CHER

JYNAMAC

Environmental Services

Peachtree Center Tower 230 Peachtree Street, N.W. Suite 500 Atlanta, GA 30303

Telephone: 404-681-0933 Fax: 404-681-0894

August 7, 1992."

Mr. A. R. Hanke, Chief Site Assessment Section U.S. EPA, Region IV 345 Courtland Street, N.E. Atlanta, Georgia 30365

w 9 3 / 1 0 199 aug 4.24

 Re: Work Assignment No. C04119 - Task 5 - Site Inspection Prioritization (SIP) Report -Dickson County Landfill, Dickson, Dickson County, Tennessee
 EPA ID No. TND981467673
 WasteLan No. 4205
 Document Control No. C04119-SIP-LC-096

Dear Al:

Enclosed please find the Site Inspection Prioritization (SIP) Report for the Dickson County Landfill in Dickson, Dickson County, Tennessee. This report has been developed to fulfill the requirements for Task 5 of the TES VIII Work Assignment No. C04119. This submittal also includes site maps, supporting reference materials and a CERCLA Eligibility Form.

If you have any questions, please contact us at (404) 681-0933.

Sincercly,

DYNAMAC CORPORATION

Charlotte M. Boulind

Site Manager

Enclosures

L. Rusher Regional Manager

.

cc: Ken Meyer, EPA Region IV Project Officer (w/o enclosures) Dennis Escher, Dynamac TES Program Manager (w/o references) Deborah Vaughn-Wright, EPA Region IV Work Assignment Manager Katharine Siders Franklin, Dynamac Work Assignment Manager (w/c references) TES WA File

5EA 7 Can 1/2:/93

TES VIII WORK ASSIGNMENT NO. C04119 SITE INSPECTION PRIORITIZATION DICKSON COUNTY LANDFILL DICKSON, DICKSON COUNTY, TENNESSEE EPA ID NO. TND981467673 WASTELAN NO. 4205

EPA REGION:	IV
CONTRACT NO.:	68-W9-0005; TES VIII
EPA WAM:	DEBORAH VAUGHN-WRIGHT
TELEPHONE NO.:	(404) 347-5065
DYNÁMAC WAM:	KATHARINE SIDERS FRANKLIN
TELEPHONE NO .:	(404) 681-0933

DOCUMENT CONTROL NO. CO4119-SIP-LC-096

Submitted to

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION IV

by

DYNAMAC CORPORATION

August 7, 1992

CONFIDENTIAL

TES VIII WORK ASSIGNMENT NO. C04119 SITE INSPECTION PRIORITIZATION DICKSON COUNTY LANDFILL DICKSON, DICKSON COUNTY, TENNESSEE EPA ID NO. TND981467673 WASTELAN NO. 4205

Pathways evaluated using the SI Worksheets were air, soil exposure, surface water and groundwater. The following scores reflect a waste quantity value of 100. The actual quantity of hazardous waste present at the landfill is unknown. There is evidence to suggest that the eastern and western halves of the landfill have received hazardous wastes. Therefore, the waste quantity value was determined based on the acreage of the working area of both halves. This was calculated by subtracting the estimated 28 acres of the extention which will not be filled from the total area of the landfill, which is approximately 74 acres. However, the waste quantity score would not increase if the entire property is considered. The overall site score in Scenario I is limited by a low waste quantity value, a low Level I population value for the groundwater pathway and the lack of observed release to a perennial surface water body.

Scenario I

Hazardous Waste Quantity value of 100

Level I observed release of TCE to a drinking water well

 $S_{rw} = 29.65$ 344 $S_{rw} = 7.68$ $S_{re} = 2.96$ $S_{sir} = 1.52$

OVERALL SCORE 15.40

In order to support the score presented in Scenario I, further investigation of the types of wastes that were disposed in the landfill, and the depth of the monitoring well where the background sample was collected is needed. Sampling results from the SI indicated that a drinking water well is contaminated with TCE. However, TCE was not found in any surficial or subsurface soil samples. According to the former superintendent of the landfill, waste solvents used to degrease automotive parts from Shraders Automotive Group were disposed of at the landfill. Shraders Automotive Group did dispose of trichloroethylene waste offsite but documentation stating that trichlorethylene waste was disposed of at the landfill could not be found. It is not clear whether the monitoring well where the background sample was collected and the contaminated well were completed in the same aquifer. If they were not completed in the same aquifer, a sampling comparison will not be valid.

