EPA Region 5 Records Ctr.
303229

L0316505004 – Cook
United Air Cleaners
ILD 096798210
SF/HRS

CERCLA Abbreviated Preliminary Assessment

Illinois Environmental Protection Agency

Bureau of Land
Federal Sites Remediation Section
Site Assessment Unit

Printed on Recycled Paper

ABBREVIATED
PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT

for:

UNITED AIR CLEANERS
ILD 096798210
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

PREPARED BY:
ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
BUREAU OF LAND
DIVISION OF REMEDIATION MANAGEMENT
FEDERAL SITE REMEDIATION SECTION
SITE ASSESSMENT UNIT

JULY 25, 2002

SITE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

SITE DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY

On September 11, 2001 the Illinois EPA's (IEPA) Site Assessment Unit was tasked by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) to conduct a Preliminary Assessment of the United Air Cleaners (UAC) site located at Chicago, Cook County, Illinois.

On February 11, 1998 the United Air Cleaners site was placed onto the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) due to a history of RCRA (Resource Conservation and Recovery Act) violations in which the operator failed to transport hazardous wastes off-site in a timely manner.

The United Air Cleaners site (ILD 096798210) consisted of a manufacturing facility located at 9705 South Cottage Grove, Chicago, IL. The facility was a manufacturer of air filters for commercial vehicles such as tractors and trucks and military tanks. Activities that were conducted at the facility included metal stamping, filter assembly and painting. The building used for manufacturing consisted of approximately 160,000 square feet and wastes were generated as the result of painting, metal parts washing and off-specification products.

The company changed ownership in 1986 and all old and unused products were collected and shipped offsite. The company was listed as a Delaware corporation qualified to do business in Illinois as a foreign corporation on October 11, 1989 under the name United Air Cleaner Company, Inc.

The facility has a history of regulatory problems. In December 1986 the company submitted a Notification of Hazardous Waste Activity to the USEPA. In March 1987 the company submitted an Illinois Generator I.D. Number Request Form to obtain a hazardous waste generator ID number. Inspections conducted by the IEPA in 1991, 1993, 1994 and 1995 indicated violations. These included waste materials stored in drums that were found to be hazardous and that remained onsite for greater than 90 days and as a result would require a permit qualifying it as a treatment, storage, disposal facility. The facility also was cited for failure to file an annual report as required and to determine if their hazardous waste is land disposal restricted.

Hazardous wastes found during the inspections included phosphoric acid, acid paint stripper, off specification plastisols and paint sludge special waste. Other wastes included metal washer sludge, waste oil and oil dry. Analysis of the paint scrapings wastes revealed a TCLP chromium level of 61.2 mg/L, which was above the Regulatory Limit of 5.0 mg/L. The waste plastsols tested above the 5.0 mg/L Regulatory Level for lead at 81.9 mg/L.

A Mr.Yasar Samarah owned all of the stock of UAC from 1993 through May 6, 1995. The property was placed in Receivership on or about April 18, 1995. Samarah sold all of UAC's equipment, machinery inventory and other assets to N.D. Management Company. On May 6, 1995 ownership returned to American Filtrona Corporation of Richmond Virginia after it was sold by Yasar Samarah.

William S. Janney purchased the Receivership Entities on or about May 6, 1995 and continued to manage the daily affairs of United Air Cleaners until November 6, 1995. The company went into bankruptcy and was purchased in December 1995 by TDC Filter Manufacturing, who combined the two companies into TDC-UAC, Inc. During an inspection by IEPA in March 1997 approximately 200 drums of waste were still onsite that had been left by the previous owners. The company stated that it planned to close operations at this location within two months and move to another facility in Cicero.

IEPA files indicate that on January 16, 1998 a final inspection was done by MCF Environmental of Atlanta GA and EnCom Systems, Inc., who certified the property free of environmental hazards. MCF-Encoms Systems, Inc. submitted a Closure Report to IEPA dated March 13, 1998. IEPA responded that the report was incomplete and mainly a documentation of waste removal and did not address other important aspects of a closure report including a description of the facility, soil cleanup levels, etc.

An inspection was conducted on March 25, 1998 by IEPA during which it was noted that the property was vacant and a for sale sign indicated that the site was purchased at a Cook County Tax Sale and was for sale "cheap". A site visit by IEPA on December 2, 1999 indicate that all of the buildings used by United Air Cleaners had been demolished and removed and the area graded to the level of the adjacent properties.

