

## DOCUMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR DETERMINATION

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

#### Current Human Exposures Under Control

**Facility Name:**                   **Concast Metal Products Company (Roessing Bronze Company)**  
**Facility Address:**           **134 Myoma Road, Mars, Pennsylvania**  
**Facility EPA ID #:**           **PAD 00 076 5651**

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).

**Current Human Exposures Under Control**  
**Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA725)**

Page 2

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)?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>Rationale / Key Contaminants</u>
Groundwater	<u><b>X</b></u>	---	---	Elevated Boron Concentrations.
Air (indoors) <sup>2</sup>	---	<u><b>X</b></u>	---	Institutional controls installed for fume and dust collection.
Surface Soil (e.g., <2 ft)	---	<u><b>X</b></u>	---	Excavation of Contaminated Soil.
Surface Water	---	<u><b>X</b></u>	---	Metal concentrations are below regulatory stds.
Sediment	---	<u><b>X</b></u>	---	No record of contamination.
Subsurf. Soil (e.g., >2 ft)	---	<u><b>X</b></u>	---	Excavation of Contaminated Soil
Air (outdoors)	---	<u><b>X</b></u>	---	Institutional controls installed for fume and dust. collection.

----- 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.

**X** 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):

Groundwater:

As part of the closure of the former cooling water impoundment, four post-closure monitoring wells were installed. One well was located upgradient while the remaining three wells were downgradient and along the edge of the former surface impoundment. The upgradient well was used for background groundwater quality monitoring. The three downgradient wells detected elevated boron concentrations at 11,000 ppb, 31,000 ppb and, 33,000 ppb respectively. The concentrations are significantly higher than the Risk-Based Concentration of 3,300 ppb. Boron in groundwater may be attributable to the historic use of borax at the facility. (EI Inspection Report 3/2000)

Surface Soil (< 2 ft.):

The concrete-lined drainage channel (trough) was removed and replaced by a subsurface drain traversing about the same location as the trough. Contaminated soil was excavated. Confirmatory samples verified satisfactory removal. [Pedersen& Pedersen (Concast consultant) letter dated July 6, 2000, Concast Assessment Document, May 2001]

Surface Soil (> 2ft.):

Contaminated soil at the former surface impoundment was excavated. Confirmatory soil sampling verified satisfactory removal of the contaminated soil for heavy metals. (EI Inspection Report 3/2000)

Air (Indoors and Outdoors):

Institutional controls are in place for fume and dust collection. (EI Inspection Report 3/2000)

Sediment:

No known suspicions of contamination. (EI Inspection Report 3/2000)

Surface water:

A stream survey was conducted at the facility's drainage ditch and the unnamed tributary leading to the Breakneck Creek. In addition to sampling at the ditch, two points of collection were also taken upgradient and downgradient from the point of discharge of the ditch to the unnamed tributary. Results from the surface water samples detected low levels of heavy metals and boron below the regulatory limits. (EI Inspection Report 3/2000, )

Footnotes:

<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>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.

**Current Human Exposures Under Control**  
**Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA725)**

Page 3

3. Are there **complete pathways** between “contamination” and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under the current (land- and groundwater-use) conditions?

Summary Exposure Pathway Evaluation Table

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

<b>“Contaminated” Media</b>	<u>Residents</u>	<u>Workers</u>	<u>Day-Care</u>	<u>Construction</u>	<u>Trespassers</u>	<u>Recreation</u>	<u>Food</u> <sup>3</sup>
Groundwater	_no_	_no_	_no_	_no_			_no_
Air (indoors)	---	---	---				
Soil (surface, e.g., <2 ft)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Surface Water	---	---			---	---	---
Sediment	---	---			---	---	---
Soil (subsurface e.g., >2 ft)	---	---		---			---
Air (outdoors)	---	---	---	---	---		

Instructions for Summary Exposure Pathway Evaluation Table:

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.

- \_\_\_X\_\_\_ 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 Pathway Evaluation Work Sheet to analyze major pathways).
- \_\_\_\_\_ 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):

The most recent groundwater samples indicate that onsite boron concentrations have decreased from 11-13 ppm in 1991 to 7-11 ppm in 2000. It does not appear that boron is migrating to the adjacent private groundwater wells or impacting Breakneck Creek. The boron groundwater plume is expected to remain stabilized between the facility and Breakneck Creek, which is located approximately 500-700 feet downgradient and east of the facility. (Concast Assessment Document, May 2001). Refer to migration of contaminated groundwater EI determination for additional explanation.

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

**Current Human Exposures Under Control**  
**Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA725)**

Page 4

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)?

----- 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): \_\_\_\_\_

<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.

**Current Human Exposures Under Control**  
**Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA725)**

Page 5

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 and 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): \_\_\_\_\_

**Current Human Exposures Under Control  
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA725)**

Page 6

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):

**YE** - Yes, "Current Human Exposures Under Control" has been verified. Based on a review of the information contained in this EI Determination, "Current Human Exposures" are expected to be "Under Control" at the **Concast Metal Products Company (Roessing Bronze Company)** facility, EPA ID # **PAD 00 076 5651**, located at **134 Myoma Road, Mars, Pennsylvania** under current and reasonably expected conditions. This determination will be re-evaluated when the Agency/State becomes aware of significant changes at the facility.

**NO** - "Current Human Exposures" are NOT "Under Control."

**IN** - More information is needed to make a determination.

Completed by (signature) \_\_\_\_\_ Date 06-17-01  
(print) Khai M. Dao \_\_\_\_\_  
(title) Remedial Project Manager \_\_\_\_\_

Supervisor (signature) \_\_\_\_\_ Date 06-21-01  
(print) Paul Gotthold \_\_\_\_\_  
(title) PA. Operations Branch Chief \_\_\_\_\_  
(EPA Region or State) EPA, Region 3 \_\_\_\_\_

Locations where References may be found:

PADEP  
Waste Management Program  
230 Chestnut Street  
Meadville, PA 16335

US EPA  
Region III  
Waste and Chemical Mgmt. Division  
1650 Arch Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Contact telephone number and e-mail:

PADEP Contact:  
Sigma Toth  
814-332-6843  
toth.sigma@state.pa.us

EPA Contact  
Khai M. Dao  
(215) 814-5467  
dao.khai@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.**