oil, kerosene, jet fuel, and so forth) are a subset under chemicals of concern (COC) and are identified in Table X6.1 by the major components. For example, the major components of gasoline would include benzene, xylene, toluene, and ethylbenzene (BTEX).

TABLE X6.1 Chemicals of Concern

Acenaphthene	1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane	Methylene chloride
Acetaldehyde	1,2-Dibromoethane (ethylene dibromide)	Methylethylketone (2-butanone)
Acetone	1,3-Dichlorobenzene	Methylisobutylketone
Acetonitrile	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	Methylmethacrylate
Acetophenone	1,4-Dichlorobenzene	2-Methylnaphthalene
Acrolein	Dichlorodifluoromethane	MTBE
Acrylonitrile	1,1-Dichloroethane	m-Xylene
Aldrin	1,2-Dichloroethane	Naphthalene
alpha-HCH (alpha-BCH)	1,1-Dichloroethylene	n-Butylbenzene
Benzaldehyde	1,2-Dichloropropane	Nitrobenzene
Benzene	1,3-Dichloropropene	2-Nitropropane
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	Dieldrin	N-Nitroso-di-n-butylamine
Benzylchloride	Endosulfan	n-Propylbenzene
beta-Chloronaphthale	Epichlorohydrin	o-Nitrotoluene
Biphenyl	Ethyl ether	o-Xylene
Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether	Ethylacetate	p-Xylene
Bis(2-chloroisopropyl)ether	Ethylbenzene	Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs)
Bis(chloromethyl)ether	Ethylene oxide	Pyrene
Bromodichloromethane	Ethylmethacrylate	sec-Butylbenzene
Bromoform	Fluorene	Styrene
1,3-Butadiene	Furan	tert-Butylbenzene
Carbon disulfide	gamma-HCH (Lindane)	1,1,1,2-Tetrachloroethane
Carbon tetrachloride	Heptachlor	1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane
Chlordane	Hexachloro-1,3-butadiene	Tetrachloroethylene (perchloroethylene)
2-Chloro-1,3-butadiene (chloroprene)	Hexachlorobenzene	Toluene
Chlorobenzene	Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene
1-Chlorobutane	Hexachloroethane	1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane
Chlorodibromomethane	Hexane	1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene
Chlorodifluoromethane	Hydrogen cyanide	1,1,2-Trichloroethane
Chloroethane (ethyl chloride)	Isobutanol	1,1,1-Trichloroethane
Chloroform	Mercury (elemental)	Trichloroethylene
2-Chlorophenol	Methylacrylonitrile	Trichlorofluoromethane
2-Chloropropane	Methoxychlor	1,2,3-Trichloropropane
Chrysene	Methyl acetate	1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene
cis-1,2-Dichloroethylene	Methyl acrylate	1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene
Crotonaldehyde (2-butenal)	Methyl bromide	Vinyl acetate
Cumene	Methyl chloride (chloromethane)	Vinyl chloride (chloroethene)
DDE	Methylcyclohexane	
Dibenzofuran	Methylene bromide	

X7. GENERALIZED GUIDANCE ON VAPOR INTRUSION ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION ALTERNATIVES

INTRODUCTION

If, after completing a VES for the TP, the user wishes to conduct additional investigation such as, for example, conducting a vapor intrusion assessment or to conduct mitigation, the user may find helpful the following general guidance on conducting a vapor intrusion assessment and general guidance on alternatives for vapor intrusion mitigation.

X7.1 Vapor Intrusion Assessment Guidance

X7.1.1 A vapor intrusion assessment investigation may use data based on interior (within or below the building) or exterior testing. Possible reasons for conducting interior testing may include regulatory requirements or a desire to measure directly

concentrations at the actual point of exposure. Possible reasons for conducting exterior testing might include lack of legal access to buildings, the property is undeveloped, a desire to

keep transaction activities confidential, and/or concerns that interior tests may be adversely affected by background sources of COC.

X7.1.2 The scope of services for a vapor intrusion assessment investigation should be established by the *user* and the *environmental professional*. The *user* and *environmental professional* should refer to existing federal or state vapor intrusion assessment regulation, policy, or guidance, if available (see [Appendix X5](#) and [Appendix X8](#)). For example, if the *target property* is owned by the U.S. Department of Defense, that agency's vapor intrusion assessment guidance should be reviewed and considered. If the property is privately owned and located in a state with vapor intrusion assessment guidance, that state's guidance should be reviewed and considered. If the privately owned property is located in a state without vapor intrusion assessment guidance, then the *user* and *environmental professional* may have to rely on federal guidance, for example, EPA, or other guidance deemed appropriate by the *environmental professional*, for example, the ITRC guidance (see [Appendix X5](#)).

X7.1.3 Because vapor intrusion investigation methods are rapidly evolving, the *user* and *environmental professional* should evaluate the most currently available technical and regulatory guidance as part of the planning and implementation of a vapor intrusion assessment evaluation. However, vapor intrusion assessment evaluations should use the following general process: (1) identify the desired endpoint; (2) identify applicable regulatory standards, requirements, and models, or other evaluation criteria to be used; (3) identify and collect needed data; and (4) evaluate data to determine if the potential for vapor intrusion into a structure exists. This general process may be applied in an iterative fashion, as needed, to achieve the selected endpoint in the most cost-effective and timely manner. There typically are three potential endpoints for a vapor intrusion assessment: (1) no vapor intrusion problem exists, (2) a vapor intrusion problem exists, or (3) it is not possible to reach a conclusion on whether or not a vapor intrusion problem exists. In drawing an endpoint conclusion, it is preferable to use a multiple lines of evidence approach.

X7.1.4 The vapor intrusion assessment should be conducted: (1) to provide a definitive determination if a vapor intrusion problem exists at the property; or (2) to narrow the uncertainty. If the *user* has obtained sufficient information to proceed with the *real estate transaction*, the *user* may choose to terminate the vapor intrusion assessment even if a definitive determination has not been made concerning the presence or absence of a vapor intrusion problem. When proceeding with a vapor intrusion assessment, the endpoint (that is, definitive determination versus reduced uncertainty) should be clearly defined to ensure adequate data collection to support the desired endpoint.

X7.1.5 Currently available regulatory and technical guidance documents for vapor intrusion contain disparate and often conflicting recommendations for data needs, data collection methods, and screening or evaluation criteria. As a result, it is important to identify clearly the regulatory and technical guidance that will be used for the vapor intrusion assessment evaluation. For sites not under the jurisdiction of a regulatory

authority with applicable guidance, the *environmental professional* should identify the specific evaluation criteria to be used in the assessment. A list of select regulatory and technical guidance documents are provided in [Appendix X5](#) and [Appendix X8](#). The *environmental professional* should ensure that the most current information is used.

