State of Vermont

SUMMARY INFORMATION ON UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS (USTs) For Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 2016 Posted 1/5/2017

Tank, facility, and on-site inspection information is based on all permitted (Category One) tanks including those that were permitted but are now out of service.

On-site inspections measure compliance with the Vermont Underground Storage Tank Rules. These rules are more stringent than Federal requirements in the following areas: VT requires weekly rather than monthly monitoring of release detection systems; VT regulates USTs that power backup generators or contain heating oil for non-heating purposes, and; if cathodic protection (CP) system repairs have been made, VT require 1-year rather than 3-year CP testing.

		recerally Rec	uired State Inspect			r
Federal Fiscal Year		2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Total Number of UST Facilities		997	968	949	939	927
Total Number of USTs		2139	2064	2016	1945	1913
Number of UST Facilities Inspected		362	357	350	332	365
Inspection Period Dates		10/1/2011 through 9/30/2012	10/1/2012 through 9/30/2013	10/1/2013 through 9/30/2014	10/1/2014 through 9/30/2015	10/1/2015 throug 9/30/2016
Percent Compliance		87%	81%	82%	75%	81%
Release reporting dates		10/1/2011 through 9/30/2012	10/1/2012 through 9/30/2013	10/1/2013 through 9/30/2014	10/1/2014 through 9/30/2015	10/1/2015 throug 9/30/2016
Number of Confirmed UST Releases		12	5	7	10	3
Summary Information for Release S	Sources and Ca	uses:				
Source: Tank		2 releases (13.3%) - 2 due to corrosion	1 release (8.3%) - due to corrosion	1 release (20%) - due to corrosion	1 release (14.3%) - due to corrosion	1 release (33.3%) - due to corrosion
Source: Piping		3 releases (20%) -due to piping failure	4 releases (33.3%) -due to piping failure	1 release (20%) -due to piping failure	2 releases (28.6%) -due to piping failure	none
Source: Dispenser		3 releases (20%) - due to physical or mechanical failure	3 releases (25%) -due to physical or mechanical failure	1 release (20%) -due to physical or mechanical failure	2 releases (28.6%) -due to physical or mechanical failure	none
Source: Submersible Turbine Pump (STP)		1 release known (6.67%) -due to physical failure	none	none	none	none
Source: Delivery/Faulty Containment Devices		3 releases known (20%) -all due to overfill	3 releases known (25%) -all due to overfill	1 release known (20%) -all due to overfill	1 release known (14.3%) -all due to overfill	2 releases known (66.6 %) -all spill bucket failure
Source: Other		3 release (20%) -unknown	1 release (8.3%) -unknown	1 release (20%) -unknown	1 release (14.3%)	none
		-unknown	-unknown	-unknown	-unknown	
	Vermont En	-		ompliance Summaries		
ach year since 2007, the UST Progr spection list which is made up of fac alidity, what the compliance rate for YEAR	am has randomly cilities last inspec	vironmental Resul	ts Project (ERP) Co nately 100 facilities to	ompliance Summaries	ERP. This is in addit on allows us to say, w Out of Compliance/ Overfill	
nspection list which is made up of fac alidity, what the compliance rate for	ram has randomly cilities last inspect the entire sector	vironmental Resul y selected approxim ted three years ago is. Out of Compliance/	ts Project (ERP) Co nately 100 facilities to b. Randomly selectin Out of Compliance/	ompliance Summaries o inspect as part of our og facilities for inspection Out of Compliance/	ERP. This is in addit on allows us to say, w Out of Compliance/	ith statistical Out of Compliance/
spection list which is made up of fac alidity, what the compliance rate for YEAR	am has randomļ cilities last inspec the entire sector % Compliance	vironmental Resul y selected approxim ted three years ago is. Out of Compliance/ Leak Detection	ts Project (ERP) Co nately 100 facilities to b. Randomly selectin Out of Compliance/ Leak Prevention	ompliance Summaries o inspect as part of our og facilities for inspection Out of Compliance/ Cathodic Protection	ERP. This is in addit n allows us to say, w Out of Compliance/ Overfill Prevention	out of Compliance, MULTI
