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: | Carlisle Syntec, Inc. |
|--------------------|---|
| Facility Address: | 1285 Ritner Highway, Carlisle, PA 17013 |
| Facility EPA ID #: | PAD 069 784 049 |

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).

Are groundwater, soil, surface water, sediments, or air media known or reasonably suspected to be 2. "contaminated"¹ 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> | <u>?</u> | Rationale / Key Contaminants |
|-----------------------------|-----|-----------|----------|------------------------------|
| Groundwater | | х | | see below |
| Air (indoors) ² | | х | | see below |
| Surface Soil (e.g., <2 ft) | | х | | see below |
| Surface Water | | х | | see below |
| Sediment | | х | | see below |
| Subsurf. Soil (e.g., >2 ft) | | х | | see below |
| Air (outdoors) | | х | | see below |

- If no (for all media) skip to #6, and enter "YE," status code after providing or citing Х 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):

Groundwater: The Carlisle Borough Municipal Authority supplies public water to the majority of people living in the area. The nearest residential well is approximately 1,000 feet south-southeast of Plant No. 4. The groundwater migration direction beneath the site is northwest toward Conodoguinet Creek.

On 18 December 1992, a #6 fuel oil tank located in Plant No. 4 overflowed due to automatic valve failure. The contaminated soil was removed and no groundwater was encountered during removal. The maximum depth of soil removal was 14 inches and groundwater table is located far below the surface. All other UST's have been removed or abandoned in place eliminating any sources for groundwater contamination. Neither the presence of groundwater nor stained soils was identified during drilling to bedrock for the removal of the UST's suggesting that groundwater was not contaminated. A natural pathway control exists due to the bedrock being located at a shallow depth and the groundwater table being located far below the surface. The average static water depth lies 43 feet beneath the ground surface.

PADEP found groundwater contamination in the vicinity of the facility, however the source is unknown and Carlisle received a letter from PADEP stating the facility is not responsible.

Air (indoors): The facility has in-place engineering controls and no adverse PADEP investigation comments. This supports a conclusion that no significant air quality issues exist at the site.

Surface soil: On 18 December 1992, a #6 fuel oil tank located in Plant No. 4 overflowed due to automatic valve failure. Approximately 74 tons of contaminated soil was removed and transported offsite for disposal.

Surface water: The facility currently discharges runoff under NPDES permit PAR233522.

Sediment: There has been no reported discharges that have reached or entered Conodoquinet Creek, therefore there is no indication of creek contamination or a need to sample.

Subsurface soil: There has been no reported discharges that have reached a depth >2 feet, therefore there is no indication of contamination or a need to sample.

Air (outdoors): The facility has in-place engineering controls and no adverse PADEP investigation comments. This supports a conclusion that no significant air quality issues exist at the site.

* source: *Environmental Indicator Inspection Report May, 2002* Footnotes:

¹ "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).

² 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.

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)

| "Contaminated" Media | Residents | Workers | Day-Care | Construction | Trespassers | Recreation | Food ³ |
|-------------------------------|-----------|---------|----------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------------|
| Groundwater | | | | | - | | |
| Air (indoors) | | | | | | | |
| Soil (surface, e.g., <2 ft) | | | | | | | |
| Surface Water | | | | | | | |
| Sediment | | | | | | | |
| Soil (subsurface e.g., >2 ft) | | | | | | | |
| 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).

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):

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

- 4. Can the **exposures** from any of the complete pathways identified in #3 be reasonably expected to be **"significant"**⁴ (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):

⁴ 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.

- 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):

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):

X 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 __Carlisle Syntec, Inc. __facility, EPA ID # _PAD 069 784 049 __, located at __1285 Ritner Highway, Carlisle, PA 17013 __ 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.

| (signature) | /s/ | Date <u>3/31/04</u> |
|-------------|--|--|
| (print) | Kevin Bilash | |
| (title) | RCRA Project Manager | |
| | | |
| (signature) | /s/ | Date <u>4/20/04</u> |
| (print) | Paul Gotthold | |
| (title) | Chief, PA Operations | |
| | (signature) (print) (title) (signature) (print) (title) | (signature) /s/ (print) Kevin Bilash (title) RCRA Project Manager (signature) /s/ (print) Paul Gotthold (title) Chief, PA Operations |

Locations where References may be found:

RCRA File Room - 11th Floor EPA Region III 1650 Arch Street Philadelphia, PA 19103-2029

Contact telephone and e-mail numbers:

| (name) | Kevin Bilash |
|-----------|----------------------|
| (phone #) | 215-814-2796 |
| (e-mail) | bilash.kevin@epa.gov |

(EPA Region or State) EPA Region III

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.