X7.1.6 The specific data needed to complete the vapor intrusion assessment evaluation will depend on the desired endpoint, applicable regulatory requirements, and a variety of other site-specific factors. Key considerations for defining data needs include: media to be characterized, need to define spatial variability, need to define temporal variability, and need for non-VOC measurements (for example, soil characteristics, building pressure gradient, and so forth). The applicable regulatory and technical guidance documents identified by the *environmental professional* may be used to define minimum data requirements to support a definitive determination that a vapor intrusion problem does not exist. To support a vapor intrusion assessment evaluation, data shall be collected in a technically sound manner and in accordance with the applicable regulatory and technical guidance documents identified by the *environmental professional*. [Appendix X8](#) provides a list of common vapor intrusion assessment data types and guidance concerning data collection methods.

X7.1.7 Data should be evaluated in accordance with the applicable regulatory and technical guidance documents identified by the *environmental professional*. If the initial data collection is not sufficient to support the selected vapor intrusion assessment endpoint, then the vapor intrusion assessment process should be continued with additional data collection or modification of the endpoint or both as needed to achieve the desired objective for the property transaction.

X7.1.8 There are a number of alternative approaches to conduct a vapor intrusion investigation.

X7.1.8.1 *Groundwater Sampling and Use of a Site-Specific Model*—Knowledge of contaminant concentrations and location in groundwater, along with contaminant properties, soil properties, and building characteristics can be used to estimate the impact on indoor air using either empirical or other types of models. Knowledge of the indoor air impact can then be used in a health risk assessment to determine if a vapor intrusion problem exists.

X7.1.8.2 *Soil Gas Sampling and Use of a Site-Specific Model*—Knowledge of contaminant concentrations and location in the soil gas, along with contaminant properties, soil properties, and building characteristics can be used to estimate the impact on indoor air using either empirical or other types of models. Knowledge of the indoor air impact can then be used in a health risk assessment to determine if a vapor intrusion problem exists. This approach uses fewer assumptions than the groundwater sampling approach, but soil gas test results typically display a higher degree of variability.

X7.1.8.3 *Subslab Soil Gas Sampling and Use of a Site-Specific Model*—Knowledge of contaminant concentrations and location in the soil gas directly beneath the slab (or in the crawl space), along with contaminant properties and building characteristics can be used to estimate the impact on indoor air using either empirical or other types of models. Knowledge of

the indoor air impact can then be used in a health risk assessment to determine if a vapor intrusion problem exists.

X7.1.8.4 Indoor Air Sampling—Measured indoor air contaminant concentrations may be directly applied in a health risk assessment of vapor inhalation exposure. If the health risk assessment results are acceptable, vapor intrusion may be eliminated from further consideration. If the health risk assessment results indicate potential concern, a vapor intrusion problem emanating from subsurface contamination is not confirmed as contributors other than subsurface vapor intrusion may be affecting indoor air quality (that is, background contributors), including, but not limited to, activities that may take place within the structure (such as smoking, wood burning, automobile parking, and so forth), products used within the structure (such as paints, solvents, cleaners, and so forth), building materials (such as carpeting, paint, adhesives, and so forth), and outdoor ambient air quality (that may, for example, be impacted by nearby automobile traffic or industrial emissions). If indoor air quality testing can be conducted to provide representative results in the occupied building space and over appropriate averaging time intervals, the indoor air sampling approach has the potential to eliminate conclusively the existence of a vapor intrusion problem. If indoor air testing indicates concentration levels that present or may present an unacceptable health risk to building occupants, a vapor intrusion problem may be indicated. Attribution of the potential contributors to indoor air quality (that is, subsurface vapor intrusion sources versus background contributors) is necessary to confirm the existence of a vapor intrusion problem originating from subsurface contamination.

X7.1.9 For the cases in which structures do not exist on the *target property* such as for a *target property* still to be developed, or in which structures may be substantially rehabilitated such as the case of a former industrial building being completely gutted and converted to residential use, then indoor air sampling may not be possible or useful. In such cases, use of alternative approaches, for example, such as identified in **X7.1.8.1-X7.1.8.3** may provide useful information.

X7.2 Vapor Intrusion Mitigation Alternatives

X7.2.1 If the vapor intrusion pathway is determined to be complete, there are a variety of mitigation alternatives, including intrinsically safe building design, engineering controls (for example, radon-type mitigation systems), institutional controls, and removal or remediation of the contaminated media causing the vapor intrusion.

X7.2.2 Mitigation of subsurface vapors falls generally into one of the following categories: (1) *institutional controls* such as deed restrictions or other mechanisms by which land uses or development of a site can be legally regulated to reduce or eliminate potential exposures; (2) *engineering controls* such as source removal or treatment, or active or passive, temporary or permanent mechanisms to reduce or eliminate potential exposures; or (3) *intrinsically safe* building design. Institutional controls (ICs) are generally legally enforceable conditions placed on a property to reduce the likelihood of exposure to unacceptable levels of contaminants, in this case, indoor air vapors. ICs do not directly address the source of contamination or the migration of vapors into enclosed spaces, but such

controls are often a key feature of mitigation measures for vapor intrusion sites. ICs can take many forms, including restrictive covenants, zoning and land use restrictions, excavation prohibitions, and groundwater advisories. ICs might also include mechanisms to require the installation of vapor intrusion mitigation systems, such as vapor barriers or passive collection systems in new construction. Although possibly less expensive than engineering controls, ICs can be difficult to implement and maintain where state or local governments do not have sufficient legal enforcement authority. Also, to ensure their long-term effectiveness, ICs may require periodic inspections and monitoring.

X7.2.3 Engineering controls (ECs) are physical mechanisms designed to reduce or eliminate vapor migration into an enclosed space. There are four general forms of ECs: (1) *source removal or treatment*; (2) *barriers and venting* that block the migration of vapors from the subsurface into a building, including sealing, modification, and/or repair of preferential pathways/conduits; (3) *pressurization* of building interiors to direct vapors away from enclosed spaces; or (4) *indoor air treatment systems*.

X7.2.4 Removal or treatment of the source of subsurface vapors may be effective for reducing or preventing vapor migration into buildings. Such approaches may also eliminate the need for incorporating other vapor mitigation measures into existing or new construction. Treatment technologies might, for example, include contaminated soil excavation and removal, soil vapor extraction, in-situ chemical oxidation, and groundwater pump and treat.

X7.2.5 Physical barriers and vapor collection systems can effectively prevent vapor migration into buildings in certain situations, although passive barriers (and venting systems) are generally not as effective as active systems. Barriers are most appropriate for new construction; however, barriers may be placed in earthen floors in crawl spaces and basements of existing structures.

X7.2.6 Vapor barriers are materials or structures installed between a building foundation and sub-foundation material or soil to physically block the migration of vapors into an enclosed space. Barriers are considered to be passive when installed without active sub-slab depressurization systems to remove vapors that might otherwise accumulate below the barrier. Passive barriers are intended to cause vapors to migrate laterally beyond the building footprint by diffusion gradients. Most passive barriers consist of an essentially impermeable high-density polyethylene (HDPE) sheet or a rubberized-asphalt emulsion applied as a liquid that then hardens to form a barrier. In new structures, barriers are placed beneath the floor slab to prevent sub-slab vapors from entering the structure through cracks or construction joints in the slab. In existing structures, membranes can be used to retard the intrusion of vapors in crawl spaces or over dirt floors. Vapors may also be physically blocked by sealing or repairing cracks in the foundation or elimination of preferential pathways.

