

**FOURTH FIVE-YEAR REVIEW REPORT
GOLDISC RECORDINGS, INC. SUPERFUND SITE
VILLAGE OF HOLBROOK
TOWN OF ISLIP
SUFFOLK COUNTY, NEW YORK**



Prepared by

**U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region II
New York, New York**

Approved by:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Prince".

**John Prince, Acting Director
Emergency and Remedial Response Division**

May 14, 2018

Date

528400



TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS & ACRONYMS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Site Background.....	1
	FIVE-YEAR REVIEW SITE SUMMARY FORM	2
II.	SITE CHRONOLOGY	3
III.	RESPONSE ACTION SUMMARY.....	3
	Basis for Taking Action	3
	Response Actions	3
	Status of Implementation.....	4
	Institutional Controls Summary	5
	Operation, Maintenance and Monitoring	6
IV.	PROGRESS SINCE LAST FIVE-YEAR REVIEW	7
V.	FIVE-YEAR REVIEW PROCESS.....	7
	Community Notification, Involvement and Site Interviews	7
	Data Review	7
	Site Inspection	8
VI.	TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT	
	Question A: Is the remedy functioning as intended by the decision documents?	9
	Question B: Are the exposure assumptions, toxicity data, cleanup levels and remedial action objectives used at the time of the remedy still valid?.....	9
	Question C: Has any other information come to light that could call into question the protectiveness of the remedy?	10
VII.	ISSUES, RECOMMENDATIONS AND FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS	11
VIII.	PROTECTIVENESS STATEMENT.....	11
IX.	NEXT FIVE-YEAR REVIEW	11

APPENDIX A – TABLES

APPENDIX B – FIGURE

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AEC	Area of Concern
AOC	Administrative Order on Consent
CD	Consent Decree
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CSW	Church Street Wellfield
EPA	(United States) Environmental Protection Agency
IC	Institutional Control
MCL	Maximum Contaminant Level
NPL	National Priorities List
NYSDEC	New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
PRPs	Potentially Responsible Parties
RA	Remedial Action
RAWP	Remedial Action Work Plan
RD	Remedial Design
RI/FS	Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study
ROD	Record of Decision
SCWA	Suffolk County Water Authority
SCDHS	Suffolk County Department of Health Services
VOC	Volatile organic compound

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of a five-year review (FYR) is to evaluate the implementation and performance of a remedy in order to determine if the remedy is and will continue to be protective of human health and the environment. The methods, findings and conclusions of FYRs are documented in FYR reports, such as this one. In addition, FYR reports identify any issues that may have been found during the review period and document any recommendations in order to address those issues.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is preparing this FYR review, pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Section 121, consistent with the National Contingency Plan (NCP) (40 CFR Section 300.430(f)(4)(ii)), and considering EPA policy.

This is the fourth FYR for the Goldisc Recordings, Inc., site (Site), located in the Town of Islip, Village of Holbrook, Suffolk County, New York. The triggering action for this statutory review is the signing of the previous FYR on September 27, 2013. The selected remedy for the Site included 1) excavation and off-site disposal of contaminated dry well sediments and soils; 2) excavation and off-site disposal of surface soils; 3) abandonment of the on-site production well, including excavation and off-site disposal of sediments and soils around and inside the well vault; and, 4) monitored natural attenuation (MNA) of the groundwater.

The EPA FYR team was led by Damian Duda, remedial project manager (RPM), and includes Rob Alvey, hydrogeologist, Lora Smith, risk assessor, Michael Clemetson, ecological risk assessor, Marla Wieder, site attorney, Cecilia Echols, community involvement coordinator (CIC) and Sal Badalamenti, supervisor.

The Site was listed on the National Priorities List (NPL) in June 1986. The documents that were reviewed for this FYR are found in **Table 1**.

Site Background

The Site (see **Figure 1**) is a 34-acre property and consists of two one-story buildings that occupy approximately six acres, three acres of pavement/parking area surrounding the buildings, a Fedex Terminal building and parking area on approximately six acres and the remaining 19 acres of vacant property, located both to the north and to the south of the original two buildings.

