<u>Disclaimer</u>: This checklist is for use by DEP in reviewing *Response Action Outcome (RAO)* Statements, and may not be relied upon for any other purpose. This checklist is not a comprehensive list of *RAO* requirements, which are fully set forth in MGL c. 21E and 310 CMR 40.0000. Completion of this checklist by DEP does not constitute a final agency decision, and does not create any legal rights or relieve any party of obligations that exist pursuant to applicable laws.

| Lead RTN: | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---|-----------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|------|
| SUBMITTAL TYPE | | OHM description: (Source, Type of OHM, Media Affected) | Date RAO Rcvd/_ | | | | |
| Class: A B C 1 2 | 3 4 | | Date Scree | ened _ | /_ | /. | |
| Partial Revised AL | JL | | | | | | |
| Other: | | Site Use: | | | | | |
| Related RTNs: | | | | | | | |
| Town: | | Site Name: | | | | | |
| Address: | | LSP Name/#: | | | | | |
| PRP/OP: | | Consulting Firm: | | | | | |
| | | | | ı | | | |
| | l upon con | ditions at time of RAO submittal | | | | | |
| I. SITE CONDITIONS | | | | Yes | No | ? | Page |
| A. Air | rd exceede | d @ residence/school with no soil gas/indoor air | campling | D | | | Page |
| 2. Site contaminants impact | | | Sampling | | | | |
| B. Drinking Water/Groundw | | uii e | | Yes | No | ? | Page |
| 1. D More than 0.5" NAPL ob | | ny monitoring well | | | | | |
| 2. Site within potential drinking | | | | | | | |
| Site located within IWPA/mapped Zone II | | | | | | | |
| 4. Private/Non-municipal public well(s) (i.e. TNC, NTNC) located within 500 feet of site | | | | | | | |
| 5. Municipal well(s) located within 1000 feet of site | | | | | | | |
| 6. Private well contaminate | d as a resu | It of site, still in use (no filter, no public water, etc | c.) | | | | |
| 7. 🗗 Public water supply cont | aminated a | s a result of site, no filters or other mitigation. | | | | | |
| C Contaminated Soil At a Se | | | | Yes | No | ? | Page |
| 1. EPC in S-1 soil exceeds Me | | | | | | <u> </u> | |
| | | Pb, PCBs, etc.) detected less than 1 foot deep | | | | <u> </u> | |
| , , , | | ome VI, cyanide) detected less than 1 foot deep | | Vac | D No | | Dana |
| D. Environmental Concerns 1. Site within 500 feet of curface water and/or wetlands | | | Yes | No 🗆 | ? | Page | |
| 1. Site within 500 feet of surface water and/or wetlands | | | | - | | | |
| Endangered species habitat, ACEC and/or certified vernal pool within 500 feet Confirmed contamination of surface water, sediments and/or wetlands with site contaminants | | | | | - | | |
| 3. Confirmed contamination of surface water, sediments and/or wetlands with site contaminants E. Site & Area Use – Check All That Apply | | | Yes | No | ? | Page | |
| Industrial use or public Right of Way (no children likely to be present) | | | | | | i age | |
| Commercial (limited preser | | • | | | | | |
| 3. School/Institution (pre-K the | | , | | | | | |
| 4. Residential | | | | | | | |
| F. Released OHM (Primary Contaminant Type[s]) | | | Yes | No | ? | Page | |
| 1. Petroleum fuel oils (e.g. #2, #4, #6, JP-4, JP-8, kerosene, lube oil, MODF, etc.) | | | | | | | |
| 2. Gasoline, waste oils, Aviation Fuel (AVGAS, Jet A, etc.) | | | | | | | |
| 3. Metals, coal tar, PCBs, pesticides/herbicides, asbestos, cyanide | | | | | | | |
| 4. Chlorinated solvents, perchlorate, or other organic compounds | | | | | | | |
| G. Site Complexity | | | Yes | No | ? | Page | |
| 1. Co-mingled plumes (i.e., from different sources, one or more releases co-mingled) | | | | | | | |
| 2. Bedrock contamination | | | | | | | |
| If № conditions currently exi | st, see sur | pervisor to discuss. | | | | | |

<u>Disclaimer</u>: This checklist is for use by DEP in reviewing *Response Action Outcome (RAO)* Statements, and may not be relied upon for any other purpose. This checklist is not a comprehensive list of *RAO* requirements, which are fully set forth in MGL c. 21E and 310 CMR 40.0000. Completion of this checklist by DEP does not constitute a final agency decision, and does not create any legal rights or relieve any party of obligations that exist pursuant to applicable laws.