X7.2.7 Advantages of vapor barriers include:

X7.2.7.1 Relatively low to moderate capital cost,

X7.2.7.2 Relatively low operation and maintenance cost,

X7.2.7.3 If breached during renovation activities, can be repaired, and

X7.2.7.4 If used in conjunction with a vapor collection system, can be very effective for mitigating vapors in new construction.

X7.2.8 Disadvantages of vapor barriers include:

X7.2.8.1 May require installation in combination with an active vapor collection/venting system to enhance performance,

X7.2.8.2 Even small cracks or tears in the barrier may significantly reduce effectiveness, and

X7.2.8.3 Generally not appropriate for existing structures except in crawl spaces and over earthen floors.

X7.2.9 A passive vapor collection or venting system offers a means of drawing subsurface vapors laterally (parallel to a foundation slab) through porous subgrade material (for example, sand or gravel), with or without perforated conveyance pipe and emitting the vapors to outdoor air before the vapors can migrate into an overlying structure. Passive venting systems are generally installed below passive barriers to enhance the lateral movement of vapors below the barrier. In addition to diffusion gradients, pressure gradients created by wind blowing over exhaust pipes or thermal gradients may enhance vapor movement. Wind-driven fans mounted on exhaust pipes may increase venting rates. Passive vents are generally not as effective as active venting systems.

X7.2.10 Advantages of passive vapor collection systems include:

X7.2.10.1 Can be used for new construction (limited use in existing buildings),

X7.2.10.2 Generally will not require permitting to emit vapors to ambient air,

X7.2.10.3 Low operating and maintenance costs,

X7.2.10.4 May be converted to an active system if desired, and

X7.2.10.5 If used in conjunction with a vapor barrier, can effectively reduce vapor intrusion.

X7.2.11 Disadvantages of passive vapor collection systems include:

X7.2.11.1 Difficult to install in existing buildings,

X7.2.11.2 Not effective without adequate vapor barrier,

X7.2.11.3 Ambient air temperatures or barometric pressure may direct vapors back into the system, and

X7.2.11.4 Will not work if the venting layer becomes saturated because of high water tables or flooding.

X7.2.12 An active vapor collection system is essentially identical to a passive venting system except that vapors are drawn into the pipe collection and exhaust system from the subslab space (depressurization) by means of a blower or fan. For crawl space applications, an impermeable membrane is installed over the dirt floor and the active vapor collection system then draws vapors from between the dirt floor and the membrane.

X7.2.13 Advantages of active vapor collection systems include:

X7.2.13.1 Documented effectiveness for reducing vapor intrusion,

X7.2.13.2 Can be installed in existing and new construction,

X7.2.13.3 Low installation cost,

X7.2.13.4 Fluctuations in air temperature or barometric pressure do not influence system effectiveness, and

X7.2.13.5 Pressure gauges and alarms can be installed with the system to assess operation.

X7.2.14 Disadvantages of active vapor collection systems include:

X7.2.14.1 May require an air permit to emit vapors through the exhaust system,

X7.2.14.2 Higher operation and maintenance costs compared to passive systems,

X7.2.14.3 Physical or legal access limitations at existing structures may preclude installation, and

X7.2.14.4 Subslab systems do not work well in wet or otherwise low-permeability soil that retards vapor movement unless combined with a dry venting layer in new structures or earthen floors in existing structures.

X7.2.15 Vapor intrusion can be significantly reduced by pressurizing the building interior relative to the subslab pressure; however, to achieve this uniformly throughout a building at all times, it may be difficult and not practical. To achieve this condition, a building's existing heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system can be operated at such an air change rate to create a positive indoor air pressure. Such a condition shall be maintained reliably wherever there are human occupants to prevent unacceptable human exposure. In general, only small increases in indoor air pressure are necessary to prevent vapor intrusion. Pressurization is generally applicable to both new and existing structures, although not all existing HVAC systems or building configurations are amenable to pressurization.

X7.2.16 Advantages of building pressurization include:

X7.2.16.1 No or limited additional capital cost if the existing HVAC system is capable of pressurization,

X7.2.16.2 May be easier to implement in existing structures (particularly large and multi-story buildings) than subslab depressurization systems,

X7.2.16.3 Can be implemented in buildings with wet or very low-permeability soils that prevent subslab depressurization, and

X7.2.16.4 Current Universal Building Codes (UBC) for HVAC systems, by default, result in slightly overpressurizing building interiors to maintain the indoor environment better.

X7.2.17 Disadvantages of building pressurization include:

X7.2.17.1 HVAC systems generally do not operate during the time the building is not occupied, nights, or weekend hours;

X7.2.17.2 Increased energy costs; and

X7.2.17.3 Regular maintenance and attention required to ensure that positive pressure is maintained reliably wherever there are human occupants to prevent unacceptable human exposure.

X7.2.18 In specialized cases, indoor air may be treated by a system that can remove contaminants. Such systems may, for example, include an activated carbon filter installed in the ventilation system. This approach may be necessary for existing structures that are difficult to cost effectively pressurize (for

example, many residential dwellings) and where subslab depressurization is not feasible as a result of wet or low-permeability soil conditions. While this approach may be used in new buildings, other alternatives are generally more effective.

X7.2.19 New buildings may also be designed intrinsically safe to reduce significantly or eliminate potential vapor intrusion concerns. An example of an intrinsically safe building design is open air first-floor parking below residential living space.

X7.2.20 The number of mitigation alternatives for new buildings are typically greater than for existing buildings. In

addition, the installation of a vapor intrusion mitigation system at the time of building construction is typically more cost effective. Therefore, it is preferable for mitigation to occur at the time a building is constructed, rather than afterwards.

X7.2.21 Once installed, mitigation systems should be operated properly and appropriately maintained to insure that the system is operating at all times the way it was designed to operate.

X7.2.22 The *user* in consultation with a qualified professional should determine the most appropriate mitigation approach.

X8. DATA COLLECTION GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS FOR VAPOR INTRUSION ASSESSMENT (REFER TO APPENDIX X7)

X8.1 To conduct a vapor intrusion assessment (refer to **Appendix X7**), data shall be collected in a technically sound manner and in accordance with applicable regulatory policy/regulation/guidance. This appendix lists common data types and relevant guidance on methods and procedures to collect these data. Data collection in support of vapor intrusion modeling pertains to more than the techniques and procedures for measuring soil gas concentrations. Parameters describing soil characteristics, flux pathway dynamics, and building particulars are important to the process of modeling or otherwise estimating vapor intrusion impact. Soil gas sampling and vapor intrusion measurement protocols already available through other ASTM standards, state and federal guidance, and peer-reviewed publications have not been reproduced. However, identification of procedures to measure the basic parameters to support modeling and evaluation of vapor intrusion is useful. **Table X8.1** lists select data required for direct assessment of the vapor intrusion pathway, as well as parameters expected to be incorporated into a modeling assessment of the vapor intrusion pathway, such as can be conducted using the U.S. EPA spreadsheet (http://www.epa.gov/oswer/riskassessment/airmodel/johnson_ettinger.htm) for the Johnson and Ettinger model (1991).

