



U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Superfund Information Systems

Recent Additions | Contact Us | Print Version Search
 EPA Home > Superfund > Sites > Superfund Information Systems > Search Superfund Site Information
 > Search Results

Superfund Site Information

Superfund Site Information

Site Documents

State Element Dictionary (DED)

Order Superfund Products

Search Results

Search Criteria:

Active vs. Archived: **Archived** *What are active and archived sites?*
City: CARRBORO
State(s): North Carolina

Found 1 site(s) that match your search criteria listed above.
 To conduct another search, return to the [Search Superfund Site Information](#) page or request a [Customized SIS Report](#).

Save results in Excel format

Displaying sites 1 through 1

EPA ID ▾	Site Name ▾	City ▾	County ▾	State ▾	NPL Status ▾
NCDD084172188	ROSEB-TRIEM INC.	CARRBORO	ORANGE	NC	Not NPL

Displaying sites 1 through 1

DISCLAIMER: Be advised that the data contained in these profiles are intended solely for informational purposes use by employees of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for management of the Superfund program. They are not intended for use in calculating Cost Recovery Statutes of Limitations and cannot be relied upon to create any rights, substantive or procedural, enforceable by any party in litigation with the United States. EPA reserves the right to change these data at any time without public notice.

[OSWER Home](#) | [Superfund Home](#)

[EPA Home](#) | [Privacy and Security Notice](#) | [Contact Us](#)

URL: <http://cfpub.epa.gov/superfund/courses/srchsrst.cfm>
 This page design was last updated on Wednesday, December 20, 2006
 Content is dynamically generated by ColdFusion



June 14, 2012

Mr. Gary Hill
Grubb & Ellis|Thomas Linderman Graham
3 Oakwood Drive
Chapel Hill, NC 27517

Reference: Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment
Former TEMC Facility
501 South Greensboro Street
Carrboro, North Carolina
Waters Edge Job No. R12-18

Dear Mr. Hill:

Waters Edge performed a May 21, 2007 *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment* which had the following recognized environmental conditions (RECs) warranting further subsurface investigation:

- **REC-1** There was a 55-gallon drum of polyester resin in a Chemical Storage Room at Building #1 (western portion of property) with staining noted on the floor. This drum has reportedly been removed. There was some polyester resin which had hardened on the floor.
- **REC-2** There was a hood in the manufacturing area of Building #1 that was probably associated with a drying oven. The hood had caked material on the metal exhaust which exits the building. For this REC, we would be focusing on the area outside the building where the exhaust fan emissions may have impacted the subsurface.
- **REC-3** Even though a REC was not noted during the site reconnaissance, we would still conduct several borings outside the Loading Dock and adjacent to the former air compressor area.
- **Other Concerns #1** We would add that our Phase I ESA did mention several older transformers south of Building #1. These are typically owned by the local utility which would handle any issues with Toxic Substance Control Act (TSCA) for PCBs. They did not have any blue dots to indicate whether the transformers were in TSCA compliance and a future owner should assure that this is the responsibility of the local utility (e.g. Duke Power).
- **Other Concerns #2** Based on a telephone conversation with Mr. John Runyon, he recommended Waters Edge install additional borings on the tract to assess whether there had been past releases of oils or hazardous substances.

It is our understanding that you represent a party that is considering acquiring the facility and would like Waters Edge to conduct a limited Phase II ESA concentrating on these RECs. Below, we have provided a description of the field investigation, laboratory analytical results and our conclusions and recommendations.

FIGURES

TABLES

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

1 Phase II Investigation

1.1 Soil Assessment

On June 4, 2012, Waters Edge mobilized a senior project manager and a Geoprobe to the site to install the following (see boring locations on Figure 2):

- **REC-1/REC-3** One soil boring (B-1) was installed near the Loading Dock which was immediately outside and below the Chemical Storage Room.
- **REC-2** One soil boring (B-2) was installed outside the exhaust vent at this REC.
- **REC-3** One soil boring (B-6) was installed outside the former air compressor area.
- **Other Concern #1** One soil boring (B-4) was installed below the pole transformers.
- **Other Concern #2** Nine (9) additional borings (B-3, B-5 and B-7 through B-13) were installed to assess other potential site concerns.