CURRENT SITE CONDITIONS/ACTIVITIES

A site reconnaissance visit was conducted by the Office of Site Evaluation of the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency on March 27, 2002. The facility is demolished and vacant with the land being graded level. The property is bordered on the north side by Best-Foam Fabricators, an active business; on the east and south by vacant open property with private residences lying approximately 200 feet beyond; and on the west side by railroad tracks/Cottage Grove street which lie parallel to each other with the campus of Chicago State University lying beyond to the west. A drive around the area indicate that the nearest school, Scmid School, is located approximately 1,100 feet east of United Air Cleaners. The property is located approximately one mile east of the Dan Ryan Expressway and approximately two and a half miles north of Lake Calumet.

During the recon the author talked with personnel at Best-Foam Fabricators. They said the buildings were demolished several years ago and that they do not know who the present owner is. They pointed out the boundary of their property that lies adjacent to United Air Cleaners but did not know where UAC other boundaries were. Research prior to the recon indicated that ownership of the property is uncertain. A search of IEPA files and phone conversations with IEPA personnel in the Springfield and Des Plaines offices could not uncover a detailed or scaled map of the property. No title search has been done on the property by IEPA during previous legal proceedings. During the recon it was noted that the property east of where the buildings stood is curved on the south side as it follows a road and that private residences lie on the south side. No distinct fence lines were noted. An aerial photo of the area was used to determine the approximate area of the manufacturing portion of the property and the property on the east side. Using a planimeter and an aerial photo it was estimated that the land where the buildings stood

contained approximately 6.1 acres with approximately 3.7 acres being under roof. The property on the east side contained approximately 2.1 acres.

RECOMMENDATION

The United Air Cleaners site is located within the city of Chicago. Drinking water is obtained from lake Michigan which is located approximately four miles east. There is no known groundwater usage in the area. The property is flat and any drainage would tend to flow east but does not have a pathway that would enter surface water. The nearby area is a mixture of residential and commercial in usage. Private residences are located near the east and south sides and the campus of Chicago State University is located west across Cottage Grove Street. Commercial businesses are located north. Within a four mile radius of the property is a mixture of residential and commercial uses.

It is not known at this time if any contamination is present at this site. The facility did not undergo proper RCRA closure and no confirmation soil samples were taken on the property. The buildings were demolished without IEPA approval or oversight and the potential exists that contamination is present that is attributable to past activities at the site. It is recommended that this site remain on CERCLIS and be given a Lower Priority SI status.

ATTACHMENT A

ABBREVIATED PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

ABBREVIATED PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

This checklist can be used to help the site investigator determine if an Abbreviated Preliminary Assessment (APA) is warranted. This checklist should document the rationale for the decision on whether further steps in the site investigation process are required under CERCLA. Use additional sheets, if necessary.

Checklist Preparer: ROBERT CASPER EPS III — 7/17/02
(Name/Title) IEPA, BOL 1021 N. GRAND AVE E. — (Date)
SPRINGFIELD, IL 62794 — 217-524-1661
(Address) — (Phone)
EPA 4467 @ EPA.STATE.IL
(E-Mail Address)

Site Name: UNITED AIR CLEANERS

Previous Names (if any):

Site Location: 9705 SOUTH COTTAGE GROVE
(Street)
CHICAGO, IL 60628-1510
(City) (ST) (Zip)

Latitude: 41° 43' 04.6" **Longitude:** 087° 36' 12.7"

Describe the release (or potential release) and its probable nature: FORMER MANUFACTURING FACILITY CLOSED AND DEMOLISHED BUILDINGS WITHOUT PROPER RCRA CLOSURE.

Part 1 - Superfund Eligibility Evaluation

If all answers are "no" go on to Part 2, otherwise proceed to Part 3.	YES	NO
1. Is the site currently in CERCLIS or an "alias" of another site?	☒	☐
2. Is the site being addressed by some other remedial program (Federal, State, or Tribal)?	☐	☒
3. Are the hazardous substances potentially released at the site regulated under a statutory exclusion (e.g., petroleum, natural gas, natural gas liquids, synthetic gas usable for fuel, normal application of fertilizer, release located in a workplace, naturally occurring, or regulated by the NRC, UMTRCA, or OSHA)?	☐	☒
4. Are the hazardous substances potentially released at the site excluded by policy considerations (i.e., deferred to RCRA corrective action)?	☐	☒
5. Is there sufficient documentation to demonstrate that no potential for a release that could cause adverse environmental or human health impacts exists (e.g., comprehensive remedial investigation equivalent data showing no release above ARARs, completed removal action, documentation showing that no hazardous substance releases have occurred, or an EPA approved risk assessment completed)?	☐	☒

Please explain all "yes" answer(s). SITE IS IN CERCLIS AND REGULATED BY RCRA BUT DID NOT UNDERGOE PROPER CLOSURE.