CONFIDENTIAL

TES VIII WORK ASSIGNMENT NO. C04119 SITE INSPECTION PRIORITIZATION DICKSON COUNTY LANDFILL DICKSON, DICKSON COUNTY, TENNESSEE EPA ID NO. TND981467673 WASTELAN NO. 4205 (CONCLUDED)

If both wells were completed in the same aquifer and Shraders Automotive Group did dispose of teichloroethylene waste at the landfill, the contamination of the drinking water well can be attributable the landfill. However, even if a Level I observed release to a drinking water well can be documented, the overall site score is below the cutoff score of 28.5 because of the limited number of people utilizing the well for drinking water.

Scenario II

- Hazardous Waste Quantity value of 100
- Level II observed release of manganese to a fishery

BioAcc. FAILS MN - .5 - Score NOT VALID = 29,65 2.96 -1.52 LC 1/13 OVERALL SCORE STA

In order to support the score presented in Scenario II, further investigation of the drainage area at the southern end of the landfill is required. During the SI, chlordane was detected in a sample collected from this area. Chlordane was also detected in a subsurface soil sample and a leachate sample collected at the landfill. However, since the available file material did not contain any information about the area and it is not depicted on the topographic map, the perennial or nonperennial status of the drainage area is not known. According to SI personnel, this area represents a perennial creek which flows into Baker Branch. However, all attempts that were made to determine if the "creek" is harvested for human consumption were unsuccessful. Therefore, a site reconnaissance, which would determine whether the "creek" is perennial and harvested for human consumption, is recommended. The validity of Scenario II can then be determined based on evaluation of this information.

Scenario I & II

Site Name: Location:

.

Dickson County Landfill Dickson, Dickson County, Tennessee

GROUND WATER MIGRATION PATHWAY SCORESHEET

Factor Categories and Factors

	Likelihood of Release to an Aquifer	<u>Maximum Value</u>	Value Assigned
1.	Observed Release	550	550
2.	Potential to Release	,	
`	2a. Containment	10	-
	2b. Net Precipitation	10	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••
	2c. Depth to Aquifer	5	
	2d. Travel Time	. 35	-
	2e. Potential to Release		
	[lines $2a \times (2b + 2c + 2d)$]	500	. -
3.	Likelihood of Release (higher of		
	lines 1 and 2e)	550	550
	Waste Characteristics	n.	
4.	Toxicity/Mobility	3	10.000
5.	Hazardous Waste Quantity	() (a	100
6.	Waste Characteristics	- 100	32
	Targets	10,000 SO,000	164431
7.	Nearest Well	50	(1505 50
8.	Population		
	8a. Level I Concentrations x10	b	60
	8b. Level II Concentrations */	b	0
	8c. Potential Contamination x 46	b	
	8d. Population (lines $8a + 8b + 8c$)	b	89 131
9.	Resources	5	0 5
10.	Wellhead Protection Area	20	Q
11.	Targets (lines $7 + 8d + 9 + 10$)	Ъ	139 / \$
	Ground Water Migration Score for an Aquife	E .	
12.	Aquifer Score		_
	[(lines 3 x 6 x 11)/82,500] ^e	100	29.65 3
	Ground Water Migration Pathway Score		
13.	Pathway Score (Sgw), (highest value	1	
	from line 12 for all aquifers		
	evaluated)"	100	29.65

ÚRAFT

Scenario 1

 Site Name:
 Dickson County Landfill

 Location:
 Dickson, Dickson County, Tennessee

SURFACE WATER OVERLAND/FLOOD MIGRATION COMPONENT SCORESHEET

Fac	tor Categories and Factors	Maximum Value	Value Assigned
DR	INKING WATER THREAT		
	Likelihood of Release		
1.	Observed Release	550	550
2.	Potential to Release by		
	Overland Flow		
	2a. Containment	10	
	2b. Runoff	25	
	2c. Distance to Surface Water	25	
	2d. Potential to Release by		
	Overland Flow		
	$(lines 2a \times [2b + 2c])$	500	
3.	Potential to Release by Flood		
	3a. Containment (Flood)	10	
	3b. Flood Frequency	50	
	3c. Potential to Release		
	by Flood (lines 3a x 3b)	500	
4.	Potential to Release		
	(lines $2d + 3c$, subject to		
-	a maximum of 500)	500	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
5.	Likelihood of Release		
	(higher of lines 1 and 4)	550	550
	Waste Characteristics		
6.	Toxicity/Persistence	a	5x10 ⁶
7.	Hazardous Waste Quantity	2	100
δ.	waste Characteristics	100	32
	Targets		
9.	Nearest Intake	50	1
10.	Population		•
	10a. Level I Concentrations	b	0
	10b. Level II Concentrations	Ь	<u>0</u>
	10c. Potential Contamination	b	5
	10d. Population		
	(lines 10a + 10b + 10c)	. b	5
11.	Kesources	5	0
12.	Targets (lines $9 + 10d + 11$)	b'	6

