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:	Koppers/Beazer- Monroeville (now PPG Research)
Facility Address:	College Park Drive, Monroeville, PA
Facility EPA ID #:	PAD082245754

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		
Air (indoors) [2]		x		
Surface Soil (e.g., <2 ft)	x			poly aromatic hydrocarbons
Surface Water		x		
Sediment		x		
Subsurf. Soil (e.g., >2 ft)	x			poly aromatic hydrocarbons
Air (outdoors)		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.

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):

PPG Industries, Inc. owns and operates a research facility in Monroeville, PA (the Facility). PPG purchased this facility in 1988 from Koppers, Inc n/k/a Beazer East, Inc. (Beazer). As a condition of the sale, Beazer retained pre-closing environmental liabilities. Of particular interest, Beazer retained the obligation to address RCRA corrective action as a consequence of a RCRA- permitted storage area operated by Koppers at the time of the sale in 1988.

Under the corrective action program, the Monroeville Facility was evaluated through two EPA programs -
RCRA Facility Assessment (RFA) program in 1984 and the CERCLA Environmental Priorities Initiative (EPI) in 1990. In addition, EPA visited the site in June 2002.

As a result of the 2002 visit and meeting, Beazer agreed to sample soil and groundwater in the vicinity of an area known as the "Former Waste Stabilization Pad" to determine if any environmental impacts remained. All other Solid Waste Management Units identified by Koppers and Epa have been either certified closed through PADEP or found to have no lasting environmental impact by EPA analysis.

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 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.

_X_ 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): See the sampling report prepared by Key Environmental (April 2003). This report shows that PAH contamination is present in the vicinity of the waste stabilization pad, but all levels detected are within either the EPA "risk-based concentrations or the PADEP State-wide health concentrations for non-residential soil. See attached table for actual results.

[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 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 former Koppers (Monroeville) facility, located at College Park Drive, Monroeville, 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 6/10/03
	(print)	Paul J. Gotthold	
	(title)	Chief, PA Operations	
Supervisor	(signature)	/s/	Date 6/10/03
	(print)	Maria Parisi Vickers	
	(title)	Deputy Director, WCMD	
	(EPA Region or State)		

Locations where References may be found:

References are held at EPA Region III in the file for "Kpooers- Monroeville Research Center"

Contact telephone and e-mail numbers:

(name)	Paul Gotthold
(phone #)	215-814-3410
(e-mail)	gotthold.paul@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.

Koppers Monroeville (PPG) Soil Sampling Results – Surface soil					
Compound	Result mg/kg	EPA res soil	EPA non-res soil	EPA soil to groundwater	Act 2 state-wide health-res
Anthracene	0.67	23,000	31,000	23-470	66,000
Chrysene	1.5	87	390	7.3-150	2,500
Fluoranthene	4.0	3,100	41,000	310-6,300	8,800
Dibenzofuran	1.0	160	2,000	0.19-3.8	220*
Phenanthrene	2.3	66,000	66,000	110-10,000	66,000
Indo(1,2,3-CD) Pyrene	1.0	0.87	3.9	0.64-13	25
Pyrene	2.8	2,300	31,000	34-680	6,600
Benzo(A) Anthracene	1.5	0.87	3.9	0.073-1.5	25
Benzo(k)Fluoran	1.1	8.7	39	2.3-45	250
Benzo(A)Pyrene	1.4	0.087	0.39	0.019-0.37	2.5

*number is for Furans