X8.2 In addition to the specific references, there are sources of information (EPA, “Uncertainty and the Johnson-Ettinger Model for Vapor Intrusion Calculations,” EPA/600/R-05/110, Weaver, J. W., and Tillman, F. D., National Exposure Research Laboratory, Athens, GA, September 2005; Johnson, P. C., “Identification of Critical Parameters for the Johnson and Ettinger (1991) Vapor Intrusion Model,” Bulletin No. 17, American Petroleum Institute, May 2002) about the relative sensitivity of the parameters to the evaluation result for vapor intrusion. If there is question about procedures for measuring individual parameters, knowledge of the relative importance of parameters on the final result may be helpful in focusing effort. It may be prudent to accept the default value for certain parameters while focusing more attention on the more sensitive parameters.

X8.3 Degradation of soil gas concentrations is not included in the U.S. EPA spreadsheet for the Johnson and Ettinger

model nor is it addressed in **Table X8.1**. However, a process for evaluating the natural attenuation of hydrocarbons in soil gas has been published (Roggemans, S., Bruce, C. L., Johnson, P. C., and Johnson, R. L., “Vadose Zone Natural Attenuation of Hydrocarbon Vapors: An Empirical Assessment of Soil Gas Vertical Profile Data,” Bulletin No. 15, American Petroleum Institute, December 2001).

*X8.4 References for **Table X8.1**:*

American Petroleum Institute (API), 2004, “Collecting and Interpreting Soil Gas Samples from the Vadose Zone: A Practical Strategy for Assessing the Subsurface-Vapor-to-Indoor-Air Migration Pathway at Petroleum Hydrocarbon Sites,” Final Draft.

ASHRAE 62.2 and 90.1 (Chapter 6) Heating and Ventilating Systems, American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-Conditioning, 2004.

ASTM E2121 Standard Practice for Installing Radon Mitigation Systems in Existing Low-Rise Residential Buildings.

ASTM D2216 Standard Test Methods for Laboratory Determination of Water (Moisture) Content of Soil and Rock by Mass.

ASTM D2937 Standard Test Method for Density of Soil in Place by the Drive-Cylinder Method.

ASTM D2487 Standard Practice for Classification of Soils for Engineering Purposes (Unified Soil Classification System).

ASTM D5126 Standard Guide for Comparison of Field Methods for Determining Hydraulic Conductivity in the Vadose Zone.

ASTM D5314 Standard Guide for Soil Gas Monitoring in the Vadose Zone.

ASTM D6306 Standard Guide for Placement and Use of Diffusion Controlled Passive Monitors for Gaseous Pollutants in Indoor Air.

ASTM F1815 Standard Test Methods for Saturated Hydraulic Conductivity, Water Retention, Porosity, and Bulk Density of Putting Green and Sports Turf Root Zones.

California Environmental Protection Agency Department of Toxic Substances Control (CA-EPA), 2005 Guidance for the Evaluation and Mitigation of Subsurface Vapor Intrusion to

Indoor Air, http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/AssessingRisk/upload/HERD_POL_Eval_Subsurface_Vapor_Intrusion_interim_final.pdf.

California Environmental Protection Agency Department of Toxic Substances Control, Glendale, California and California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, 2003, Advisory—Active Soil Gas Investigations, January 28, http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb4/html/programs/ust/03_0210_Schools_Advisory_Active_Soil_Gas_Investigations.pdf.

California Regional Water Quality Control Board Los Angeles Region (LARWQCB), 1997, Interim Guidance for Active Soil Gas Investigation, February 25, http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb4/html/programs/ust/03_0210_Interim%20Guidance%20for%20Active%20Soil%20Gas%20Investigations.pdf.

DiGiulio, D., Paul, C., et al (2006). Assessment of Vapor Intrusion in Homes Near the Raymark Superfund Site Using Basement and Sub-Slab Air Samples, U.S. EPA Office of Research and Development.

Eklund, B. and Schmidt, C. (1990), Estimation of Baseline Air Emissions at Superfund Sites, Air/Superfund National Technical Guidance Study Series, Vol II, August 1990, EPA-450/1-89-002a.

EPRI, 2005 Reference Handbook for Site-Specific Assessment of Subsurface Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air, Report 1008492, Electric Power Research Institute, Palo Alto, CA.

Hartman, B. (2006), “How to Collect Reliable Soil Gas Data for Risk Based Application—Specifically Vapor Intrusion, Part 4: Updates, on Soil Gas Collection and Analytical Procedures,” LUSTLine #53, published by the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission, Lowell, MA, newsletter reporting on Federal and State Programs to control leaking underground storage tanks, October 2006.

Hartman, B. (2003). How to Collect Reliable Soil Gas Data for Risk Based Applications, Part 2: Flux Chamber Method, LUSTLine #44, August 2003.

http://www.epa.gov/superfund/programs/risk/airmodel/johnson_ettinger.htm.

ISO-11272 Soil Quality—Determination of Dry Bulk Density, 1998.

ISO/CD10381-7, Soil Quality-Sampling—Part 7: Guidance on Sampling Soil Gas, International Standards Organization (ISO), 2005.

ITRC, 2007. The Vapor Intrusion Pathway, A Practical Guideline, Interstate Technology & Regulatory Council, www.itrcweb.org.

Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MADEP), 2002 Indoor Air Sampling and Evaluating Guide.

McHugh, T. et al, 2007. Use of Radon Measurements for Evaluation of VOC Vapor Intrusion: Method and Application.

Nelson, D. W. and Sommers, L. E., 1982. Total Carbon, Organic Carbon, and Organic Matter, In: Page, A. L. et al, (Editors), Methods of Soil Analysis: Part 2 Chemical and Microbiological Properties, ASA [American Society of Agronomy, Inc.] Monograph Number, pp. 539-579.

New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH). 2006. Guidance for Evaluating Soil Vapor Intrusion in the State of New York, Final. Troy, NY: Center for Environmental Health, Bureau of Environmental Exposure Investigation, http://www.health.state.ny.us/nysdoh/gas/svi_guidance/.

NJDEP 2005, New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Vapor Intrusion Guidance. Site Remediation and Waste Management Program. www.nj.gov/dep/srp/guidance/vaporintrusion.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA), 1986, Measurement of Gaseous Emission Rates from Land Surfaces Using an Emission Isolation Flux Chamber, User's Guide, by M. R. Kienbusch, Radian Corporation, P.O. Box 9948, Austin, TX 78766, EPA Contract No. 68-02-3889, Work Assignment 18, Exposure Assessment Division, Environmental Monitoring Systems Laboratory, Las Vegas, NV 89114, February.