Scenario I

 Site Name:
 Dickson County Landfill

 Location:
 Dickson, Dickson County, Tennessee

.

SU	JRFACE WATER OVERLAND/FLOOD MI	GRATION COMPONEI	NT SCORESHEI	ET, Continued
Fac	tor Categories and Factors	Maximum Value	Value Assig	ned
DR	INKING WATER THREAT (Concluded)	·		
	Drinking Water Threat Score			
13.	Drinking Water Threat Score ([lines 5 x 8 x 12]/82,500, subject to a maximum of 100)	100	· ·	1.28
HU	MAN FOOD CHAIN THREAT		N	
	Likelihood of Release			
14.	Likelihood of Release (same value as line 5)	550		550
	Waste Characteristics			
15. 16. 17.	Toxicity/Persistence/Bioaccumulation Hazardous Waste Quantity Waste Characteristics Targets	a a 1,000	<u>5x10</u> <u>100</u>	320
18. 19. 20.	Food Chain Individual Population 19a. Level I Concentrations 19b. Level II Concentrations 19c. Potential Human Food Chain Contamination 19d. Population (lines 19a + 19b + 19c) Targets	50 b b b	0 0 3 3	
	(lines 18 + 19d) Human Food Chain Threat Score	, b		3
21.	Human Food Chain Threat Score ([lines 14 x 17 x 20]/82,500, subject to a maximum of 100)	100		<u> </u>

Local	tion: <u>Dickson</u> , Dickson County, Tenne	<u>3366</u>		
ŚĒ	RFACE WATER OVERLAND/FLOOD	MIGRATION COMPONEN	IT SCORESHEET	, Concluded
Fac	tor Categories and Factors	Maximum Value	Value Assigne	d
EN	VIRONMENTAL THREAT			
	Likelihood of Release			
22.	Likelihood of Release (same value as line 5)	550		550
EN	VIRONMENTAL THREAT (Concluded)			•
	Waste Characteristics			
23. 24. 25.	Ecosystem Toxicity/Persistence/ Bioaccumulation Hazardous Waste Quantity Waste Characteristics	a a 1.000	<u> </u>	100
	Targets	1,000		100
26.	Sensitive Environments 26a. Level I Concentrations 26b. Level II Concentrations 26c. Potential Contamination 26d. Sensitive Environments	b b b	0 0	
27.	(intes 20a + 200 + 20c) Targets (value from line 26d)	D D	·0	0
	Environmental Threat Score			
28,	Environmental Threat Score ([lines $22 \times 25 \times 27$]/ $82,500$, subject to a maximum of 60)	60		0
SUR	RFACE WATER OVERLAND/FLOOD M	IGRATION COMPONEN	T SCORE FOR A	WATERSHED
29,	Watershed Score ^e (lines $13 + 21 + 28$, subject to a maximum of 100)	100		<u></u>
SUI	RFACE WATER OVERLAND/FLOOD N	AIGRATION COMPONE	NT SCORE	
30.	Component Score $(S_{of})^{c}$ (highest score from line 29 for all watersheds evaluated, subject to a maximum of 100)	100		7,68

Site Name:

