

#### **DOCUMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR DETERMINATION**

Interim Final 2/5/99

## RCRA Corrective Action Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA725)

#### **Current Human Exposures Under Control**

Facility Name:	Raybestos Products Company
Facility Address:	1204 Darlington Avenue, Crawfordsville, IN 47933
Facility EPA ID #:	IND 006 061 477

1. Has **all** available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to soil, groundwater, surface water/sediments, and air, subject to RCRA Corrective Action (e.g., from Solid Waste Management Units (SWMU), Regulated Units (RU), and Areas of Concern (AOC)), been **considered** in this EI determination?

X If yes - check here and continue with #2 below.

- If no re-evaluate existing data, or
  - \_\_\_\_\_ if data are not available skip to #6 and enter"IN" (more information needed) status code.

# BACKGROUND

## Definition of Environmental Indicators (for the RCRA Corrective Action)

Environmental Indicators (EI) are measures being used by the RCRA Corrective Action program to go beyond programmatic activity measures (e.g., reports received and approved, etc.) to track changes in the quality of the environment. The two EI developed to-date indicate the quality of the environment in relation to current human exposures to contamination and the migration of contaminated groundwater. An EI for non-human (ecological) receptors is intended to be developed in the future.

## **Definition of "Current Human Exposures Under Control" EI**

A positive "Current Human Exposures Under Control" EI determination ("YE" status code) indicates that there are no "unacceptable" human exposures to "contamination" (i.e., contaminants in concentrations in excess of appropriate risk-based levels) that can be reasonably expected under current land- and groundwater-use conditions (for all "contamination" subject to RCRA corrective action at or from the identified facility (i.e., site-wide)).

## **Relationship of EI to Final Remedies**

While Final remedies remain the long-term objective of the RCRA Corrective Action program the EI are near-term objectives which are currently being used as Program measures for the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, GPRA). The "Current Human Exposures Under Control" EI are for reasonably expected human exposures under current land- and groundwater-use conditions ONLY, and do not consider potential future land- or groundwater-use conditions or ecological receptors. The RCRA Corrective Action program's overall mission to protect human health and the environment requires that Final remedies address these issues (i.e., potential future human exposure scenarios, future land and groundwater uses, and ecological receptors).

## **Duration / Applicability of EI Determinations**

EI Determinations status codes should remain in RCRIS national database ONLY as long as they remain true (i.e., RCRIS status codes must be changed when the regulatory authorities become aware of contrary information).

2. Are groundwater, soil, surface water, sediments, or air media known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated"<sup>1</sup> above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, guidance, or criteria) from releases subject to RCRA Corrective Action (from SWMUs, RUs or AOCs)?

	Yes	<u>No</u>	?	Rationale / Key Contaminants
Groundwater		Х		
Air (indoors) <sup>2</sup>		Х		
Surface Soil (e.g., <2 ft)		Х		
Surface Water		Х		
Sediment		Х		
Subsurf. Soil (e.g., >2 ft)	х			Hydrocarbons
Air (outdoors)		х		

If no (for all media) - skip to #6, and enter "YE." status code after providing or citing appropriate "levels," and referencing sufficient supporting documentation demonstrating that these "levels" are not exceeded.

If yes (for any media) - continue after identifying key contaminants in each "contaminated" medium, citing appropriate "levels" (or provide an explanation for the determination that the medium could pose an unacceptable risk), and referencing supporting documentation.

If unknown (for any media) - skip to #6 and enter "IN" status code.