U.S. EPA 1992. Indoor Radon and Radon Decay Product Measurement Device Protocols. EPA 402-R-92-004, July 1992 (revised).

U.S. EPA, 2002a. OSWER Draft Guidance for Evaluating the Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air Pathway from Groundwater and Soils (Subsurface Vapor Intrusion Guidance), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, November.

U.S. EPA, 2002b. Ground-Water Sampling Guidelines for Superfund and RCRA Project Managers: Ground Water Forum Issue Paper. Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Document No. 542/S-02/001. May 2002.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA), 2002c, “User's Guide for the Johnson and Ettinger (1991) Model for Subsurface Vapor Intrusion Into Buildings (Revised),” Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, Washington, DC 20460, December. http://www.epa.gov/oswer/riskassessment/airmodel/johnson_ettinger.htm.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA), 2003, User's Guide for Evaluating Subsurface Vapor Intrusion into Buildings, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, Washington, DC 20460, June 19.

U.S. EPA 2007. Proceedings from the Soil Gas Methods Workshop, AEHS Conference, San Diego, CA, 3-2007.

TABLE X8.1 Data Collection Guidance for a Direct Vapor Intrusion Assessment of the Vapor Intrusion Pathway

Direct Evaluation of Vapor Intrusion Pathway		
Parameter	Key Issues	Select Guidance
VOCs in Groundwater ^A	General guidance	ITRC 2007; NJDEP 2005; EPA 2002b
VOCs in Soil Gas ^A	Sample depth below water table	ITRC 2007; NJDEP 2005
	General guidance	ASTM 2006; CA-EPA 2003; API 2004; Wilson, Johnson et al, 2005; ISO/CD10381-7;
	Sample point location	ITRC 2007; NYSDOHS, 2006
	Sample point installation	ITRC 2007; EPA 2007; Hartman 2006; DiGiulio 2006
	Purge/sample volume and rate	EPA 2007; ITRC 2007; CA-EPA 2003; Hartman 2006
	Analysis methods	EPA 2007; ITRC 2007; Hartman 2006;
	Target analytes	ITRC 2007
	Leak tracer gas	EPA 2007; ITRC 2007; Hartman 2006; CA-EPA 2003
	Flux chambers	Hartman 2003; Eklund and Schmidt 1990; EPA 1986;
	Passive sampling methods	EPA 2007; ITRC 2007; EPA 1998;
VOCs in Sub-slab Gas ^A	General guidance	ITRC 2007
	Sample point installation	ITRC 2007; DiGiulio 2006
	Purge/sample volume and rate	ITRC 2007; DiGiulio 2006
	Analysis methods	EPA 2007; ITRC 2007; Hartman 2006
	Target analytes	ITRC 2007
	Leak tracer gas	EPA 2007; ITRC 2007; Hartman 2006; CA-EPA 2003
	Sampling method selection: for example, active or passive	EPA 2007; ITRC 2007; EPA 1998
VOCs in Indoor Air ^A	General guidance	ITRC 2007; NJDEP 2005; NYDOHS 2006; CA-EPA 2006; MADEP 2002; EPRI, 2005; EPA 2002c
	Indoor background	McHugh, Connor et al, 2004; McHugh, DeBlanc et al, 2006
	Ambient background	ASTM D6196
	Sampling rate/duration	ITRC 2007; NJDEP 2005; MADEP 2002
	Analysis methods	ITRC 2007; MA-DEP 2002
	Target analytes	ITRC 2007
	Source removal	ASTM E2121
	Passive sampling methods	ASTM 2003
	Building operating conditions	http://resourcecenter.pnl.gov/cocoon/morf/ResourceCenter/article/1307
Radon in Sub-slab Gas and Indoor Air	General guidance	USEPA 1992; McHugh 2007; ASTM 2003
Cross Foundation Pressure Gradient	General guidance	USEPA 2002a
Meteorological data	General guidance	http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/wdc/index.php
	Specific data needs and sources	Meteorological office of local airport
Building Inspection	General guidance	CA-EPA 2005; NJDEP 2005; ITRC 2007
	Indoor sources	CA-EPA 2005; NYSDOH 2006
	HVAC system	ASHRAE Standards 62.2 and 90.1 (Chap. 6) 2004
	Building foundation	CA-EPA 2005; NJDEP 2005
	Preferential pathways: sumps, dry wells, utility conduits, and so forth	CA-EPA 2005; NJDEP 2005
Measurements in Support of Analytical or Numerical Modeling		
Parameter	Key Issues	Select Guidance
Depth to Water Table	General guidance	ASTM D6000
Depth to Base of Building Foundation	General guidance	USEPA 2002a
Foundation Thickness	General guidance	ACI 360R R1997
Foundation Crack Fraction	General guidance	USEPA 2002a
Building Floor Area	General guidance	ASTM E1836
Building Mixing Height	General guidance	USEPA 2002a
Building Air Exchange Rate	General guidance	ASTM D6306; ASTM E741
Volumetric Air Flow Through Foundation (Qsoil)	General guidance	USEPA 2002a
Vadose Zone Soil Thickness	Estimation methods	CA-EPA 2005
SCS or USCS Soil Type	General guidance	ASTM D5314; ASTM D4700; ASTM D5730; ASTM D6235
Total Porosity	General guidance	ASTM D2487
Water-Filled Porosity	Estimation methods	CA-EPA 2005; ASTM F1815; ASTM D5126
	General guidance	ASTM D6727
	Measurement methods	ASTM D2216
Soil Dry Bulk Density	General guidance	ISO-11272
	Measurement methods	ASTM D2937
Fraction of Organic Carbon Content	General guidance	ASTM E1195
	Measurement methods	Nelson and Sommers 1992

^A Check applicable State guidance; see [Appendix X5](#).

