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: Jamestown Paint Company

Facility Address: 108 Main Street, Jamestown, PA 16134

Facility EPA ID #: PAD 00 432 3788

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).

Page 2

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)?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	?	Rationale / Key Contaminants
Groundwater		_X		Refer to References (1) and (2) below
Air (indoors) ²		_X		No indoor air pathway associated with SWMU
Surface Soil (e.g., <2 ft)		_X		Refer to Reference (3) below
Surface Water		_X_		Nearby Shenango River is for recreational use in the
				site vicinity
Sediment		_X		Nearby Shenango River is for recreational use in the
				site vicinity
Subsurf. Soil (e.g., >2 ft)	_X		Refer to References (1), (2) and (3)
Air (outdoors)		_X_		See below; section d.
appro that th If yes "conta detern	priate "level lese "level (for any m aminated"	els," and s" are no dedia) - comedium, at the me	referent exceed to exceed to exceed to the exceed to the exceed to the exceed to the exceeding to the exceed	and enter "YE," status code after providing or citing noting sufficient supporting documentation demonstrating eded. after identifying key contaminants in each appropriate "levels" (or provide an explanation for the could pose an unacceptable risk), and referencing
If unk	nown (for	any medi	a) - sk	ip to #6 and enter "IN" status code.

Rationale and Reference(s): (1) Jamestown Paint Company letter of October 4, 1994 to PADEP; Re: Jamestown Paint Company Remedial Action Status Report; (2) Jamestown Paint Company letter of January 13, 1997 to PADEP; Re: Post-Remedial Monitoring; and, (3) PADEP letter of September 5, 1997 to Jamestown paint Company; Re: Storage Tank/NFA.

a. No known or reasonably suspected surface water and suspected sediment impact above risk based from SWMU.
b. The facility has one outfall that does not require testing. Though, due to its location on the small stream/highway drainage ditch, facility personnel check it frequently. There are no floor drains in any of the buildings, the buildings themselves act as secondary containment features.
c. The closest surface water intake is located in Sharpesville, along Shenango River, approximately 11 miles downstream of the site.
d. The facility has applied a permit as a natural minor because they produce less than 50 tons of VOCs annually.

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).

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

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

"Contaminated" Me	edia Re	sidents	Workers	Day-Care	Construction	n 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 Sum	mary Expo	sure Pat	thway Ev	aluation Ta	<u>ble</u> :			
1. Strike-o	ut specific	Media i	ncluding	Human Re	ceptors' space	es for Media w	hich are not	
"contamina	ted") as ide	entified	in #2 abo	ve.				
2. enter "v	es" or "no"	for pot	ential "co	mpletenes	s" under each	"Contaminate	ed" Media	Human
Receptor co		-		r				
Note: In order to foc	us the eval	luation t	o the mo	st probable	combinations	s some potenti	ial "Contami	nated"
Media - Human Rec				-		_		
combinations may n								
added as necessary.					, ,		C	
If	no (pathwa	avs are n	ot compl	ete for anv	contaminated	media-recept	or combinati	on) - skip
	-	-	-	-		or referencin		_
						plete exposure	•	
-		nated medium (e.g., use optional <u>Pathway Evaluation Work Sheet</u> to analyze						
	najor pathways).							
If	yes (pathw	ays are	complete	for any "C	ontaminated'	' Media - Hum	an Receptor	
	-	-	_	-	supporting ex		•	
If	unknown (for any	"Contami	nated" Me	dia - Human I	Receptor comb	oination) - sk	ip to #6
	d enter "IN	-				•	ŕ	•
Rationale and								
Reference(s):								
3 Indianat Dathway/D	acenter (c	~ ***	tables fu	uita amama	most and dai	d4.	_11_11£: _1	-4- \

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

Page 4

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)?						
		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.

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
Rationale and Reference(s):	

Page 6

6.	Check the appropriate RCRIS status codes for the Current Human Exposures Under Control El 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 Jamestown Paint Company facility, EPA ID # PAD 00 432 3788, located at 108 Main Street, Jamestown, PA 16134 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) /Hon Lee (print) Hon Lee (title) Remedial Project Manager	ate: <u>07-12-02</u>				
Supervisor	(signature) /Paul Gotthold Da (print) Paul Gotthold (title) PA Operations Branch Chief (EPA Region or State) EPA, Region 3	ate: <u>07-15-02</u>				

Locations where References may be found:

- (1) PADEP Northwest Regional Office, 230 Chestnut Street, Meadville, PA 16335; and,
- (2) US EPA Region 3, 3WC22, 1650 Arch Street, PA 19103.

Contact telephone and e-mail numbers:

(name) Hon Lee (phone #) 215-814-3419 (e-mail) lee.hon@epa.gov

FINAL NOTE: THE HUMAN EXPOSURES ELIS 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.