



Rev. 3/13/2026

RBCR Training Q&A

Focus Session 1

Discovery & Reporting Presented January 28, 2026

1. **If PFAS (or any other analyte) is tested and detected after March 1 for the first time as part of investigation at a site that is already in the Transfer Act or VRP/ABC, does that need to be reported under RBCRs? Or does that just get regulated along with everything else under the existing program the site is in (Transfer Act or VRP/ABC)?**

It depends on when the release occurred and if the site has been verified/had final approval. Generally, if the release occurred after the latter of the form filing or Phase II, it must be reported under the RB process. Any SERs that are reported must be addressed under the RB process. For any non-SER releases, the creator/maintainer may indicate if they choose to clean up the release under the RB process or incorporate it into the verification for the site if it has not been submitted yet.

2. **Can you please confirm that information in the “file cabinet” is not one of the multiple lines of evidence?**

If information in the file cabinet from before March 1, 2026, is the **ONLY** line of evidence, it does not result in discovery.

Information in the file cabinet dated before March 1, 2026, can be an **additional line of evidence** supporting discovery if there is an additional line of evidence dated March 1, 2026, or later. This **can** be one of the multiple lines of evidence.

3. **Any quantity of spilled PCB is reportable, so does that mean any quantity of known or suspected PCB is an ERR?**

Yes. The only releases eligible for exemption due to quantity are those reportable under the sections of 22a-450 mentioned in the definition of an ERR (134tt-1(a)(37)). Known or suspected releases of PCBs are reportable under a different section of the Release Reporting Regulations (Releases of oil or petroleum required to be reported at any quantity: 22a-450-2(a)(1)) and therefore are always ERRs.

4. **Are concentrations less than criteria reportable?**

Releases at concentrations less than criteria are not reportable as long as a release remediation closure report has been verified by an LEP within 365 days after discovery. If the concentration is less than the lower bounds specified in 22a-134tt-1(4)(B), it is considered incidental and not subject to any requirements of the RBCRs.

5. For stockpiled soils and pre-characterization completed as part of construction, if concentrations are above RCBR criteria, is this reportable under the RCBRs?

Becoming "aware of the results of laboratory analysis of soil, groundwater, sediment, or soil vapor that indicate concentrations of such substances above the laboratory reporting limit" constitutes discovery of an existing release and would need to be handled under the RCBRs. The reporting requirements and timelines under the RBCP would depend on the concentrations, but if the concentrations are above RBCR criteria, then there would be a requirement to report and investigate/remediate with the discovered existing release.

6. Regarding multiple lines of evidence... do multiple lines need to be present for a condition to be reportable, or must only one line be present to be reportable?

Multiple lines of evidence determine discovery. Reportability is based on concentrations relative to cleanup criteria (or the lack of criteria) and NAPL. If a release is discovered through multiple lines of evidence, and no sampling is conducted, it is reportable.

In the absence of analytical data, more than one line of evidence is needed for discovery; however, at the point of decision, there is rarely only one line of evidence. And historical information can be one of those lines if there is also a current line of evidence."

7. Can you give an example of a non-analytical line of evidence obtained outside a business decision to investigate...?

An environmental professional (EP) is visiting a manufacturer to order some parts related to a personal hobby and observes significant staining around a catch basin at a loading dock near the building's entrance. The EP is not there in an investigatory capacity and does not represent a business decision to investigate.

8. It really seems that we are required to look in many places to figure out what the Department really expects. With that being the case, will the Department be compiling a comprehensive list of documents which (together) include the new expectations as of 3/1?

We appreciate that there is a lot of information related to the regulations implementation. We expect everyone to do their best. To assist, the Department is releasing information sheets on program specific topics, has issued guidance on the multiple lines of evidence topic, and is providing online forms, such as for immediate action notifications, and templates for key steps, such as Release Catalogue Reports. The information can be found on the main Environmental Cleanup webpage.