X9. SUPPLEMENTAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

X9.1 *ASTM Standards:*

D5157 Guide for Statistical Evaluation of Indoor Air Quality Models

D5314 Guide for Soil Gas Monitoring in the Vadose Zone

D5466 Test Method for Determination of Volatile Organic Chemicals in Atmospheres (Canister Sampling Methodology)

D5791 Guide for Using Probability Sampling Methods in Studies of Indoor Air Quality in Buildings

D6196 Practice for Selection of Sorbents, Sampling, and Thermal Desorption Analysis Procedures for Volatile Organic Compounds in Air

D6245 Guide for Using Indoor Carbon Dioxide Concentrations to Evaluate Indoor Air Quality and Ventilation

D6246 Practice for Evaluating the Performance of Diffusive Samplers

D6306 Guide for Placement and Use of Diffusion Controlled Passive Monitors for Gaseous Pollutants in Indoor Air

D6345 Guide for Selection of Methods for Active, Integrative Sampling of Volatile Organic Compounds in Air

D7297 Practice for Evaluating Residential Indoor Air Quality Concerns

E741 Test Method for Determining Air Change in a Single Zone by Means of Tracer Gas Dilution

E1528 Guide for Environmental Site Assessments: Transaction Screen Process

E1739 Guide for Risk-Based Corrective Action Applied at Petroleum Release Sites

E1903 Guide for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase II Environmental Site Assessment Process

E2435 Guide for Application of Engineering Controls to Facilitate Use or Redevelopment of Chemical-Affected Properties

E2531 Guide for Development of Conceptual Site Models and Remediation Strategies for Light Nonaqueous-Phase Liquids Released to the Subsurface

X9.2 *U.S. EPA Documents:*

U.S. EPA/OSWER Draft, Guidance for Evaluating Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air Pathway from Groundwater and Soils (Subsurface Vapor Intrusion Guidance), EPA530-D-02-004, November 2002 (accessible at www.epa.gov/correctiveaction/eis/vapor.htm).

U.S. EPA/OSWER Interim Final Report, Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund, Volume 1: Human Health Evaluation Manual (Part A), December 1989 (accessible at www.epa.gov/oswer/riskassessment/ragsa/index.htm).

U.S. EPA/OSWER Expedited Site Assessment Tools for Underground Storage Tanks: A Guide for Regulators (Chapter IV: Soil Gas Surveys), EPA 510-B-97-001, March 1997.

U.S. EPA Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, User's Guide for Evaluating Subsurface Vapor Intrusion into Buildings, February 22, 2004.

U.S. EPA On-line Tools for Site Assessment Calculation: Estimated Henry's Law Constants, Washington, DC, 2004 (accessible at www.epa.gov/ATHENS/learn2model/part-two/onsite/esthenry.htm)

U.S. EPA (1998). Environmental Technology Verification Report, Soil Gas Sampling Technology, W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc. GORE-SORBER Screening Survey, USEPA Office of Research and Development.

U.S. EPA (1998). Environmental Technology Verification Report, Soil Gas Sampling Technology, Quadrel Services, Inc.

EMFLUX Soil Gas System, U.S. EPA Office of Research and Development. EPA Report No. 600/R-98/096.

U.S. EPA (1999). Compendium Method TO-15, Determination of VOCs in Air Collected in Specially-Prepared Canisters and Analyzed by GC/MS. U.S. EPA Office of Research and Development. EPA Report No. 625/R-96/010b (accessible at <http://www.epa.gov/ttnamti1/files/ambient/airtox/to-15r.pdf>).

U.S. EPA (1999). Compendium Method TO-17, Determination of VOCs in Ambient Air Using Active Sampling onto Sorbent Tubes. USEPA Office of Research and Development. EPA Report No. 625/R-96/010b (accessible at <http://www.epa.gov/ttnamti1/files/ambient/airtox/to-17r.pdf>).

U.S. EPA (1992). Assessing Potential Indoor Air Impacts for Superfund Sites. EPA Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Research Triangle Park, NC, contract No. 68D00124, Work Assignment 1-76, September.

U.S. EPA (2003). Urban Air Toxics Monitoring Program, Final Report, EPA-454/R-04-003, July.

U.S. EPA (1998). Environmental Technology Verification Report, Soil Gas Sampling Technology, Quadrel Services, Inc.

X9.3 *Other Federal Agency Documents:*

U.S. Army Interim Vapor Intrusion Policy for Environmental Response Actions, October 31, 2006.

U.S. Air Force Institute for Operational Health, Guide for the Assessment of the Vapor Intrusion Pathway, Cox, D. N., Howard, W. B., and Smith, M. A., NTIS: ADA449121, 64 pp, February 2006.

X9.4 *State Agency Documents:*

Alabama Department of Environmental Management (ADEM), 2001. ARBCA: Alabama Risk Based Corrective Action for Underground Storage Tanks, Guidance Manual, Revision 1.0, Appendix H: Evaluation of the Indoor Inhalation Pathway, November.

Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC), 2004. Evaluation of Vapor Intrusion Pathway at Contaminated Sites, Division of Spill Prevention and Response, June 28.

Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC), 2002. Inhalation of Diesel Vapor in Indoor Air. Technical Memorandum-01-001. ADEC Division of Spill Prevention and Response, Contaminated Sites Remediation Program, 1 December.

California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal EPA), 2005. Guidance for the Evaluation and Mitigation of Subsurface Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air, Department of Toxic Substances Control, Interim Final, February 7.

California Environmental Protection Agency [Cal-EPA], 2003. Advisory—Active Soil Gas Investigations, Joint Publication of the Department of Toxic Substances Control, Glendale, CA, and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board Los Angeles Region 4, January 28.

Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE), 2004. Indoor Air Guidance, Hazardous Materials and Waste Management Division, Draft, September.

Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection (CT-DEP), 2003. Proposed Revisions to Connecticut Remediation Standard Regulations Volatilization Criteria; Permitting, Enforcement and Remediation Division, Bureau of Water Management, March.

Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection (CT-DEP), 2005. Significant Environmental Hazard Condition Notification Threshold Concentrations, Reference Table A – Volatile Organic Substances. December.

Delaware DNREC, “Policy Concerning the Investigation, Risk Determination and Remediation for the Vapor Intrusion Pathway,” March 2007.

Hawaii DOH, “Screening for Environmental Concerns at Sites with Contaminated Soil and Groundwater,” November 2006.

Idaho DEQ, “Idaho Risk Evaluation Manual,” July 2004.

Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM), 2006. Draft Vapor Intrusion Pilot Program Guidance, April 26.

Kansas DHE, “Kansas Vapor Intrusion Guidance—Chemical Vapor Intrusion and Residential Indoor Air,” July 2007.

Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ), 2003. Risk Evaluation/Corrective Action Program (RECAP), Corrective Action Group, October 20.

Maine Department of Environmental Protection (MEDEP), 1999. Field Guideline for Protection Residents from Inhalation Exposure to Petroleum Vapors, October 1998, Revised May 27 and July 22, 1999, and June 16, 2000.

Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP), 2002. Indoor Air Sampling and Evaluation Guide, WSC Policy #02-430, April, <http://mass.gov/dep/images/indair.pdf>; Revised Air Guidelines, Memorandum, Dec. 6, 1995, <http://mass.gov/dep/air/aallist.pdf>.

Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ), 2004. RRD Operation Memorandum No. 1, Part 201 Cleanup Criteria, Part 213 Risk-Based Screening Levels, Remediation and Redevelopment Division (RRD), December 10.

Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ), 2006. RRD Operational Memorandum No. 4, Site Characterization and Remediation Verification, Attachment 4—Soil Gas and Indoor Air, Peer Review Draft, Remediation and Redevelopment Division (RRD), February.

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA), 2005. Vapor Intrusion Assessments Performed During Site Investigations, Petroleum Remediation Program, April.