spection list which is made up of fac alidity, what the compliance rate for YEAR 2008	am has randomly cilities last inspect the entire sector % Compliance 66	vironmental Resul y selected approxim ted three years ago is. Out of Compliance/ Leak Detection 33	ts Project (ERP) Co nately 100 facilities to b. Randomly selectin Out of Compliance/ Leak Prevention	pompliance Summaries poinspect as part of our og facilities for inspection Out of Compliance/ Cathodic Protection 2	ERP. This is in addit n allows us to say, w Out of Compliance/ Overfill Prevention 2	Out of Compliance, MULTI 11
ispection list which is made up of fac alidity, what the compliance rate for YEAR 2008 2009	am has randomly cilities last inspect the entire sector % Compliance 66 74	vironmental Resul y selected approxim ted three years ago is. Out of Compliance/ Leak Detection 33 19	ts Project (ERP) Co nately 100 facilities to Description of a compliance/ Leak Prevention 10	pompliance Summaries poinspect as part of our og facilities for inspection Out of Compliance/ Cathodic Protection 2 2	ERP. This is in addit n allows us to say, w Out of Compliance/ Overfill Prevention 2 4	Out of Compliance, MULTI 11 9
spection list which is made up of fac alidity, what the compliance rate for YEAR 2008 2009 2010	am has randomly cilities last inspect the entire sector % Compliance 66 74 84	vironmental Resul y selected approxim ted three years ago is. Out of Compliance/ Leak Detection 33 19 13	ts Project (ERP) Co nately 100 facilities to b. Randomly selectin Out of Compliance/ Leak Prevention 10 17 2	pompliance Summaries poinspect as part of our og facilities for inspection Out of Compliance/ Cathodic Protection 2 2 1	ERP. This is in addit n allows us to say, w Out of Compliance/ Overfill Prevention 2 4 0	Out of Compliance, MULTI 11 9 0
spection list which is made up of fac alidity, what the compliance rate for YEAR 2008 2009 2010 2012	am has randomly cilities last inspect the entire sector % Compliance 66 74 84 80	vironmental Result y selected approxim ted three years ago is. Out of Compliance/ Leak Detection 33 19 13 16	ts Project (ERP) Cc mately 100 facilities to b. Randomly selecting Out of Compliance/ Leak Prevention 10 17 2 11	pompliance Summaries or inspect as part of our og facilities for inspection Out of Compliance/ Cathodic Protection 2 2 1 0	ERP. This is in addit on allows us to say, w Out of Compliance/ Overfill Prevention 2 4 0 0	Out of Compliance, MULTI 11 9 0 7
spection list which is made up of fac alidity, what the compliance rate for YEAR 2008 2009 2010 2012 2013	am has randomly cilities last inspect the entire sector % Compliance 66 74 84 80 93	vironmental Resul y selected approxim ted three years ago is. Out of Compliance/ Leak Detection 33 19 13 16 6	ts Project (ERP) Co nately 100 facilities to b. Randomly selectin Out of Compliance/ Leak Prevention 10 17 2 11 6	pompliance Summaries poinspect as part of our og facilities for inspection Out of Compliance/ Cathodic Protection 2 2 2 1 0 0 0	ERP. This is in addit n allows us to say, w Out of Compliance/ Overfill Prevention 2 4 0 0 0 0	ith statistical Out of Compliance MULTI 11 9 0 7 2
spection list which is made up of fac alidity, what the compliance rate for YEAR 2008 2009 2010 2012 2013 2014	am has randomly cilities last inspect the entire sector % Compliance 66 74 84 80 93 87	vironmental Resul y selected approxim ted three years ago is. Out of Compliance/ Leak Detection 33 19 13 16 6 4	ts Project (ERP) Cc nately 100 facilities to b. Randomly selectin Out of Compliance/ Leak Prevention 10 17 2 11 6 3	pompliance Summaries poinspect as part of our og facilities for inspection Out of Compliance/ Cathodic Protection 2 2 1 0 0 0 1	ERP. This is in addit n allows us to say, w Out of Compliance/ Overfill Prevention 2 4 0 0 0 0 0	ith statistical Out of Compliance MULTI 11 9 0 7 2 3