DOCUMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR DETERMINATION

Interim Final 2003

RCRA Corrective Action
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA725)

Current Human Exposures Under Control

Facility Name: Sasol North America, Inc (Formerly CONDEA Vista Co)
Facility Address: 2201 Old Spanish Trail, Westlake LA 70669
Facility EPA ID #: LAR 000041087 (formerly LAD 086478047) AI # 3271

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			**EDC, TCA, metals>MCL and RECAP criteria**
Air (indoors)[2]		X		**No problems, not expected with site data**
Surface Soil (e.g., <2 ft	X			**EDC, TCA, metals>MCL and RECAP criteria**
Surface Water		X		**Surface Waters not contaminateed**
Sediment		X		**Sediment samples <RECAP standards**
Subsurf. Soil (e.g., >2 ft)	X			**EDC, TCA, metals >MCL and RECAP criteria**
Air (outdoors)		X		**No contaminants known to be in outdoor air from releases subject to RCRA Corrective Action**

_____ 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): Numerous documents reporting the results of site-wide contaminant investigations have been prepared and submitted to appropriate regulatory agencies. Attachment 3 is a listing of the relevant ones prepared prior to December 1996. Since that time the following documents have been prepared: Hydrogeologic Report, CH2MHILL, 1996; Rate and Extent Report, CH2MHILL, 1996; Task 9 Deliverables Report, CH2MHILL, 1998; Draft Phase I RFI Report, CH2MHILL, 1999; Updated Contaminant Distribution and Stratigraphic Setting, CH2MHILL, 2002; RFI Phase I Report, CH2MHILL, 2003; RFI Phase I Report – Final, CH2MHILL, 2003. Additionally, Quarterly and Annual Groundwater Monitoring Reports are routinely submitted to the LDEQ.

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	no	yes	no	yes			no
Air (indoors)	X	X	X				
Soil (surface, e.g., <2 ft)	no	yes	no	yes	no	no	no
Surface Water	no	no			no	no	no
Sediment	no	no			no	no	no
Soil (subsurface e.g., >2 ft)				yes			no
Air (outdoors)	X	X	X	X	X		

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).

__X__ 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): For all "yes" answers in the above table, the only "potentially completed" exposure pathways, as discussed in #2 above, at the LCCC involve site workers/contractors during construction, excavation, or maintenance/monitoring activities associated with the groundwater/RFI monitoring , investigation and remediation programs. However, these individuals are trained personnel and OSHA guidelines are followed and monitored during work in these infrequent conditions. References are the same as listed for question Number 2 on page 2. Past site work has shown groundwater to be "contaminated", but no individual(s) has been identified as using the groundwater from within the known areas of contamination. No day-care, recreation or food pathways are known or expected. The facility is fenced and signs posted to deter trespassers.

[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)?

__X__ 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): No human health risk assessment has yet been completed for this site. However, all known contaminants and concentrations, when combined with the site geologic, hydrogeologic and overall physical setting, strongly indicate that exposure due to "contamination subject to RCRA corrective action" at this facility "can not be reasonably expected to be significant". For all "yes" answers in the above table, the only "potentially completed" exposure pathways, as discussed in #2 above, at the LCCC involve site workers/contractors during construction, excavation, or maintenance/monitoring activities associated with the groundwater/RFI monitoring , investigation and remediation programs. However, these individuals are trained personnel and OSHA guidelines are followed and monitored during work in these infrequent conditions. References are the same as listed for question Number 2 on page 2. Past site work has shown groundwater to be "contaminated", but no individual(s) has been identified as using the groundwater from within the known areas of contamination. No day-care, recreation or food pathways are known or expected. The facility is fenced and signs posted to deter trespassers.

[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 _____ _____ facility, EPA ID #_____, located at _____ 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 Ellen Broussard Date 3/31/03
Ellen Broussard
Geologist 3

Supervisor Lewis A. Donlon Date 3/31/03
Lewis A. Donlon
Supervisor
Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality

Locations where References may be found:

Louisiana Dept of Environmental Quality, Baton, Rouge, LA
Sasol North America, Inc., Westlake, LA

Contact telephone and e-mail numbers

(name) Ellen Broussard
(phone #) (337) 491-2667
(e-mail) ellenb@deq.state.la.us

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.