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 N	ame: Sperry Marine
	Facility A	ddress: 1070 Seminole Trail, Charlottesville, VA
	Facility El	PA ID #: VAD003123833
1.	groundwater, St	le relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to soil, urface water/sediments, and air, subject to RCRA Corrective Action (e.g., from Solid Waste nits (SWMU), Regulated Units (RU), and Areas of Concern (AOC)), been considered in this EI
	<u>X</u>	If yes - check here and continue with #2 below.
	A000000	If no - re-evaluate existing data, or
		If data are not available skip to #6 and enter "IN" (more information needed) status code.

BACKGROUND

Facility Name:

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" El 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., sitewide)).

Relationship of EI to Final Remedies

While Final remedies remain the long-term objective of the RCRA Corrective Action program the EI are nearterm 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" El 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" 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	NO_	?	Rationale / Key Contaminants			
Groundwater		X			Chlorinated solvents greater than MCLs			
Air (indoors) ²			$\frac{X}{X}$		See vapor intrusion EI			
Surface Soil (e.g., <2 ft)			X		All less than direct contact valves for non residential soil			
Surface Water		X			Chlorinated solvents greater than MCLs			
Sediment			X		All less than direct contact values for non-residential soil			
Subsurf. Soil (e.g., >2 ft)		X			Chlorinated solvents greater than direct contact valves for non- residential soil and leach to groundwater pathway valves			
Air (outdoors)			X		N/A			
If no (for all media) - skip to #6, and enter "YE," status code after providing or citin 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):								
Groundwar	Groundwater: Tetrachloroethene up to 260 ug/L (V Trichloroethene up to 2,600 ug/L (W							
					L (W-15), MCL=70 ug/L			
*								
	Note:	deed restr	ictions pr	onibiting g	roundwater use are in place.			
	Surface Water: Trichloroethene up to 65 ug/L in North Stream, MCL=5 ug/L Tetrachloroethene up to 51 ug/L in North Stream, MCL=5 ug/L							
Subsurface	Subsurface Soil: Trichloroethene up to 1,200 ug/kg in Boring B-7 (Feb 1987)							
	VRP Tier III=73 ug/kg, USEPA Region 3 RBC							
(direct contact) = 7,200 ug/kg								
Tetrachloroethene up to 6,200 ug/kg in Boring B-15 (Sept 1987)								
	JSEPA Region 3 RBC							
		(direct c	ontact) =	5,300 ug/k	g			

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) suggests 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

Potential Human Receptors (Under Current Conditions)

Contaminated Medi	<u>a</u> R	esidents	Workers	Day-Care	Construction	Trespassers	Recreation	Food ³
Groundwater	-	No	No	No				No
Air (indoors)								
Surface Soil (e.g., <2	-ft)							
Surface Water	~~~~~	No	Yes			No	No	No
Sediment								
Soil (subsurface e.g.,	>2 ft)				Yes			
Air (outdoors)	***************************************							
Instruct	ions for Sum	ımary Exp	osure Pathwa	y Evaluation T	「able:			
1.	Strike-out "contamina	specific ited") as id	Media included in #2	ding Human 2 above.	Receptors' space	es for Media	which are not	
2.	enter "yes"	or "no"			s" under each "C	Contaminated" I	Media Human	
	necessary.	or oc proc	aoie in most	situations they	not have check may be possible	in some setting	gs and should be	
	whether n	atural or i	man-made, pro	le, aπer expla eventing a com	aminated media- ining and/or ref aplete exposure pa Work Sheet to ar	erencing condi	tion(s) in-place,	
<u>X</u>	If yes (pat continue a	thways are after provi	e complete for ding supportin	r any "Contam ng explanation	inated" Media - F	łuman Receptor	combination) -	
	If unknow enter "IN"	vn (for an	y "Contamina de	ited" Media -	Human Receptor	combination) -	skip to #6 and	
Rationale There are	and Referer	nce(s):	lace prohibitin	o groundwata	use. Security sy			
indicated concentra	that any vap	or intrusion s than risk ace water a	on does not po based screen	ling for indoor ose an unaccep ing values for	air was conducte table risk to huma non-residential la is expected to be	d (see RFI Wor in health. Surfa	kplan) and ce soil	

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" (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)?					
	<u>X</u>	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."				
	<u> </u>	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				
	site opera S&ME (Stream w	te security measures that are in place, and the remote location of the North Stream relative to the ations, exposure frequency is expected to be low. A site-specific risk assessment completed by 1996) indicated potential risks associated with exposure to surface water and sediment in the North were less than USEPA's target risk levels. It also indicated that potential construction worker to subsurface soil is within USEPA acceptable risk range.				
		·				

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.

*Additional and a second	If yes (all "significant" exposures have been shown to be within acceptable limits) - continuand enter "YE" after summarizing and referencing documentation justifying why al "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

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):							
	the inf be "Ui 1070 : This d	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 <u>Sperry Marine</u> facility, EPA ID # <u>VAD003123833</u> , located at 1070 Seminole Trail, Charlottesville, VA 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) (print) (title)	Barbara Smith EPA Project Manager	Date 7/01/08				
	Supervisor	(signature) (print) (title) (EPA Region	Robert Greaves Chief, RCRA Operations Branch on or State) EPA-III	Date 7-15-08	<u> </u>			
	Locations where F		y be found: project record files					
	Contact telephone	and e-mail nu	mbers:					
	(nam (pho (e-m	ne #)	Robert M. Glazier 410-381-4333 rglazier@geosyntec.com					

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., SITESPECIFIC) ASSESSMENTS OF RISK.