Nebraska DEQ, “Risk-Based Corrective Action at Petroleum Release Sites: Tier 1 and Tier 2 Assessments and Reports,” February 2004.

New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services (NHDES), 2006. Vapor Intrusion Guidance, July.

New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP), 2005. Vapor Intrusion Guidance, October and Vapor Intrusion Guidance Tables dated May 2006.

New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP), 2005. Field Sampling Procedures Manual: Chapter 9—Soil Gas Surveys, August (accessible at <http://www.state.nj.us/dep/srp/guidance/fspm/pdf/chapter09.pdf>).

New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH), 2006. Guidance for Evaluating Soil Vapor Intrusion in the State of New York, Center of Environmental Health, Bureau of Environmental Exposure Investigation, Final, October.

New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH), 2005. Indoor Air Sampling and Analysis Guidance. Prepared by Division of Environmental Health Assessment, Center for Environmental Health, February 1.

Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OHEPA), 2005. Methodology for Vapor Intrusion Assessment, Division of Emergency and Remedial Response, Technical Decision Compendium, April 12.

Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ORDEQ), 2006. Risk-Based Decision Making for the Remediation of Petroleum-Contaminated Sites, Spreadsheets, September.

Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ORDEQ), 2004. Screening Model for Volatilization from Soil to Indoor Air at Heating Oil Tank Sites. March 23.

Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP), 2004. Vapor Intrusion into Buildings from Groundwater and Soil under the Act 2 Statewide Health Standard, Land Recycling Program Technical Guidance Manual—Section IV.A.4, January 24.

Rhode Island DEM, “Rules and Regulations for the Investigation and Remediation of Hazardous Material Releases,” February 2004.

Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VADEQ), 2006. Voluntary Remediation Program Risk Assessment Guidance, February 16.

Washington State Department of Ecology Model Toxics Control Act (Chapter 173-340 WAC) Cleanup Regulation Chapter 70.105D RCW, October 2005.

Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services “Chemical Vapor Intrusion and Residential Indoor Air,” February 2003.

X9.5 Other Documents:

Abreu, L. D. and Johnson, P. C., “Effect of Vapor Source—Building Separation and Building Construction on Soil Vapor Intrusion as Studied with a Three-Dimensional Numerical Model,” *Environmental Science and Technology*, 2005, 39, pp. 4550–4561.

ASHRAE 62.1–2007. Ventilation for Acceptable Indoor Air Quality, American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers, Inc.

American Petroleum Institute, Bulletin No. 8, Characteristics of Dissolved Petroleum Hydrocarbon Plumes: Results from Four Studies, C. J. Newell and J. A. Connor, December 1998.

American Petroleum Institute, Bulletin No. 17, Identification of Critical Parameters for the Johnson and Ettinger (1991) Vapor Intrusion Model, P. Johnson, May 2002.

American Petroleum Institute, Publication No. 4674, Assessing the Significance of Subsurface Contaminant Vapor Migration to Enclosed Spaces, December 1998.

American Petroleum Institute, Publication No. 4741, Collecting and Interpreting Soil Gas Samples from the Vadose Zone, A Practical Strategy for Assessing the Subsurface Vapor-to Indoor Air Migration Pathway at Petroleum Hydrocarbon Sites, L. H. Wilson, P. C. Johnson, et al, 2005.

Davis, R., "Vapor Attenuation in the Subsurface from Petroleum Hydrocarbon Sources," LUSTLine Bulletin 52: pp. 22-25, May 2006.

DiGiulio, D., Paul, C., et al (2006). Assessment of Vapor Intrusion in Homes Near the Raymark Superfund Site Using Basement and Sub-Slab Air Samples, U.S. EPA Office of Research and Development.

Eklund, B., Folkes, D., Kabel, J., and Farnum, R., An Overview of State Approaches to Vapor Intrusion, Environmental Manager, Air & Waste Association, February 2007.

Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI, 2005), Reference Handbook for Site-Specific Assessment of Subsurface Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air, Report 1008492, EPRI, Palo Alto, CA.

Hodgson, A. T., et al (1995). Use of Volatile Tracers to Determine the Contribution of Environmental Tobacco Smoke to Concentrations of Volatile Organic Compounds in Smoking Environments. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA. Report No. LBL-37376, December.

Hodgson, A. T. and Levin, H. (2003). Volatile Organic Compounds in Indoor Air: A Review of Concentrations Measured in North America Since 1990. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA. Report No. LBNL-51715, April 12.

Hartman, B., "How to Collect Reliable Soil-Gas Data for Risk-Based Applications, Part 1: Active Soil-Gas Method," LUSTLine Bulletin 42: pp. 17-22, published by the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission, Lowell, MA, newsletter reporting on Federal and State Programs to control leaking underground storage tanks, pp. 17-22, 2002.

Hartman, B. (2003). "How to Collect Reliable Soil-Gas Data for Upward Risk Assessments, Part 2: Surface Flux-Chamber Method," LUSTLine Bulletin 44: pp. 14-34.

Hartman, B. (2006). "How to Collect Reliable Soil-Gas Data for Risk-Based Applications—Specifically Vapor Intrusion, Part 4: Updates on Soil Gas Collection and Analytical Procedures," LUSTLine Bulletin 53: pp. 14-19.

Interstate Technology & Regulatory Council (ITRC), Vapor Intrusion Pathway: A Practical Guide, Washington, D.C., January 2007.

Kurtz, J. P. and Folkes, D. J., "Background Concentrations of Selected Chlorinated Hydrocarbons in residential Indoor Air," Proceedings of the International Conference on Indoor Air Quality and Climate, International Academy of Indoor Air Sciences, Monterey, CA, June 30-July 5, 2002 (available at www.envirogroup.com).

Lowell, P. and Eklund, B., VOC Emission Fluxes as a Function of Lateral Distance from the Source, Environmental Progress, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 52-58, April 2004.

McHugh, T. E., Connor, J. A., et al (2004). "An Empirical Analysis of the Groundwater-to-Indoor-Air Exposure Pathway: The Role of Background Concentrations in Indoor Air," Environmental Forensics 5: pp. 33-44.

McHugh, T. E., DeBlanc, P. C., et al (2006). "Indoor Air as a Source of VOC Contamination in Shallow Soils Below Buildings," Soil and Sediment Contamination 15(1): pp. 103-122.

Shah, J. J. and Singh, H. B., (1988). Distribution of Volatile Organic Chemicals in Outdoor and Indoor Air. Environmental Science & Technology, Volume 22, No. 12, December.