Part 2 - Initial Site Evaluation

For Part 2, if information is not available to make a "yes" or "no" response, further investigation may be needed. In these cases, determine whether an APA is appropriate. Exhibit 1 parallels the questions in Part 2. Use Exhibit 1 to make decisions in Part 3.

If the answer is "no" to any of questions 1, 2, or 3, proceed directly to Part 3.	**YES**	**NO**
1. Does the site have a release or a potential to release?	☒	☐
2. Does the site have uncontained sources containing CERCLA eligible substances?	☐	☒
3. Does the site have documented on-site, adjacent, or nearby targets?	☒	☐

If the answers to questions 1, 2, and 3 above were all "yes" then answer the questions below before proceeding to Part 3.	**YES**	**NO**
4. Does documentation indicate that a target (e.g., drinking water wells, drinking surface water intakes, etc.) has been exposed to a hazardous substance released from the site?	☐	☒
5. Is there an apparent release at the site with no documentation of exposed targets, but there are targets on site or immediately adjacent to the site?	☐	☒
6. Is there an apparent release and no documented on-site targets or targets immediately adjacent to the site, but there are nearby targets (e.g., targets within 1 mile)?	☐	☒
7. Is there no indication of a hazardous substance release, and there are uncontained sources containing CERCLA hazardous substances, but there is a potential to release with targets present on site or in proximity to the site?	☐	☒

Notes: FACILITY USED HAZARDOUS PHOSPHORIC ACID, ACID PAINT STRIPPER, OFF SPECIFICATION PLASTISOLS AND PAINT SLUDGE SPECIAL WASTE. FACILITY DID NOT UNDERGOE PROPER RCRA CLOSURE AND IT IS UNKNOWN IF CONTAMINATION REMAINS AT THE SITE

EXHIBIT 1
SITE ASSESSMENT DECISION GUIDELINES FOR A SITE

Exhibit 1 identifies different types of site information and provides some possible recommendations for further site assessment activities based on that information. You will use Exhibit 1 in determining the need for further action at the site, based on the answers to the questions in Part 2. Please use your professional judgement when evaluating a site. Your judgement may be different from the general recommendations for a site given below.

Suspected/Documented Site Conditions		APA	Full PA	PA/SI	SI
1. There are no releases or potential to release.		Yes	No	No	No
2. No uncontained sources with CERCLA-eligible substances are present on site.		Yes	No	No	No
3. There are no on-site, adjacent, or nearby targets.		Yes	No	No	No
4. There is documentation indicating that a target (e.g., drinking water wells, drinking surface water intakes, etc.) has been exposed to a hazardous substance released from the site.	Option 1: APA ⇨ SI	Yes	No	No	Yes
	Option 2: PA/SI	No	No	Yes	NA
5. There is an apparent release at the site with no documentation of exposed targets, but there are targets on site or immediately adjacent to the site.	Option 1: APA ⇨ SI	Yes	No	No	Yes
	Option 2: PA/SI	No	No	Yes	NA
6. There is an apparent release and no documented on-site targets and no documented targets immediately adjacent to the site, but there are nearby targets. Nearby targets are those targets that are located within 1 mile of the site and have a relatively high likelihood of exposure to a hazardous substance migration from the site.		No	Yes	No	No
7. There is no indication of a hazardous substance release, and there are uncontained sources containing CERCLA hazardous substances, but there is a potential to release with targets present on site or in proximity to the site.		No	Yes	No	No

Part 3 - EPA Site Assessment Decision

When completing Part 3, use Part 2 and Exhibit 1 to select the appropriate decision. For example, if the answer to question 1 in Part 2 was "no," then an APA may be performed and the "NFRAP" box below should be checked. Additionally, if the answer to question 4 in Part 2 is "yes," then you have two options (as indicated in Exhibit 1): Option 1 -- conduct an APA and check the "Lower Priority SI" or "Higher Priority SI" box below; or Option 2 -- proceed with a combined PA/SI assessment.

Check the box that applies based on the conclusions of the APA:

- [X] NFRAP
- [ ] Higher Priority SI
- [X] Lower Priority SI
- [ ] Defer to RCRA Subtitle C
- [ ] Defer to NRC
- [ ] Refer to Removal Program - further site assessment needed
- [ ] Refer to Removal Program - NFRAP
- [ ] Site is being addressed as part of another CERCLIS site
- [ ] Other: _____

Regional EPA Reviewer: _____ Print Name/Signature J Griffin 9/23/02 Date