All borings were advanced between 1 to 8' below ground surface (bgs) and assessed in the field with a photoionization detector (PID) in one foot intervals. Standard operating procedures contained in Appendix A and boring logs are contained in Appendix B. Many of the borings were very shallow due to encountering shallow bedrock. However, based on the PID readings, three soil samples were selected, placed in laboratory provided containers, and transported to the laboratory according to EPA-accepted procedures. These samples were analyzed as follows:

- **REC-1/REC-3/B-1@2' bgs, Other Concern #2/B-4 @ 1' bgs, and B-7 @ 3' bgs**
 1. Diesel-Ranged total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH-DRO) via Method 8015
 2. Oil & Grease (O&G) via Method 9071
 3. Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) via Method 8260
 4. Inorganic Metals (Cadmium, Chromium, Lead, and Zinc) via Method 6010
- We also submitted a background sample for the inorganic parameter for comparison purposes.

The results are summarized in Table 1 and documented in Appendix C.

1.2 Groundwater Assessment

Geoprobe borings B-1 (REC-1 and REC-3) and B-13 (Other Concern #2 representing a topographic low point prior to a stormwater discharge from the site) were advanced to a sufficient depth below the groundwater table (groundwater estimated between 4-5' bgs) such that a groundwater sample could be collected with a peristaltic pump and new Tygon tubing (see SOPS in Appendix A). All groundwater samples collected in laboratory supplied containers and

transported to the laboratory according to EPA-accepted procedures. Both samples were analyzed for VOCs and the inorganic metal list provided in Section 1.1 (see results in Table 2 and documented in Appendix C).

1.3 Surface Water Assessment

Two surface water samples (SW-1 located east of Building #2 and SW-2 located west of South Greensboro Road exiting the site- see locations in Figure 2) were also collected to represent both upgradient and downgradient conditions at the site. Both samples were collected in laboratory-supplied containers and submitted to the laboratory according to the same EPA-accepted procedures. Both samples were analyzed for VOCs (see results in Table 3 and documentation in Appendix C).

2 Conclusions and Recommendations

We would have the following conclusions and recommendations:

- **Soil**
 1. There were some low concentrations of TPH-DRO in all soil borings ranging from 7.4 mg/kg in B-1 to 33 mg/kg in B-7 versus a 40 mg/kg NCDENR trigger level.
 2. There was a low concentration of oil and grease in boring B-1 at 112 mg/kg versus a 250 mg/kg NCDENR trigger level.
 3. Acetone was detected in B-1 at 0.0093 mg/kg versus a NCDENR Target Screening Value (TSV) and REC Preliminary Soil Remediation Goal (PSRG) at 24 mg/kg. We would comment that the acetone detected may be a laboratory artifact.
 4. The inorganic metals detected in all soil samples were also at low levels and below NCDENR trigger levels (trivalent chromium trigger level used for this calculation).

In conclusion, there were no NCDENR soil exceedances for the soil samples taken. As such, no further assessment is warranted.

- **Groundwater** Both groundwater samples detected low levels of organics but were below all North Carolina Groundwater Standards (NCGS). All inorganic parameters were non-detect (ND) with the exception of B-1 detecting zinc (0.0182 mg/L versus a NCGS at 1.0 mg/L). As such, no further assessment is warranted.
- **Surface Water** All surface water samples were ND with the exception of SW-1 detecting acetone at 0.005 mg/L. There is no NCDENR surface water standard (NCAC 2B) for acetone. Again, we would comment that the acetone detected may be a laboratory artifact. As such, no further assessment is warranted.

APPENDIX A
APPENDIX B
APPENDIX C

*Limited Phase II ESA Investigation
Former TEMC Facility
501 South Greensboro Street
Carrboro, North Carolina
June 14, 2012
Page 4 of 4*

If there are any questions, please contact me at 919.219.5820 or prahn@watersedgeenv.com.

Sincerely,

WATERS EDGE ENVIRONMENTAL, LLC



Phillip L. Rahn, PG
President

12-053/PLR

FIGURES

TABLES

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C