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: Union Carbide Corporation - Seadrift
Facility Address: Port Lavaca, Texas
Facility EPA ID #: TXD041515420

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?

   ✓ 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 E1 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 E1 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 release subject to RCRA Corrective Actions (from SWMUs, RUs or AOCs)?

	Yes	No	?	Rationale/Key Contaminants
Groundwater		✓		See References listed in Attachment A
Air (indoors) [2]		✓		See References listed in Attachment A
Surface Soil (e.g., <2 ft)		✓		See References listed in Attachment A
Surface Water		✓		See References listed in Attachment A
Sediment		✓		See References listed in Attachment A
Subsurface. Soil (e.g., > 2 ft)		✓		See References listed in Attachment A
Air (outdoors)		✓		See References listed in Attachment A

__✓__ 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 Union Carbide - Seadrift plant is an active petrochemical plant for the production of organic chemicals and polyolefins. It operates under SIC codes 2869 and 2821. The Union Carbide - Seadrift plant uses a TNRCC endorsed focused approach for remedial activities. The focused approach prioritizes SWMU's and AOC's based on potential risk to human health and the environment. The focused approach also divides the plant into geographical areas as well.

Task I Plant wide ground water (complete)
Task II - Central Plant
Task III - Wastewater transfer ditch and Barge Dock
Task IV - West Field Area
Task V - North Landfill Area
Task VI - Follow up Ground Water monitoring from low priority SWMU's

Substantial remedial activities have been done to date. These have been documented through many reports to the TNRCC - Corrective Action Section as indicated in Attachment A. Current ground water monitoring activities indicate no contamination is leaving the plant site.

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.

____ 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 (CA 725), 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):

_✓_ 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 Union Carbide Corporation- Seadrift facility, EPA ID # TXD041515420, located at HWY. 185, North Seadrift, Texas, 77983 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) Brian Habeck Date 12-17-99

(print) Brian Habeck

(title) Technical Staff

Supervisor (signature) *Authority delegated from plant manager to position held by Brian Habeck. Letter previously submitted to TNRCC*

Date

(print)

(title)

(EPA Region or State)

Locations where References may be found:

Seadrift Plant, TNRCC Central Records Office - Austin, and TNRCC - Regional Office.
See attached Table of Reference Documents in Attachment A. A map of the facility is contained in Attachment B.

Contact telephone number and e-mail

(name) Brian Habeck
Technical Staff
Union Carbide Corporation
P. O. Box 186
Port Lavaca, TX 77979
(phone #) (361) - 553 - 2922
(e-mail) habeckbd@ucarb.com

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 Union Carbide Corporation SeaDrift facility, EPA ID #TXD041515420, SWRN 30129, located in Port Lavaca, TX 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." Doc 7014 Rec'd 2901

___ IN - More information is needed to make a determination.
(1) **Incomplete information**
(2) **Reports in house, yet to be reviewed**
(3) **Unfamiliar site**

For "NO" or "IN" determination, expected date of "YE" determination _____

Completed by (signature) Maureen Hatfield Date 01/13/2000
(print) Maureen Hatfield
(title) Project Manager

Supervisor (signature) Cathy Kemmert Date Jan 24, 2000
(print) Cathy Kemmert
(title) Supervisor
(EPA Region or State) TNRCC

Locations where References may be found:

If "YE" Code is assigned then attach a copy of database, highlight the reports which support "YE"determination.
See attached

Contact telephone and e-mail numbers

(name) Mr. Brian Habeck - Union Carbide Corp.
(phone #) 361-553-2922
(e-mail) habeckb@ucarb.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., SITE-SPECIFIC) ASSESSMENTS OF RISK.

YE based on review of company's self-evaluation & documentation (list attached to 750 checklist)