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	y Name: y Address: y EPA ID #:	
1.	groundwater, sur	relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to soil, face water/sediments, and air, subject to RCRA Corrective Action (e.g., from Solid Waste ts (SWMU), Regulated Units (RU), and Areas of Concern (AOC)), been considered in tion?
	_	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).

Page 2

Are groundwater, soil, surface water, sediments, or air **media** known or reasonably suspected to be

	Yes	No	<u>?</u>	Rationale / Key Contaminants
Groundwater			_	
Air (indoors) ²				
Surface Soil (e.g.	, <2 ft)			
Surface Water				
Sediment				
Subsurf. Soil (e.g	g., >2			
ft)				
Air (outdoors)				
		vels," an	d referencing	enter "YE," status code after providing or ci sufficient supporting documentation demons
				r identifying key contaminants in each

Rationale and Reference(s):

Footnotes:

2.

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).

²Recent 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.

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

Rationale and Reference(s):

Potential Human Receptors (Under Current Conditions	Potential Hum	ian Receptor	s (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 Sumn	nary Exposur	re Pathway	Evaluation	Table:			
1. Strike-out "contaminate			_	Receptors' space	ces for Media	which are no	t
2. enter "yes Receptor con		-	"completene	ess" under eacl	h "Contamina	ted" Media	- Human
Note: In order to focu Media - Human Recep combinations may not added as necessary.	ptor combina	tions (Path	ways) do no	ot have check s	spaces ("")). While thes	e
skip in-p eacl	to #6, and e lace, whethe	enter "YE" er natural or ed medium	status code, r man-made	ny contaminate after explaining, preventing a ptional <u>Pathwa</u>	ng and/or refe complete exp	rencing condosure pathwa	ition(s) y from
-	•	-	•	'Contaminated g supporting e		man Receptor	r
	nknown (for and enter "IN			/ledia - Human	Receptor cor	nbination) - s	skip to

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

Page 4

"significant" (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
ationale and Re	eference(s):

Ra

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?

⁴ If

Page 5

	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
olo and Da	oference(s);

Rationale and Reference(s):

Page 6

(CA725), and ol	priate RCRIS status codes for the Current Human I btain Supervisor (or appropriate Manager) signature th appropriate supporting documentation as well as	e and date on the EI determination			
	YE - Yes, "Current Human Exposures Under Coreview of the information contained in this EI De Exposures" are expected to be "Under Control" at facility, EPA under current an	etermination, "Current Human			
	determination will be re-evaluated when the Agency/State becomes aware of significant changes at the facility.				
	NO - "Current Human Exposures" are NOT "Un	nder Control."			
	IN - More information is needed to make a det	ermination.			
Completed by	(signature) (print) (title)				
Supervisor	(signature) (print) (title) (EPA Region or State)	Date			
Locations wher	e References may be found:				
Contact telephor	ne and e-mail numbers				
(name (phone (e-mai	e #)				

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.

DOCUMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR DETERMINATION

Interim Final

2/5/99

RCRA Corrective Action Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)

Facility Name: Facility Address: Facility EPA ID #: 1. Has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to the groundwater media, 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? 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 "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" EI

A positive "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" EI determination ("YE" status code) indicates that the migration of "contaminated" groundwater has stabilized, and that monitoring will be conducted to confirm that contaminated groundwater remains within the original "area of contaminated groundwater" (for all groundwater "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 "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" EI pertains ONLY to the physical migration (i.e., further spread) of contaminated ground water and contaminants within groundwater (e.g., non-aqueous phase liquids or NAPLs). Achieving this EI does not substitute for achieving other stabilization or final remedy requirements and expectations associated with sources of contamination and the need to restore, wherever practicable, contaminated groundwater to be suitable for its designated current and future uses.

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).

Page 2

		C
2.	"levels" (i.e., app	known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective plicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, eria) from releases subject to RCRA Corrective Action, anywhere at, or from, the facility?
		If yes - continue after identifying key contaminants, citing appropriate "levels," and referencing supporting documentation.
		If no - skip to #8 and enter "YE" status code, after citing appropriate "levels," and referencing supporting documentation to demonstrate that groundwater is not "contaminated."
		If unknown - skip to #8 and enter "IN" status code.
	Rationale and Re	eference(s):
Foot		

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 appropriate

Page 3

"levels" (appropriate for the protection of the groundwater resource and its beneficial uses).

3.	expected to rema	on of contaminated groundwater stabilized (such that contaminated groundwater is an within "existing area of contaminated groundwater" as defined by the monitoring ated at the time of this determination)?
		If yes - continue, after presenting or referencing the physical evidence (e.g., groundwater sampling/measurement/migration barrier data) and rationale why contaminated groundwater is expected to remain within the (horizontal or vertical) dimensions of the "existing area of groundwater contamination" ²).
		If no (contaminated groundwater is observed or expected to migrate beyond the designated locations defining the "existing area of groundwater contamination" ²) - skip to #8 and enter "NO" status code, after providing an explanation.
		If unknown - skip to #8 and enter "IN" status code.
	Rationale and Re	eference(s):

² "existing area of contaminated groundwater" is an area (with horizontal and vertical dimensions) that has been verifiably demonstrated to contain all relevant groundwater contamination for this determination, and is defined by designated (monitoring) locations proximate to the outer perimeter of "contamination" that can and will be sampled/tested in the future to physically verify that all "contaminated" groundwater remains within this area, and that the further migration of "contaminated" groundwater is not occurring. Reasonable allowances in the proximity of the monitoring locations are

Page 4

permissible to incorporate formal remedy decisions (i.e., including public participation) allowing a limited area for natural attenuation.

