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:	Lancaster Metals Science Corp.
Facility Address:	826 North Queen Street, Lancaster, PA
Facility EPA ID #:	PAD980919005

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).

2. Are groundwater, soil, surface water, sediments, or air **media** known or reasonably suspected to be **"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	No	?	Rationale / Key Contaminants
Groundwater		X		For all media, see Rationale and References below.
Air (indoors)[2]		X		
Surface Soil (e.g., <2 ft)		X		
Surface Water		X		
Sediment		X		
Subsurf. Soil (e.g., >2 ft)		X		
Air (outdoors)		X		

X 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.

___ 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): The ranking of Lancaster Metals (PAD98091905) as a high priority RCRA corrective action facility was based on the reported release of carbon tetrachloride to groundwater. However, an initial review of the file information suggested that this reported release may be in error. In particular, the NCAP ranking form for Lancaster Metals - PAD98091905 indicated the address as East Petersburg, PA, the location of a former Lancaster Metals operation (now known as Fulton Financial) being addressed by a RCRA corrective action order, rather than 826 Queen St. in Lancaster, PA. In addition, the owner/operators of the Lancaster Metals facility in Lancaster indicated to EPA that neither carbon tetrachloride nor other chlorinated solvents such as TCE had ever been used at the Queen Street location (see EPA memo of 1/23/02 regarding EPA site visit on January 10, 2002). A review of all available EPA and PA file information and an EPA site visit were subsequently performed to determine whether the reported release of carbon tetrachloride was in error and whether there otherwise may have been a release of hazardous waste or substances above protective levels at the facility.

The Lancaster Metals facility on Queen St. is a photochemical etching facility which has been in operation at that location since March 1984. The facility has been owned and operated by the Ludewig family throughout this period. In 1984, the facility did notify the PA Dept. of Envi. Resources (PADER) of the generation and reuse, recycling and reclamation of F001, F002, F005, F006 and/or non-listed corrosive hazardous wastes at the facility (PA DER Notification of Waste Activity form, 1/10/84). However, a Land Disposal Disposal Restrictions Inspection of the facility in 1987 by an EPA contractor(PRC, 12/14/87) found that while the facility generated hazardous wastes related to the use of methyl ethyl ketone, isopropyl alcohol, ferric chloride, and nitric acid, there was no evidence of past or current use of chlorinated solvents or carbon tetrachloride at the facility. The facility was found to operate a wastewater treatment system and discharged treated industrial wastewater to a sewer which conveyed the wastewater to the city of Lancaster publicly owned treatment works as approved by industrial discharge permit No. 1062. In 1994, the facility reported the generation of spent non-halogenated solvents (F005), wastewater treatment sludges from electroplating operations (F006), corrosive wastes (D002) and chromium toxicity wastes (D007), but no generation of halogenated solvent wastes was reported (see EPA Notification of Regulated Waste Activity (2/23/94)).

Observations from an EPA site visit on January 10, 2002 (EPA Memo, 1/23/02) also found no evidence of the presence or use of halogenated solvents. In addition, there was otherwise no evidence or observations which would suggest a release of any hazardous wastes or substances.

Based on the above, it has been concluded that the report of the carbon tetrachloride release at this facility was in error and that there otherwise is no information which would suggest a potential release of any hazardous wastes or substances above protective levels at the facility.

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? NO

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 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.

_____ 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):

[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.

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):

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 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 Lancaster Metals Science Corp. facility, EPA ID # PAD980919005, located at 826 Queen Street in Lancaster, PA 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)	/s/	Date 8/20/02
	(print)	Darius Ostrauskas	
	(title)	Project Manager	
Supervisor	(signature)	/s/	Date 8/20/02
	(print)	Paul Gotthold	
	(title)	Chief, PA Operations	
	(EPA Region or State)	EPA Region 3	

Locations where References may be found:

U.S.E.P.A. Region III
Waste and Chemicals Management Division
1650 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Contact telephone and e-mail numbers:

(name)	Darius Ostrauskas
(phone #)	215-814-3360
(e-mail)	ostrauskas.darius@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.