Dickson County Landfill

Site Name:Dickson County LandfillLocation:Dickson, Dickson County, Tennessee

Scenario II

SURFACE WATER OVERLAND/FLOOD MIGRATION COMPONENT SCORESHEET

Fact	or Categories and Factors	Maximum Value	Value Assigned
DR	INKING WATER THREAT		
	Likelihood of Release		
1.	Observed Release	550	550
2.	Potential to Release by	•	
	Overland Flow	·	
	2a. Containment	10	
	2b. Runoff	25	
	2c. Distance to Surface Water	25	
	2d. Potential to Release by		
	Overland Flow		
	$(lines 2a \times [2b + 2c])$	500	
3.	Potential to Release by Flood		
	3a. Containment (Flood)	10	
	35. Flood Frequency	50	
	Sc. Potential to Kelease	500	
	Dy Flood (lines 3a x 30)	500	• ·
4.	Potential to Kelease		,
	(1 mes 20 + 3 c, subject to)	500	
5	a maximum of Sooj	500	
э.	(higher of lines 1 and 4)	550	550
	(inglier or fines 1 and 4)	000	<u> </u>
	Waste Characteristics		
6.	Toxicity/Persistence	3	5x10 ⁶
7.	Hazardous Waste Quantity	. a	100
8.	Waste Characteristics	100	32
	Targets		
9.	Nearest Intake	50	l
10.	Population		
	10a. Level I Concentrations	b	Q
	10b. Level II Concentrations	b	0
	10c. Potential Contamination	b	5
	10d. Population		
	(lines 10a + 10b + 10c)	Ь.	5
11.	Resources	5	0
12.	Targets (lines $9 + 10d + 11$)	b (6
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

Scenario II

Dickson County Landfill Dickson, Dickson County, Tennessee Site Name: Location:

SU	JRFACE WATER OVERLAND/FLOOD MI	GRATION COMPONE	NT SCORESHEE	T, Continued
Fac	tor Categories and Factors	Maximum Value	Value Assign	ied
DR	INKING WATER THREAT (Concluded)			
	Drinking Water Threat Score			
13.	Drinking Water Threat Score ([lines 5 x 8 x 12]/82,500, subject to a maximum of 100)	100	``.	<u>1,28</u>
HU	MAN FOOD CHAIN THREAT			
	Likelihood of Release			
14.	Likelihood of Release			· ·
	(same value as line 5)	550		550
	Waste Characteristics			
15.	Toxicity/Persistence/Bioaccumulation	2	5x10 ¹⁰	
16.	Hazardous Waste Quantity	a	100	
17.	Waste Characteristics	1,000		320
	Targets			
18.	Food Chain Individual	50	0	
19.	Population			
	19a. Level I Concentrations	Ъ	0	
	19b. Level II Concentrations	Ъ	45	
	19c. Potential Human Food			
	Chain Contamination	b	<u>0</u>	
	190. Population			
20	(1003 198 + 190 + 190)	D	45	
	(lines 18 + 19d)	Ь	·	45
	Human Food Chain Threat Score	~		
21.	Human Food Chain Threat Score			
	([lines 14 x 17 x 20]/82,500,	. .		
	subject to a maximum of 100)	100		6,40
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

Maximum value applies to waste characteristics category.
Maximum value not applicable.
Do not round to nearest integer.

PRAFT

Dickson County Landfill Dickson, Dickson County, Tennessee Site Name: Location:

Scenario II

ડા	JRFACE WATER OVERLAND/FLOOD	MIGRATION COMPONEI	NT SCORESHEET, Cond	uded
Fac	tor Categories and Factors	Maximum Value	Value Assigned	
EN	VIRONMENTAL THREAT (Concluded))		
	Likelihood of Release			
22.	Likelihood of Release		· ·	
	(same value as line 5)	550	<u>.550</u>	
	Waste Characteristics			
23.	Ecosystem Toxicity/Persistence/	-	5-101	
24	Bioaccumuration	a	<u>>x10-</u>	
24.	mazardous waste Quantity	a	100	
25.	Waste Characteristics	1,000		100
	Targets		те	
26.	Sensitive Environments			
	26a Level I Concentrations	h	0	
	26b Level II Concentrations		<u> </u>	
	260. Detential Contamination	0 5	0	
	26d. Sensitive Environmente	b	0	
	200. Sensitive Environments		-	
	$(1000 \pm 200 \pm 200 \pm 200)$	6	0	
27.	Targets	Ь		0
	(value from line 26d)			
	Environmental Threat Score			
28.	Environmental Threat Score			
	(llines 22 x 25 x 27)/82,500.			
	subject to a maximum of 60)	60		Δ
				<u> </u>
Fac	tor Categories and Factors	Maximum Value	Value Assigned	
SU	RFACE WATER OVERLAND/FLOOD N	AIGRATION COMPONEN	T SCORE FOR A WATE	RSHEI
29.	Watershed Score ^c			
•	(lines 13 + 21 + 28)			
	subject to a maximum of 100)	100	Ô	7 64
		100		<u></u>
SU	RFACE WATER OVERLAND/FLOOD	MIGRATION COMPONE	ENT SCORE	
30.	Component Score (S)			
	(highest score from line 29			
	for all watersheds evaluated			
	subject to a maximum of 100)	100		
	Subject to a maximum UL 100)	100	9	1.04