Rationale and Reference(s): As described in detail in the current conditions report May 2004: The former 18-inch storm sewer system and Utility Tunnel were decontaminated of elevated lead and polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) in 1996 and was abandoned in 1999. Shelby Ditch where the storm sewer discharged was remediated in 2002. The contaminated soil and sediments were excavated and disposed of as special wastes at the Twin Bridges Landfill in Danville, IL. The three former stockpile areas used for storage of contaminated soils were sampled in December 2004 and confirmed to be below industrial remediation regulations. The greatest lead level from the sampling event was 510.46 milligrams per kilograms (mg/kg). The greatest PCB levels from the sampling event were Aroclor 1248 3.3 mg/kg and Aroclor 1254 1.8 mg/kg. The former three stockpile areas were covered with grass. Former stockpile area #2 has a concrete pad has been constructed over the area. The areas not covered by the pad had grass coverage. During the sampling event in December of 2004, the end of 18-inch storm sewer was sampled and found to have a limited area of stained soil at 2-feet below ground surface. The verification sampling confirmed no residual contamination.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> "Contamination" and "contaminated" describes media containing contaminants (in any form, NAPL and/or dissolved, vapors, or solids, that are subject to RCRA) in concentrations in excess of appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (for the media, that identify risks within the acceptable risk range).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Recent evidence (from the Colorado Dept. of Public Health and Environment, and others) suggest that unacceptable indoor air concentrations are more common in structures above groundwater with volatile contaminants than previously believed. This is a rapidly developing field and reviewers are encouraged to look to the latest guidance for the appropriate methods and scale of demonstration necessary to be reasonably certain that indoor air (in structures located above (and adjacent to) groundwater with volatile contaminants) does not present unacceptable risks.

The facility may have contributed to the sediment contamination in Reach 4 and Reach 5 of Shelly Ditch. However, that contamination is being addressed under CERCLA, and other potentially responsible parties may have contributed to the contamination as well. Accordingly the potential human health risks in Reach 4 and Reach 5 are outside of the scope of this determination.

3. Are there **complete pathways** between "contamination" and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under the current (land— and groundwateruse) conditions?

Summary Exposure Pathway Evaluation Table

#### Potential Human Receptors (Under Current Conditions)

"Contaminated" Media	Residents	Workers	DayCare	Construction	Trespassers	Recreation	Food <sup>3</sup>
Groundwater							
Air (indoors)							
Soil (surface, e.g., <2 ft)							
Surface Water							
Sediment							
Soil (subsurface e.g., >2 ft)	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No
Air (outdoors)							

Instructions for <u>Summary Exposure Pathway Evaluation Table</u>:

1. Strike-out specific Media including Human Receptors' spaces for Media which are not "contaminated" as identified in #2 above.

2. enter "yes" or "no" for potential "completeness" under each "Contaminated" Media -- Human Receptor combination (Pathway).

Note: In order to focus the evaluation to the most probable combinations some potential "Contaminated" Media - Human Receptor combinations (Pathways) do not have check spaces ("\_\_\_\_"). While these combinations may not be probable in most situations they may be possible in some settings and should be added as necessary.

- If no (pathways are not complete for any contaminated media-receptor combination) skip to #6, and enter "YE" status code, after explaining and/or referencing condition(s) in-place, whether natural or man-made, preventing a complete exposure pathway from each contaminated medium (e.g., use optional <u>Pathway Evaluation Work Sheet</u> to analyze major pathways).
- Х
- If yes (pathways are complete for any "Contaminated" Media Human Receptor combination) continue after providing supporting explanation.
- If unknown (for any "Contaminated" Media Human Receptor combination) skip to #6 and enter "IN" status code.

Rationale and Reference(s): December 2004 soil sampling on-site confirmed no surface soil contamination in the former stockpile areas, transformer area, and remediation/abandonment of 300 feet of 18-inch storm sewer pipe. The groundwater does not intersect any subsurface soil contamination. The depth to groundwater is 50-feet. The site is not used for habitation, has no full time residents, and does not house any recreational, healthcare, day-care, or playground facilities. No recreational areas are located within the facility's boundary, and no growth of crops, grazing of livestock, or harvesting of fish occurs on the property. There are no human exposures to contaminated

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Indirect Pathway/Receptor (e.g., vegetables, fruits, crops, meat and dairy products, fish, shellfish, etc.)

groundwater on- or off-site. There are no human exposures to subsurface contaminated soil on- or off-site. Shelly Ditch discharges into Sugar Creek and is approximately 2-miles west of the Facility.

