

## North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources

Division of Waste Management

**Beverly Eaves Perdue** Governor

Dexter R. Matthews Director

Dee Freeman Secretary

February 8, 2011

## CERTIFIED MAIL 7008 1870 0001 3421 2847 RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Ken John 2507 McKeag Ct. Fort Collins, CO 80526

Notice of No Further Action Re:

15A NCAC 2L .0407

Risk-based Assessment and Corrective Action for Petroleum Underground Storage Tanks

**Promats Property** 1517 South Main Street

Salisbury, Rowan County, NC (MRO)

FTF Incident Number 36397 Low Risk Classification, L35R

Dear Mr. John:

On January 28, 2011, the Underground Storage Tank (UST) Section of the Division of Waste Management's Raleigh Central Office received a Receptor Survey and Groundwater Sampling report for the above-referenced site. According to information on file, a gas station utilizing eight USTs operated on the property from approximately 1931 until 1950. In 1988, Cone Mills closed the USTs in place by filling them with concrete. In 2007, Promats, Inc. hired Piedmont Industrial Services to conduct a Soil and Groundwater Assessment, and several petroleum compounds were identified in the soil, but none of them exceeded the Soil-to-Groundwater Maximum Soil Contaminant Concentrations (MSCCs) established in 15A NCAC 2L .0411. Petroleum compounds were also identified in one of the monitor wells at concentrations exceeding state 2L groundwater standards. A review of the recent 2011 report shows that no petroleum contaminated groundwater was detected above the level of the standards or interim standards established in 15A NCAC 2L .0202. One water supply well used in a manufacturing process was identified 650 feet away, but it is not used as a drinking water source. Municipal water is used and available throughout the area, and no surface water bodies are located within 500 feet. The site is not located in the Coastal Plain physiographic region or a wellhead protection area

Based on information provided to date, the UST Section finds it appropriate to classify the risk of the discharge or release as low. Furthermore, the UST Section determines that no further action is warranted for this incident. This determination shall apply unless the UST Section later determines that the discharge or release poses an unacceptable risk or a potentially unacceptable risk to human health or the environment or additional information is provided to warrant re-assessment of the site. 1637 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-1637 North Carolina Naturally

Phone: 919-733-8486 \ FAX: 919-733-9413 \ Internet: www.wastenotnc.org

An Equal Opportunity \ Affirmative Action Employer

Ken John Promats Property, FTF #36397 February 8, 2011 Page 2

Pursuant to 15A NCAC 2L .0407, you have a continuing obligation to notify the UST Section of any changes that you know of or should know of, that might affect the level of risk assigned to the discharge or release. Please be advised that the monitoring wells used to investigate this incident will be closed in accordance with 15A NCAC 2C .0113 and .0214, respectively by a State-Lead Contractor. You will be notified by the Contractor prior to their arrival on site. If you have any questions concerning this notice, please contact Sharon Ghiold at 919-733-1320.