<https://portal.ct.gov/deep/remediation--site-clean-up/environmental-cleanup>

9. Blue chromium dust was covered by dirt. No evidence?

How was the blue chromium dust identified without evidence?

If the environmental professional observed this, and it is subsequently covered, it is still discovered.

If the idea is that this condition may be present but is never observed because of the soil cover, then there is no line of evidence to follow to discovery.

10. Can GPR survey lead to discovery for utility clearance?

This question appears to be asked if GPR surveys conducted for utility clearance purposes could result in the discovery of a release. There is a lot of nuance in that. If the GPR data is provided to an environmental professional or other qualified person as part of an environmental assessment, it could certainly serve as a line of evidence that helps to discover a release. If the GPR operator is a qualified person, they may make observations during the survey that constitute knowledge of a release.

It's important to remember that an investigation by a qualified person can lead to knowledge of a release. Discovery happens when the creator/maintainer obtains such knowledge. Refer to the *Multiple Lines of Evidence Guidance* for additional details regarding discovery in the absence of analytical data.

11. An EP/LEP/etc. has been asked to quote on an environmental site assessment of a property. As part of that proposal preparation, a site walk is offered, and the EP participates. During the site walk, the EP notes "lines of evidence" indicating a likely release. What are reporting requirements, as there is no client?

The EP has not been engaged to investigate the site, and this is an orientation, not an investigation. There will likely be a contracted, formal site reconnaissance as part of an environmental assessment that will constitute the basis for discovery (reporting requirements are based on the nature of the discovery).

If, however, the property owner decides to discuss what environmental conditions the LEP observed during the orientation, this complicates the relationship. At this point, the property owner is making a business decision regarding obtaining knowledge of an investigatory nature, and the LEP is making a business decision regarding providing free consulting. So, such a discussion may warrant discovery.

12. Can you clarify "multiple" lines of evidence vs. "single" line of evidence? Is the observation of soil with an odor, in and of itself, grounds for notification (in the absence of other observations or lines of evidence)?

It's important to consider what a line of evidence is - an observable fact. Is there an odor? Soil with an odor is one line of evidence. The nature of the odor (gasoline, sweet, acrid) is another line. What is or was in this area? Does vegetation appear impacted? You should

consider the location of the soil related to vents, drums, tanks, etc., documentation of existence of the aforementioned, and consider why you are observing the soil in the first place. That rationale may be another line of evidence. A single line of evidence is rare but should prompt you to consider any other lines available.

13. If you don't have analytical data after the discovery of a release from multiple lines of evidence and you notify your client of the discovery, how do you (client) know if you are in the 120-day or 360-day category for reporting? Also, what is the applicable criteria? Is it the DEC or is PMC applicable? Pollutant mobility is a characteristic of the released material/constituent and is dependent on a number of factors which may not be known at the time of discovery via laboratory data.

See the Multiple Lines of Evidence Guidance. When the environmental professional obtains knowledge of a release based on evidence other than analytical data, they are expected to notify their client within 30 days of the reconnaissance where such evidence was identified. If their client is the creator/maintainer, discovery has occurred. In the absence of data, reporting is to be completed within 120 days.

It's not clear if applicability of the DEC and PMC is intended to be part of the multiple lines of evidence question or a separate question. Both answers are provided below:

1) If lab data is **not** available, the DEC and PMC are not relevant. Reporting is based on non-analytical lines of evidence.

2) If data is available both the DEC and PMC are applicable for evaluating reportability per 22a-134tt-3(a)(2)(A)(i). If the concentration is reportable based on comparison to the DEC or PMC, it is to be reported; other pollutant mobility factors may figure into characterization and remediation but are not a consideration for reportability.

14. There is repeated reference to multiple lines of evidence, yet it appears that the reality of the situation is that just one piece of evidence from a list of potential lines of evidence triggers a discovery - is that the case?