| II. TECHNICAL ADECUACY | 0:4-4:(-) | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|-----|-----|---|-------|------|
| II. TECHNICAL ADEQUACY | Citation(s) | | N.1 | 0 | N.1.0 | _ |
| A. Remedial Response Actions: | | Yes | No | ? | NA_ | Page |
| Documentation (BOL, HWM, etc.) of removal/treatment of contaminated soil was provided | 40.0030 | | | | | |
| 2. Remediation waste properly managed (Air [95%], GW [permit], SW [NPDES]) | 40.0031-40.0049 | | | | | |
| B. Source/Extent Investigations: | | Yes | No | ? | NA | Page |
| History of OHM use/storage/disposal at the site included | 40.0405(1), 40.0835(4)(c) | | | | | |
| 2. Potential source(s) identified, characterized, or abated (septic leach field, floor drain, AST, etc.) | 40.0923(2), 40.1003(5) | | | | | |
| 3. All migration pathways evaluated (soil, groundwater, surface water, air, sediment, food) | 40.0904(2)(c) | | | | | |
| 4. Extent of contamination defined in all media (including downgradient) | 40.0904(2)(a),40.1003(5) | | | | | |
| 5. Potential or actual OHM analyzed for and/or evaluated (metals, VPH, VOCs, etc.) | 40.0904(3)(a), 40.0926(1) | | | | | |
| 6. Proper sample collection technique/preservation//holding times/surrogate recovery, etc. | 40.0017(2-3), 40.1056(1)(j) | | | | | |
| C. Risk Characterization: | | Yes | No | ? | NA | Page |
| 1. Correct risk characterization method used (relative to indoor air, surface water, sediment, etc.) | 40.0941, 40.0942 | | | | | |
| Background identified or characterized | 40.0904(2)(b), 40.1020 | | | | | |
| 3. All receptors accounted for (human, environmental) or AUL applied | 40.0920-40.0922 | | | | | |
| 4. Site activities and uses identified (current, future, any limitations that were assumed) | 40.0923 | | | | | |
| 5. Exposure points identified (GW & soil for all RC Methods, other media for Methods 2 & 3) | 40.0924 | | | | | |
| 6. All exposure pathways identified and evaluated (inhalation, ingestion, dermal, etc.) | 40.0925 | | | | | |
| 7. Hot Spot(s) addressed, identified (as Hot Spot) and not added in to other EPCs | 40.0924(4), 40.0926(5) | | | | | |
| 8. EPC calculation(s)/equations provided (including spatial and/or temporal, Hot Spots, etc.) | 40.0926 | | | | | |
| 9. EPC properly calculated (maximum concentration, 75%/10x, upper confidence limit) | 40.0926(3)(a),(b),(c) | | | | | |
| 10. Soil/groundwater categories properly identified | 40.0930 | | | | | |
| 11. Applicable soil and/or GW standards not exceeded (Method 1 or 2) or AUL applied | 40.0973(7), 40.0988(2) | | | | | |
| 12. Characterization of Risk to Safety is included (all methods) | 40.0960 | | | | | |
| 13. Method 3 Public Welfare Risk Characterization is included | 40.0994 | | | | | |
| 14. Method 3 Environmental Risk Characterization – Stage 1 or 2 was completed, if applicable | 40.0995 | | | | | |
| 15. Method 3 Human Health: Non-Cancer Risks < HI of 1, ELCR < than 1x10 ⁻⁵ | 40.0993(6),(7) | | | | | |

Ver. MCP 04/06 Page 2 RAO 08/16/06 RTN ______

<u>Disclaimer</u>: This checklist is for use by DEP in reviewing *Response Action Outcome (RAO)* Statements, and may not be relied upon for any other purpose. This checklist is not a comprehensive list of *RAO* requirements, which are fully set forth in MGL c. 21E and 310 CMR 40.0000. Completion of this checklist by DEP does not constitute a final agency decision, and does not create any legal rights or relieve any party of obligations that exist pursuant to applicable laws.

