

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
POLLUTION/SITUATION REPORT
Holland Road Dump - Removal Polrep
Initial and Final Removal Polrep



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
Region IV

Subject: POLREP #1
Initial and Final POLREP
Holland Road Dump
B495
Rock Hill, SC
Latitude: 34.9337053 Longitude: -81.1237442

To: Matt Taylor, USEPA R4 ERRB
Shane Hitchcock, USEPA R4 ERRB
Paul Edinger, SCDHEC

From: Matthew Huyser, On Scene Coordinator

Date: 5/28/2010

Reporting Period: 5/24/2010 to 5/25/2010

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Site Number:	B495	Contract Number:	TTEMI-05-001-0127
D.O. Number:		Action Memo Date:	
Response Authority:	CERCLA/OPA	Response Type:	Emergency
Response Lead:	EPA	Incident Category:	Removal Assessment
NPL Status:	Non NPL	Operable Unit:	
Mobilization Date:	5/24/2010	Start Date:	5/24/2010
Demob Date:	5/25/2010	Completion Date:	5/25/2010
CERCLIS ID:		RCRIS ID:	
ERNS No.:		State Notification:	
FPN#:		Reimbursable Account #:	

1.1.1 Incident Category

Emergency Response

1.1.2 Site Description

During the week of May 17, 2010, local law enforcement received information from a previous employee of Seven Star Construction that blasting caps and dynamite had been buried at a dumpsite in the back of the company's property. The York County Sheriff's department excavated several areas based on this information and successfully recovered several blasting caps and sticks of dynamite from the site. Additional information included the claim that several thousand gallons of fuel had been spilled on the site. SCDHEC mobilized to the site and conducted an inspection, then dug two test trenches in the alleged fuel dumping area but found no observable evidence that fuel had actually been dumped. However, SCDHEC did discover two 20,000-gallon USTs that had been placed on the site and spilled several hundred gallons of either a heavy fuel oil or light tar.

The site had been identified several years earlier by York County and SCDHEC as a nonpermitted landfill. A majority of the material dumped at the site is soil, concrete, land-clearing debris (vegetative brush/stumps, etc.), construction & demolition debris, and inoperable vehicles; several batteries and damaged small tanks were found as well. Approximately four monitoring wells had been installed at the eastern edge of the property as a previous requirement by SCDHEC; these wells are sampled semi-annually. SCDHEC reported the recent explosives dumping incident and fuel release to the NRC on 5/20/2010, and then collected three soil samples and one sediment sample for laboratory analysis.

1.1.2.1 Location

The site is located at 1286 Holland Road, Rock Hill, York County, South Carolina. The site is surrounded by residential properties and a new subdivision that is being constructed less than 800 feet from the back of the property.

1.1.2.2 Description of Threat

A majority of the site drains to the east and south where there are two unnamed tributaries at the edge of the property that meet in the southeast corner. The tributary at the southern edge is intermittent and usually dry throughout the year. The tributary at the eastern edge is regularly flowing with water

approximately 3-5 feet wide and 6-12 inches deep. The streams then flow approximately 1.4 miles to Fishing Creek.

The USTs are located on a portion of the site that does not drain to the waterways. Rather, that portion of the site has been unevenly excavated so that rainwater collects and does not drain (capacity of the excavated area exceeds approximately 100,000 gallons before spillage into waterway may occur).

1.1.3 Preliminary Removal Assessment/Removal Site Inspection Results

OSC Huyser, with START, inspected several areas of the site on 5/24 and 5/25. PID/FID field instrumentation that no volatiles could be detected in the two trenches that had been dug in the area where several thousand gallons of fuel had allegedly been dumped. The vehicle shop contained several drums of oil and used oil but did not exceed the 1320 gal limit for SPCC; although there were several abandoned fuel tanks around the site that could have brought the bulk storage limit above 1320 gal, these tanks were significantly damaged and OSC Huyser determined that they could not practically be considered functional for SPCC regulation purposes.

A burn pit that was still smoldering was discovered. Unburned fibers were observed in the pit but it was not determined whether these fibers were asbestos. Several automotive batteries were observed throughout the property (approximately 30-40) many of which were cracked and drained. Small spots of oil were observed in areas where inoperable vehicles had been dragged and two drums of oily waste/rags (approximately 10 gallons total) were observed to be open and abandoned.

In the southwest corner of the dump, a portion of the site drained across a bare area of 1/2-acre where the ground surface was strewn with debris and the soil was unlevel. The drainage path led to a shallow depression where rainwater could collect before draining along the southern border of the site; in the depression was natural forest debris (leaves, etc.) that appeared to be stained black but it could not be readily determined whether it had been due to an oil spill or rotting organic material. The eastern tributary was observed to have black staining on the bank near the water level just at and several hundred feet downstream of the intersection of the eastern and southern tributaries. The staining was not observed immediately upstream of the intersection at both the eastern and southern tributaries. It could not be readily determined whether the staining was due to oil contamination or organic material.