There is rarely only one line of evidence leading to any discovery. Each discrete piece of information (odor, nature of odor, staining, color, use of the area) are all lines of evidence. It means that not every stain warrants discovery. Not every odor in the air warrants discovery. The odor of gasoline in soil constitutes multiple lines of evidence and warrants discovery.

The bottom line is, does the collective observable evidence suggest that soil or groundwater could be impacted? If the answer is yes, there is no reason to try to count the lines of evidence.

15. Please confirm that an odor of gas is two lines of evidence.

Yes. An odor is one line. Identifying it as gas is another line. But there is still not enough information here to decide if these lines warrant discovery of a release.

Is the odor gasoline in the air at a gas station? This is not necessarily indicative of a release to

soil or groundwater (unless it is next to an open excavation).

Is the odor in a soil sample? This is probably enough evidence to warrant discovery (particularly when combined with the reason for collecting a sample in the first place).

16. Would the presence of a dry cleaner for a significant period of time but no visible evidence of a release, be enough to be one line of evidence?

Yes. It is one line of evidence (one fact) that could inform other observations. By itself, it does not indicate the presence of a release.

Combine this information with the presence of staining by the door, and there is enough evidence to warrant discovery of a release.

17. On an existing PTP site, if we get an analytical report showing an exceedance in soil or GW after 1 MAR 2026 that exceeds criteria, is this Discovery?

It depends on when the release occurred and if the site has been verified/had final approval. Generally, if the release occurred after the latter of the form filing or Phase II, it must be reported under the RB process. Any SERs that are reported must be addressed under the RB process. For any non-SER releases, the creator/maintainer may indicate if they choose to clean up the release under the RB process or incorporate it into the verification for the site if it has not been submitted yet.

18. Would cleanup before 120 days for that type of release (no IA) leave no trace of records or submittal in DEEP files?

According to 22a-134tt-3(a)(2)(B), a release shall not be reported if, not more than 120 days after the discovery, it has been remediated to the standards, and a release remediation closure report has been verified by an LEP. Any release remediation closure report is expected to comply with the requirements of 22a-134tt(12), which includes retaining it by the person who created or maintained the releases for not less than 10 years, and if not submitted previously to the commissioner, be submitted to the commissioner not more than 30 days following a request in writing for submission. [22a-134tt-12(4)]. In simple words, if release remediation closure report is done before the 120 days, then DEEP will likely not have no trace of records. However, if a Commissioner approval request is submitted to DEEP and used to demonstrate compliance with RCBRs, then DEEP would have documentation related to this request available.

19. How would the discovery of one or more PFAS (or other compounds) that do not have associated remediation criteria be handled?

If PFAS is discovered on a parcel used for industrial or commercial purposes, there shall be a reasonable expectation that such release is or was located on such parcel. For substances for which there is no specified Direct Exposure Criteria, the LEP may submit a proposed release-specific direct exposure criterion following the calculation provided in Sec 22a-134tt-App8. Additionally, where there has been a parcel-wide investigation conducted and multiple polluting substances have been identified, a risk-based alternative direct exposure criteria may be

calculated under Sec 22a-134tt-9(d)(5). Specifically, for PFAS, DEEP anticipates the soil background study being conducted by USGS will give us all a sense of which PFAS and respective concentrations ranges are present ubiquitously in CT.

20. Releases below 2 times criteria are reportable at day 365 if not characterized and closed out.

That is correct. According to 3(a)(2)(C), for each substance released, if there is one or more numeric cleanup standards, or an additional polluting substances criteria can be calculated, and the results of laboratory analysis shows detected concentration less than twice the applicable numeric cleanup standard or calculated additional polluting substances criteria, then report the existing release not more than 365 days after discovery. Do not report such release if within 365 days from discovery the release has been remediated to the standards, and the release remediation closure report has been verified by an LEP. Any release remediation closure report is expected to comply with the requirements of section 12 of the RBCRs.