- 4. Can the **exposures** from any of the complete pathways identified in #3 be reasonably expected to be "**significant**"<sup>4</sup> (i.e., potentially "unacceptable" because exposures can be reasonably expected to be: 1) greater in magnitude (intensity, frequency and/or duration) than assumed in the derivation of the acceptable "levels" (used to identify the "contamination"); or 2) the combination of exposure magnitude (perhaps even though low) and contaminant concentrations (which may be substantially above the acceptable "levels") could result in greater than acceptable risks)?
  - X If no (exposures can not be reasonably expected to be significant (i.e., potentially "unacceptable") for any complete exposure pathway) skip to #6 and enter "YE" status code after explaining and/or referencing documentation justifying why the exposures (from each of the complete pathways) to "contamination" (identified in #3) are not expected to be "significant."
    - If yes (exposures could be reasonably expected to be "significant" (i.e., potentially "unacceptable") for any complete exposure pathway) - continue after providing a description (of each potentially "unacceptable" exposure pathway) and explaining and/or referencing documentation justifying why the exposures (from each of the remaining complete pathways) to "contamination" (identified in #3) are not expected to be "significant."

If unknown (for any complete pathway) - skip to #6 and enter "IN" status code

Rationale and Reference(s): A limited area of hydrocarbon stained soil approximately 10-feet by 10-feet at 2-feet below ground surface was identified during the December 2004 conformation sampling. The 18-inch storm sewer pipe was decontaminated in 1996 and was abandoned, the last section of the pipe was removed, and sealed in 2001. The hydrocarbon stained, soil is within the confines of the facility's industrial complex, which is zoned for industrial use. The Facility is fenced around the perimeter. The hydrocarbon stained soil area is 75-feet from the plant building. Although the extent of subsurface contamination is a complete pathway for construction workers, no maintenance or excavation is planned in the near future.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> If there is any question on whether the identified exposures are "significant" (i.e., potentially "unacceptable") consult a human health Risk Assessment specialist with appropriate education, training and experience.

- 5. Can the "significant" **exposures** (identified in #4) be shown to be within **acceptable** limits?
  - If yes (all "significant" exposures have been shown to be within acceptable limits) continue and enter "YE" after summarizing <u>and</u> referencing documentation justifying why all "significant" exposures to "contamination" are within acceptable limits (e.g., a site-specific Human Health Risk Assessment).
  - If no (there are current exposures that can be reasonably expected to be "unacceptable")continue and enter "NO" status code after providing a description of each potentially "unacceptable" exposure.
  - If unknown (for any potentially "unacceptable" exposure) continue and enter "IN" status code

Rationale and Reference(s): Not Applicable

6. Check the appropriate RCRIS status codes for the Current Human Exposures Under Control EI event code (CA725), and obtain Supervisor (or appropriate Manager) signature and date on the EI determination below (and attach appropriate supporting documentation as well as a map of the facility):

<u>X</u>	YE - Yes, "Current Human Exposures Under Contro review of the information contained in this EI Determ Exposures" are expected to be "Under Control" at the facility, EPA ID # IND 006 061 477, located at 1204 IN under current and reasonably expected conditions. evaluated when the Agency/State becomes aware of s	ination, "Current Human Raybestos Products Company Darlington Avenue, Crawfordsville, This determination will be re-
	NO - "Current Human Exposures" are NOT "Under	Control."
	IN - More information is needed to make a determi	nation.
Completed by	(signature)	Date
	(print) John Nordine	_
	(title) Geologist	-
Supervisor	(signature)	Date
	(print) George Hamper	
	(title) Chief, Corrective Action Section	_
	(EPA Region or State) EPA Region 5	-
Locations wher	e References may be found:	
U.S. EPA Reco 7 <sup>th</sup> floor	-	
77 West Jackso	n Boulevard	
Chicago, IL 600	504	
Contact telephor	ne and e-mail numbers	
(name)	) John Nordine	

(manne)	John Norume
(phone #)	(312) 353-1243
(e-mail)	nordine.john@epa.gov

FINAL NOTE: THE HUMAN EXPOSURES EI IS A QUALITATIVE SCREENING OF EXPOSURES AND THE DETERMINATIONS WITHIN THIS DOCUMENT SHOULD NOT BE USED AS THE SOLE BASIS FOR RESTRICTING THE SCOPE OF MORE DETAILED (E.G., SITE-SPECIFIC) ASSESSMENTS OF RISK.