LEGAL REFERENCES FOR APPENDIX XI

- (1) "Hazardous substance" includes all substances designated as hazardous under other statutes referred to in CERCLA or designated as hazardous substance by USEPA under CERCLA itself. 42 USC § 9601(14). Petroleum, including crude oil and any fraction thereof, and natural gas are excluded.
- (2) Note that "all appropriate inquiries" are, as USEPA says, "legally distinct" from the more general concepts or processes of "environmental site assessment" and "environmental due diligence." See, for example, USEPA's discussion of this matter in its preamble to the final AAI Rules, 70 Fed.Reg. 66069, 66072 (Nov. 1, 2005).
- (3) This Legal Appendix does not address the separate issue, not raised by the VE Standard Guide, of whether *vapor intrusion* analysis, as described in guidance issued by USEPA and state agencies, would ever be required under the AAI Rules or to satisfy the definition of recognized environmental condition under E1527-05 Phase I. Vapor intrusion analysis determinations are sensitive and complex and the information necessary to complete them would not typically be

- gathered by the environmental professional performing all appropriate inquiries or a Phase I under E1527-05.
- (4) Note that the VE Standard Guide is not limited to CERCLA "hazardous substances."
- (5) VE Standard Guide, Section 1.2.
- (6) 42 USC § 9601(9).
- (7) 42 USC § 9607(a)(1).
- (8) Note that the *bona fide* prospective purchaser protection (9607(r) and 9601(40)), may leave the owner subject to a lien for unrecovered response costs against an increase in value of the property because of cleanup.
- (9) 42 USC § 9607(b).
- (10) 42 USC § 9601(35)(A).
- (11) See, for example, *New Windsor v. Tesa Tuck, Inc., et al.*, 935 F.Supp. 310 (S.D.N.Y. 1996) (landowner established the Third Party Defense despite having not taken steps to discover the contamination at its property from the encroachment of a neighboring landfill).

- (12) 42 USC § 9607(q). This provision was added in the “Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act of 2002,” the stated purpose of which was to “provide certain relief for small businesses from liability” under CERCLA and “to promote the cleanup and reuse of brownfields....” It is likely inconsistent with these purposes for the contiguous property owner provision to be read to effectively incorporate the requirements of the contiguous property owner provision into the ‘due care’ or ‘precaution’ requirements of the Third Party Defense (9607(b)(3)(a) and (b)) for offsite landowners. However, USEPA guidance has not addressed this nor has it been addressed in case law to date.
- (13) 42 USC § 9607(r) and § 9601(40).
- (14) AAI is only one component of these landowner liability protections. Others include that the landowner is not otherwise liable under CERCLA or affiliated with a liable party; did not cause, contribute to or consent to the release; and has satisfied what is referred to as ‘continuing obligations’ with regard to the property. See e.g., *Interim Guidance Regarding Criteria Landowners Must Meet in Order to Qualify for Bona Fide Prospective Purchaser, Contiguous Property Owner, or Innocent Landowner Limitations on CERCLA Liability* (known as the “Common Elements” Guidance), USEPA Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (Mar. 2003).
- (15) CERCLA’s definition of “facility” is intended to be expansive and includes every place where hazardous substances come to be located. *United States v. Conservation Chemical Company*, 619 F. Supp. 162, 185 (W.D.Mo. 1985).
- (16) 42 USC § 9601(35)(A)(i).
- (17) 42 USC § 9601(35)(B)(ii).
- (18) 70 Fed. Reg. 66070(40 CFR 312).
- (19) 42 USC § 9601(35)(B)(iii)(V) and (VI).
- (20) 42 USC § 9601(9)(B).
- (21) 42 USC § 9607(q)(1)(A)(viii)(II). Emphasis added. For more on USEPA’s views on the contiguous property owner liability protection, the potential liability of offsite property owners, and USEPA exercise of enforcement discretion in this regard, see, for example, *Interim Enforcement Discretion Guidance Regarding Contiguous Property Owners*, Memorandum, USEPA Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance, (Jan. 2004); *Final Policy Towards Owners of Property Containing Contaminated Aquifers*, Memorandum, USEPA Office of Site Remediation Enforcement (May 1995); and *Policy Towards Owners of Residential Property at Superfund Sites*, Memorandum, USEPA Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (July 1991).
- (22) 40 CFR 312.26(c).
- (23) 40 CFR 312.26(d).
- (24) CERCLA defines “release” to include “any spilling, leaking, pumping, emitting, emptying, discharging, injecting, escaping, leaching, dumping, or disposing into the environment . . .” 42 USC § 9601(22).
- (25) 40 C.F.R. Part 312, at 312.11.
- (26) E1527-05, Section 1.1.
- (27) E1527-05, Section 1.1.1. Note that E1527-05 includes petroleum and is not limited to CERCLA hazardous substances. See Section 1.1.2 of E1527-05 that explains that E1527-05 includes petroleum products because they are a concern in assessing real estate but not because of any applicability of CERCLA to petroleum products.
- (28) E1527-05, Section 1.1.1.
- (29) 42 USC § 9601(14).
- (30) 42 USC § 9601(14)(E).
- (31) 40 CFR 61.01(a) and <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/188polls.html>.
- (32) 42 USC § 9601(22).
- (33) See for example, *Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund*, Volume I, Human Health Evaluation Manual, (Part A), Interim Final, EPA/540/1-89/002, Dec. 1989; “Assessing Potential Indoor Air Impacts for Superfund Sites,” 1992; “Options for Developing and Evaluating Mitigation Strategies for Indoor Air Impacts at Superfund Sites,” 1993.
- (34) See for example, *Action Manufacturing Co., Inc. v. Simon Wrecking Co.*, 428 F. Supp. 2d 288, 307, 332 (E.D.Pa. 2006).
- (35) 67 Fed. Reg. 71169-71172 (November 29, 2002).
- (36) USEPA Draft VI Guidance, I.F. p. 4.
- (37) See, for example, 40 CFR 312.1(c)(1).
- (38) 40 CFR 312.26(d)(6).
- (39) Note, among other differences, that the search distances for offsite releases in the VE Standard Guide do not satisfy the search distance criteria set forth in E1527-05. Only E1527-05 has been evaluated and deemed by USEPA to satisfy the AAI Rules and all appropriate inquiries.
- (40) VE Standard Guide, Section 1.2.

ASTM International takes no position respecting the validity of any patent rights asserted in connection with any item mentioned in this standard. Users of this standard are expressly advised that determination of the validity of any such patent rights, and the risk of infringement of such rights, are entirely their own responsibility.

This standard is subject to revision at any time by the responsible technical committee and must be reviewed every five years and if not revised, either reapproved or withdrawn. Your comments are invited either for revision of this standard or for additional standards and should be addressed to ASTM International Headquarters. Your comments will receive careful consideration at a meeting of the responsible technical committee, which you may attend. If you feel that your comments have not received a fair hearing you should make your views known to the ASTM Committee on Standards, at the address shown below.

This standard is copyrighted by ASTM International, 100 Barr Harbor Drive, PO Box C700, West Conshohocken, PA 19428-2959, United States. Individual reprints (single or multiple copies) of this standard may be obtained by contacting ASTM at the above address or at 610-832-9585 (phone), 610-832-9555 (fax), or service@astm.org (e-mail); or through the ASTM website (www.astm.org). Permission rights to photocopy the standard may also be secured from the ASTM website (www.astm.org/COPYRIGHT/).