Scenarios I & II

Site Name: Location:

٠

1

Dickson County Landfill Dickson, Dickson County, Tennessee

SOIL EXPOSURE PATHWAY SCORESHEET

Fact	tor Categories and Factors	Maximum Value	Value Assigne	d
RES	SIDENT POPULATION THREAT	• .		
	Likelihood of Exposure			
1.	Likelihood of Exposure	. 550		550
	Waste Characteristics			
2. 3. 4.	Toxicity Hazardous Waste Quantity Waste Characteristics	a a 100	<u> 10,000</u> <u> 100</u>	18
	Targets			
5. 6.	Resident Individual Resident Population	50	0	
	 6a. Level I Concentrations 6b. Level II Concentrations 6c. Resident Population (lines 6a + 6b) 	Ե Ե Ե	Q Q Q	
7. 8. 9.	Workers Resources Terrestrial Sensitive	15 5	<u>5</u> 0	
10.	Environments Targets (lines $5 + 6c + 7 + 8 + 9$)	с Ъ	0	5
	Resident Population Threat Score		4	
11.	Resident Population Threat (lines 1 x 4 x 10/82,500)	b		49,500
NEA	RBY POPULATION THREAT		• •	·
	Likelihood of Exposure			
12. 13. 14.	Attractiveness/Accessibility Area of Contamination Likelihood of Exposure	100 100 500		
	Waste Characteristics	<i>t</i> :-		
15. 16. 17.	Toxicity Hazardous Waste Quantity Waste Characteristics	a a 100		

Site Name: Dickson County Landfill Location: Dickson, Dickson County, Tennessee

SOIL EXPOSURE PATHWAY SCORESHEET, Concluded

Factor Categories and Factors NEARBY POPULATION THREAT (Concluded)		Maximum Value	Value Assigned	
	Targets			
18. 19. 20.	Nearby Individual Population Within 1 Mile Targets (lines 18 + 19)	1 b b		
	Nearby Population Threat Score			
21.	Nearby Population Threat (Default Value: 2 points)	· b	2	
SOI	L EXPOSURE PATHWAY SCORE	•		
22.	Soil Exposure Pathway Score ⁴ (Lines 11 + 21, subject to a maximum of 100)	100	2.96	

- Maximum value applies to waste characteristics category.
 Maximum value not applicable.

^d Do not round to nearest integer.

^o No specific maximum value applies to factor. However, pathway score based solely on sensitive environments is limited to maximum of 60.

Site Name: Location:

Dickson County Landfill Dickson, Dickson County, Tennessee

AIR MIGRATION PATHWAY SCORESHEET

Factor Categories and Factors Likelihood of Release Maximum Value Value Assigned **Observed Release** 550 1. 2. Potential to Release 2a. Gas Potential to Release 500 2b. Particulate Potential to Release 500 2c. Potential to Release (higher of 500 500 lines 2a and 2b) 3. Likelihood of Release (higher of lines 1 and 2c) 550 500 Waste Characteristics 4. Toxicity/Mobility 100 a 5. Hazardous Waste Quantity 100 8 6. Waste Characteristics 100 10 Targets 7. Nearest Individual 50 20 Population 8. 8a. Level I Concentrations 0 b 8b. Level II Concentrations b Q 8c. Potential Contamination b 5 8d. Population (lines 8a + 8b + 8c) b 5 9. Resources 5 0 10. Sensitive Environments 10a. Actual Contamination c 0 10b. Potential Contamination 0 C 10c. Sensitive Environments Q С (lines 10a + 10b) 11. Targets (lines 7 + 8d + 9 + 10c)b 25 Air Migration Pathway Score 12. Pathway Score (S.) $[(lines 3 x 6 x 11)/82,500]^4$ 100 1.52

- . Maximum value applies to waste characteristics category.
- Maximum value not applicable.
- No specific maximum value applies to factor. However, pathway score based solely on sensitive environments is limited to maximum of 60.
- ⁴ Do not round to nearest integer.