1.	Does "contamination	ated" groundwater discharge into surface water bodies?
		If yes - continue after identifying potentially affected surface water bodies.
		If no - skip to #7 (and enter a "YE" status code in #8, if #7 = yes) after providing an explanation and/or referencing documentation supporting that groundwater "contamination" does not enter surface water bodies.
		If unknown - skip to #8 and enter "IN" status code.
	Rationale and Ro	eference(s):

Page 5

5.	maximum conce appropriate grou discharging cont	of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water likely to be " insignificant " (i.e., the entration ³ of each contaminant discharging into surface water is less than 10 times their indwater "level," and there are no other conditions (e.g., the nature, and number, of eaminants, or environmental setting), which significantly increase the potential for pacts to surface water, sediments, or eco-systems at these concentrations)?
		If yes - skip to #7 (and enter "YE" status code in #8 if #7 = yes), after documenting: 1) the maximum known or reasonably suspected concentration ³ of <u>key</u> contaminants discharged above their groundwater "level," the value of the appropriate "level(s)," and if there is evidence that the concentrations are increasing; and 2) provide a statement oprofessional judgement/explanation (or reference documentation) supporting that the discharge of groundwater contaminants into the surface water is not anticipated to have unacceptable impacts to the receiving surface water, sediments, or eco-system.
		If no - (the discharge of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water is potentially significant) - continue after documenting: 1) the maximum known or reasonably suspected concentration ³ of <u>each</u> contaminant discharged above its groundwater "level, the value of the appropriate "level(s)," and if there is evidence that the concentrations are increasing; and 2) for any contaminants discharging into surface water in concentrations ³ greater than 100 times their appropriate groundwater "levels," the estimated total amount (mass in kg/yr) of each of these contaminants that are being discharged (loaded) into the surface water body (at the time of the determination), and identify if there is evidence that the amount of discharging contaminants is increasing.
	Rationale and Re	If unknown - enter "IN" status code in #8. eference(s):

As measured in groundwater prior to entry to the groundwater-surface water/sediment interaction (e.g., hyporheic) zone.

Page 6

6.	Can the discharge of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water be shown to be " currently acceptable " (i.e., not cause impacts to surface water, sediments or eco-systems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented ⁴)?
	If yes - continue after either: 1) identifying the Final Remedy decision incorporating these conditions, or other site-specific criteria (developed for the protection of the site's surface water, sediments, and eco-systems), and referencing supporting documentation demonstrating that these criteria are not exceeded by the discharging groundwater; OR 2) providing or referencing an interim-assessment, ⁵ appropriate to the potential for impact, that shows the discharge of groundwater contaminants into the surface water is (in the opinion of a trained specialists, including ecologist) adequately protective of receiving surface water, sediments, and eco-systems, until such time when a full assessment and final remedy decision can be made. Factors which should be considered in the interim-assessment (where appropriate to help identify the impact associated with discharging groundwater) include: surface water body size, flow, use/classification/habitats and contaminant loading limits, other sources of surface water/sediment contamination, surface water and sediment sample results and comparisons to available and appropriate surface water and sediment "levels," as well a any other factors, such as effects on ecological receptors (e.g., via bio-assays/benthic surveys or site-specific ecological Risk Assessments), that the overseeing regulatory agency would deem appropriate for making the EI determination.
	If no - (the discharge of "contaminated" groundwater can not be shown to be "currently acceptable") - skip to #8 and enter "NO" status code, after documenting the currently unacceptable impacts to the surface water body, sediments, and/or eco-systems.
	If unknown - skip to 8 and enter "IN" status code.
	Rationale and Reference(s):

⁴ Note, because areas of inflowing groundwater can be critical habitats (e.g., nurseries or thermal refugia) for many species, appropriate specialist (e.g., ecologist) should be included in management decisions that could eliminate these areas by significantly altering or reversing groundwater flow pathways near surface water bodies.

⁵ The understanding of the impacts of contaminated groundwater discharges into surface water bodies is a rapidly developing field and reviewers are encouraged to look to the latest guidance for the appropriate methods and scale of demonstration to be reasonably certain that discharges are not causing currently

Page 7

unacceptable impacts to the surface waters, sediments or eco-systems.

7.	necessary) be co	er monitoring / measurement data (and surface water/sediment/ecological data, as llected in the future to verify that contaminated groundwater has remained within the rtical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area of contaminated groundwater?"
		If yes - continue after providing or citing documentation for planned activities or future sampling/measurement events. Specifically identify the well/measurement locations which will be tested in the future to verify the expectation (identified in #3) that groundwater contamination will not be migrating horizontally (or vertically, as necessary) beyond the "existing area of groundwater contamination."
		If no - enter "NO" status code in #8.
		If unknown - enter "IN" status code in #8.
	Rationale and Re	eference(s):

Page 8

	YE - Yes, "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" verified. Based on a review of the information contained in this EI determination, it has been determined that the "Migration of Contamin Groundwater" is "Under Control" at the			
	facility, EPA ID # indicates that the migration of "contaminated" gand that monitoring will be conducted to confir groundwater remains within the "existing area of This determination will be re-evaluated when the significant changes at the facility.	Specifically, this groundwater is un that contaminated got contaminated g	determination der control, ted roundwater"	
	NO - Unacceptable migration of contaminated IN - More information is needed to make a det		bserved or exp	
Completed by	(signature) (print) (title)			
Supervisor	(signature) (print) (title) (EPA Region or State)	Date		
Locations wher	e References may be found:			
Contact telephor	ne and e-mail numbers			