| III. Response Action Outcome Statement (RAO): | | Yes | No | ? | NA | Page |
|---|------------------------------|-----|----|---|----|------|
| Correct RAO Class was selected | 40.1030 – 40.1050 | | | | | |
| 2. RAO boundaries delineated and referenced to permanent landmarks or surveyed boundaries | 40.1003(4), 40.1056(2)(a) | | | | | |
| 3. Relationship of this RAO to other RAOs for the property has been defined | 40.1056(1)(d) | | | | | |
| 4. Data Usability Assessment (scien. valid & defensible, precise, accurate, complete) is included | 40.1056(1)(j), 40.1056(2)(k) | | | | | |
| 5. Data Representativeness Evaluation (adequate spatial and temporal data) is included | 40.1056(2)(k) | | | | | |
| A. CLASS A – Permanent Solutions: | | Yes | No | ? | NA | Page |
| A background feasibility evaluation is included | 40.1020(3) | | | | | |
| 2. A Permanent Solution has been achieved | 40.1035(1) | | | | | |
| All sources have been eliminated or controlled | 40.1035 (2)(b) | | | | | |
| 4. Phase IV, Phase V, or Post-RAO O&M, where required, were completed | 40.1036(6) | | | | | |
| A-1. CLASS A-1: | | Yes | No | ? | NA | Page |
| 1. The level of OHM at the site has been reduced to background | 40.1036(1)(a) | | | | | |
| 2. Threats of Release Only: all TORs were eliminated, and a release of OHM has not occurred | 40.1036(1)(b) | | | | | |
| A-2. CLASS A-2: | | Yes | No | ? | NA | Page |
| 1. An AUL is <i>not</i> required to maintain a condition of No Significant Risk | 40.1036(2)(c) | | | | | |
| A-3. CLASS A-3: | | Yes | No | ? | NA | Page |
| An AUL has been implemented to maintain a condition of No Significant Risk | 40.1036(3)(c) | | | | | |
| 2. Groundwater or Soil OHM concentrations do not exceed UCLs | 40.1036(3)(d) | | | | | |
| A-4. CLASS A-4: | | Yes | No | ? | NA | Page |
| An AUL has been implemented to maintain a condition of No Significant Risk | 40.1036(4)(c) | | | | | |
| 2. OHM in soil that exceeds UCLs is beneath engineered barrier or >15 feet below ground surface | 40.1036(4)(d) | | | | | |
| 3. UCL Feasibility Evaluation conducted and shows that achieving UCLs is not feasible | 40.1036(4)(e), 40.1056(2)(f) | | | | | |

| B. CLASS B – Permanent Solutions: | Y | Yes | No | ? | NA | Page |
|-----------------------------------|---|------|-----|---|------|-------|
| B. CEACO B Terminonic Conditions. | | 1 00 | 140 | • | 14/1 | i age |

 Ver. MCP 04/06
 Page 3
 RAO 08/16/06
 RTN ______

<u>Disclaimer</u>: This checklist is for use by DEP in reviewing *Response Action Outcome (RAO)* Statements, and may not be relied upon for any other purpose. This checklist is not a comprehensive list of *RAO* requirements, which are fully set forth in MGL c. 21E and 310 CMR 40.0000. Completion of this checklist by DEP does not constitute a final agency decision, and does not create any legal rights or relieve any party of obligations that exist pursuant to applicable laws.

| 1. A condition of No Cignificant Diak eviate | 40.1045(1) | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|-----|----|---|----|------|
| A condition of No Significant Risk exists Demodial entires have mathean conducted. | 40.1045(1) | | | | | |
| 2. Remedial actions have <i>not</i> been conducted | 40.1045(2), 40.1046(6) | | | | | |
| 3. Where GW-1 applies, groundwater does <i>not</i> exceed an applicable or analogous standard | 40.1046(5)(b) | | | | | |
| B-1. CLASS B-1: | | Yes | No | ? | NA | Page |
| 1. One or more AULs are <i>not</i> necessary to maintain a level of no significant risk | 40.1046(1) | | | | | |
| B-2. CLASS B-2: | | Yes | No | ? | NA | Page |
| 1. An AUL has been implemented to maintain a condition of No Significant Risk | 40.1046(2)(a), 40.1056(2)(g) | | | | | |
| 2. OHM in groundwater or soil does not exceed UCLs | 40.1046(2)(b) | | | | | |
| B-3. CLASS B-3: | | Yes | No | ? | NA | Page |
| 1. An AUL has been implemented to maintain a condition of No Significant Risk | 40.1046(3)(a), 40.1056(2)(g,h) | | | | | |
| 2. EPC in soil exceeds UCLs; however: | | | | | | |
| a. OHM is located >15 feet below ground surface, AND | 40.1046(3)(b) | | | | | |
| b. UCL Feasibility Evaluation shows that achieving UCLs is not feasible | 40.1046(3)(c) | | | | | |
| C. CLASS C – Temporary Solutions: | | Yes | No | ? | NA | Page |
| A condition of No Substantial Hazard exists | 40.1050(1)(a), 40.1051(1, 2) | | | | | |
| 2. ID, charactization, elimination, and control or mitigation of OHM release has been demonstrated | 40.1050(1)(b), 40.1056(2)(d) | | | | | |
| 3. Soil and/or groundwater concentrations exceed applicable or analogous standards or UCLs | 40.1050(2)(a, b) | | | | | 1 |
| 4. Phase II and Phase III reports were submitted, or DPS Opinion was submitted | 40.1050(3), 40.1050(4)(a) | | | | | |
| 5. A plan with definitive and enterprising steps toward a Permanent Solution has been submitted | 40.1051(3)(a), 40.1051(4)(a) | | | | | 1 |
| C-1. Class C-1: | | Yes | No | ? | NA | Page |
| Valid feasibility evaluation - Permanent Solution currently cannot be achieved. | 40.1051(1) | | | | | |
| C-2. Class C-2: | | Yes | No | ? | NA | Page |
| 1. Site has a valid Tier I Permit, Permit Extension, or Tier 2 status | 40.1051(4)(b) | | | | | |

Ver. MCP 04/06 Page 4 RAO 08/16/06 RTN ______