Sincerely,

George C. Matthis, Jr., Trust Fund Branch Head

Cc: Ron Taraban, Supervisor, MRO UST Section

## **Environmental Survey Officer's Questionnaire**

DDRESS 1517	5. Main Street (+	DATI D. 181 ac. parcel adjoining at 15	10-30-1	/3		
RESENT USE OF PROP	ERTY A COLO	D. 181 ac. parcel adjoining at 15	31 S. Main 8	£). J	clip bu	
ESCRIBE ANY BUILDIN	- IMPARA TUIT	5. T DISTUSATION WARD hore	<b>a</b> 0	7		7
ECONIDE ANT BUILDIN	36, 3	92 St - Warehouse MAO.	office 1=			<u> </u>
ESCRIBE SURROUNDI	IG LAND USE hight Ind	Estime, Connerceal Retail	ALLECASI Yac	ilety.		
PLEASE CC	MPLETE EACH QUESTION. (	COMMENTS PEOUIDED FOR ANNUAL				
4 111		COMMENTS REQUIRED FOR ANY YES	ANSWERS (E)	KCEPT F	OR *).	
_i. I was there any part	of the property that you were	nable to inspect?		YES	NO	
	- Intering systems on the site?			<del>   </del>		
o. I is the politowers bi	ISIDASS OF ANY other business	ngaged in on the property, one that is lis	ted in the	<del>    </del>		$\bot$
4. Are hazardous sub	Policy as a suspect business?	If yes, explain.	rea in the			
5. Are there or have the	pere been envised of, used, man	If yes, explain.  ufactured, generated or stored on the pr	operty?	$+\pi$	1	—
below:	and and along a story	utactured, generated or stored on the prage tanks on the property. If yes, please	answer a-e		<del>         </del>	+-
a. Number of Tar	iks_ <i>8</i> :	Ago of Tools		}	"	1
b. Size of Gallone	Juk, d	Use/Product at and in To yes.		1		1
6. Are there any storage	idence of leakage Link.	Age of Tanks 60 - 70 y Rs. Use/Product stored in Tanks gasel		l	1	
o. I wie mere anv storac	A drums or similar contains	n the property? If yes, please answer a	el la	<u> </u>		
Approximate Nur     b. Size in gallons	nber of drums?	. 1 you, picuse answer a	a nelow:		Q	
c. Are the drums ste	ored property 2			1		1
d. is there clear lab	eling of contents on the deven-			[		1
. Do any structures of	the property contain hazarday	and the state of t				1
<ol><li>Was the property ev</li></ol>	er used for industrial purposes?	s substances (i.e. asbestos)?			W	+
. I have any state or federal actions been filed against a state of the state of th			U		†	
owner of the property for violation of environmental law?  Have there been any adverse press reports or complaints concerning the property or surrounding property?		r or any prior		12	1	
). Have there been any	adverse press reports or comp	laints concerning the property of current	adt			
I. Are there any obvious			laing			{ C
Are there electrical to	s physical signs of contamination	on on the property or surrounding proper	v?	-	- TOTAL	<del>├</del>
. Are there electrical transformers or capacitors on the property?  Are there any groundwater wells on or near the property/			岩	<u>R</u>	<del>├</del>	
s the property along or near a waterway?			一十十			
. Is the property near any floodolain, wotland, are as the			$\dashv$		┝╌╠	
			+		┝╌┾	
7. Are there any easements on the property with potential environmental implications?  3. Were any chemicals or fuels ever handled of the price.			ns?			-
						7
. I Ale usere any honde	nife or logoone on the area at a					Ī
ls there any evidence	of any surface water run-on fro	m surrounding commercial/industrial site			W	
environmentally sens	tive areas?		s or runoff to		<b>₽</b> 2	
	odors present?			$\neg$		
If any abstract of title	surface features (e.g. mounds	or depressions)?		+	N N	
			thing in the	一十一	뿝니	- <u> </u>
Environmental Audit?	was you lear that an outside cor	ssary and obtained, did you observe an mpany should be retained to perform a F	hase I	_	_	Œ
DITIONAL COMMENTS	Use attachments if necessary)					
· 8USTSLLIST D	os allachments if necessary)	To. Ust's filled w/ concrete in 198				
Como Nico /-	in service station in 199	TO. UST'S filled w/come note: 100	0.1.0			
one meus/Text	ele industre 1988-2001.	1 10001001198	o ozconemili	ς.		
TOWN MILL UST	sfiel w/concrete in 1988	i.	<del>-</del>			

THIS ASSESSMENT IS BASED SOLELY ON THE VISUAL OBSERVATIONS OF THE SITE AND ITS IMPROVEMENTS. DOCUMENTS MADE AVAILABLE TO THE INSPECTOR AND INTERVIEWS WITH BORROWER(S) OR GUARANTOR(S). NO OTHER INVESTIGATION WAS CONDUCTED AND CONDITONS NOT CLEARLY OBSERVABLE ARE NOT ADDRESSED.