The two USTs were located near the northwest corner of the site. It was observed that the areas where SCDHEC had photographed oil on the ground on 5/20/2010 was recently tilled and covered. SCDHEC believes that the tanks were originally rolled over to be emptied, then the several hundred of gallons of oil that spilled were buried in-place. Employees reported that the two tanks had been brought to the site so that they could be scrapped and sold for recycling; employees also reported that the oil the tank was not No. 5 fuel oil but was, instead, "road tack" similar to a road patching tar. An interview with one of the employees who was tasked with scrapping the tanks revealed that the company did not have an adequate plan for addressing the residual oils in the tank or addressing the soil that the spilled oil had contaminated.

2. Current Activities

2.1 Operations Section

2.1.1 Narrative

5-gas, PID/FID, and XRF field instrumentation was used to assess site conditions and monitor for worker safety. START collected 6 samples for laboratory analysis in order to support SCDHEC's pending investigation on the nonpermitted landfill. Results of all sample analysis will be documented in a letter report from Tetra Tech (START) and will be provided to SCDHEC.

2.1.2 Response Actions to Date

The portable 5-gas analyzer and PID/FID field instrumentation confirmed that no VOCs could be detected in the two trenches that had been dug in the area where several thousand gallons of fuel had allegedly been dumped. Elevated VOCs were detected in all of the abandoned tanks on-site from residuals inside (all tanks were confirmed empty).

START collected 6 samples for laboratory analysis in order to support SCDHEC's pending investigation on the nonpermitted landfill: 2 soil samples were collected in areas where the blasting caps and dynamite had previously been buried, 1 soil sample was collected from the area where fuels had allegedly been spilled, 1 waste sample was collected from the burn pit, 1 waste sample was collected from the soils between the two USTs where the heavy oil had been spilled, and 1 sample was collected from the fibrous material in the burn pit for asbestos analysis. The three soil samples and two waste samples were scanned in the field with a portable XRF for metals. Results of all sample analysis will be documented in a letter report from Tetra Tech (START) and will be provided to SCDHEC.

2.1.3 Enforcement Activities, Identity of Potentially Responsible Parties (PRPs)

2.1.4 Progress Metrics

<i>Waste Stream</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Quantity</i>	<i>Manifest #</i>	<i>Treatment</i>	<i>Disposal</i>

2.2 Planning Section

2.2.1 Anticipated Activities

SCDHEC will retain the response and enforcement lead for this site. EPA will provide analytical and documentation information on activities already conducted.

2.2.1.1 Planned Response Activities

2.2.1.2 Next Steps

2.2.2 Issues

2.3 Logistics Section

No information available at this time.

2.4 Finance Section

No information available at this time.

2.5 Other Command Staff

2.5.1 Safety Officer

It is believed that the York County Sherrif's department was successful in removing all blasting caps and dynamite from the site. However, as a safety precaution, START sought the guidance of an expert who provided information on what to watch out for concerning blasting caps:

The two types most often used are electrically-initiated and shock-tube (non-electric/non-el) initiated. In either variety the charge looks a lot like the refill for a nice ballpoint pen and is about the same size. Electrically-initiated caps have two wires coming out of one end about 5ft in length.

Shock-tube types have a neon-colored hollow plastic tube coming out of one end; it looks like weed-eater wire. This "shock-tube" has really fine-grained explosive power inside it that the blaster sparks at one end (from a safe distance) and the spark travels through the tube to the charge at the other end. Often they have plastic clips on the other end that also contain a blasting cap. These clips are for linking together blast holes.

A third type is electronically-initiated caps. These are blasting caps that can be activated remotely. They are just a cap with a little RF receiver chip on them. These are very rare.

All types should be considered "HIGH" explosives and have the potential to blow off a hand or a foot. The power and casing are pretty robust though and they are not going to blow just by stepping on them. Don't mess with them if you see them.

2.6 Liaison Officer

2.7 Information Officer

2.7.1 Public Information Officer

2.7.2 Community Involvement Coordinator

3. Participating Entities

3.1 Unified Command

3.2 Cooperating Agencies

- EPA
- SCDHEC

4. Personnel On Site

- EPA (1)
- SCDHEC (3)
- START (2)

5. Definition of Terms

No information available at this time.

6. Additional sources of information

No information available at this time.

7. Situational Reference Materials

No information available at this time.

POLREP #1 Last Updated 7/26/2010