From 1968 to 1990, the two buildings on the Site were occupied by Goldisc Recordings, Inc., which produced phonographic records; the ElectroSound Group, Inc. (ElectroSound) (a.k.a., Viewlex Audio Visual Company), which manufactured audio visual and optical devices; and, Genco Auto Electric, Inc. (Genco), which rebuilt automotive engine parts. These buildings are approximately 1200 feet upgradient of the Church Street Wellfield (CSW) which is owned and operated by the Suffolk County Water Authority (SCWA).

Between 1968 and 1990, the substances known to have been disposed of at the Site include wastewater from various production processes, waste oils, metals, solutions containing high concentrations of xylene and trichloroethylene and other degreasing agents. These substances

were reportedly discharged to the environment through on-site dry wells, leaching pools, storm drains and leaking containers located in and around the buildings.

In the early 1980s, the Suffolk County Department of Health Services collected groundwater samples which revealed elevated levels of solvents and metals, including trichloroethane, trichloroethylene, tetrachloroethylene, lead, nickel, chromium and silver. Analyses of samples obtained from the CSW showed concentrations of tetrachloroethylene slightly exceeding the federal and state Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) of 5 micrograms/liter (µg/l) for public drinking water. Based on these findings, the Site was added to the NPL in June 1986.

Residents of the Town of Islip are on public water from production wells. The closest residences to the Site are located a few hundred feet southwest of the Site. The Village of Holbrook has an estimated population of 21,000 people.

FIVE-YEAR REVIEW SUMMARY FORM

SITE IDENTIFICATION		
Site Name: Goldisc Recordings, Inc.		
EPA ID: NYD980768717		
Region: 2	State: NY	City/County: Town of Islip/Suffolk
SITE STATUS		
NPL Status: Final		
Multiple OUs? Yes	Has the site achieved construction completion? Yes	
REVIEW STATUS		
Lead agency: EPA		
Author name (Federal or State Project Manager): Damian Duda		
Author affiliation: EPA		
Review period: 04/01/2013 – 03/31/2018		
Date of site inspection: 11/15/2017		
Type of review: Statutory		
Review number: 4		
Triggering action date: 09/27/2013		
Due date (five years after triggering action date): 09/27/2018		

II. SITE CHRONOLOGY

The chronology of Site events is shown in **Table 2**.

III. RESPONSE ACTION SUMMARY

Basis for Taking Action

EPA conducted a baseline risk assessment to evaluate the potential risks to human health and the environment. The risk assessment contaminants included tetrachloroethylene, 1,1-dichloroethane, 1,1,1-trichloroethane, vinyl chloride, benzo(a)anthracene, chrysene, cadmium, copper, lead, nickel and zinc. The risk assessment evaluated commercial/industrial exposures under the current use scenario; it was assumed that, in the future, the property would continue to be used for commercial/industrial purposes. Groundwater was considered as a current and future drinking water aquifer. Exposure pathways evaluated included 1) dermal absorption of chemicals in the soil by children trespassing on the Site, 2) direct contact (including incidental ingestion and dermal absorption) with soils by on-site commercial/industrial employees, 3) direct contact with soil by future short-term construction workers and 4) domestic use of groundwater (including ingestion and inhalation of volatiles by nearby residents using the CSW as the exposure point). The RI/FS was completed in August 1995 and concluded that no unacceptable risk was present on-site for current and future commercial/industrial land use.

The only potential route for wildlife to be exposed to Site contaminants is if contaminants were transported through groundwater and discharged via groundwater into surface waters, particularly the state wetland located one-half mile south of the Site. Sampling showed that the wetland had not been impacted by Site contaminants. Therefore, EPA determined that the Site did not pose a significant ecological risk.

Since significant contamination, specifically nickel, was detected in the soils at the Site, it was determined that there was a high potential for cross-media impacts as nickel can migrate into the groundwater via fluctuations of the water table and precipitation. This is supported by the detection of high levels of nickel in the groundwater. Historically, the maximum concentration of nickel in one on-site well was detected at 959 µg/L. Furthermore, nickel contamination had historically impacted the nearby CSW. One of the CSW production wells, CS#2, was found to contain elevated concentrations of nickel contamination which, at the time, were above the federal MCL of 100 micrograms per liter (µg/L). Subsequently, the federal MCL was remanded. However, the New York State (NYS) Class GA Groundwater Quality Standard (GWQS) for nickel is 100 µg/L is the applicable or relevant and appropriate requirement (ARAR) for the Site. This elevated concentration was determined to be related to the disposal activities that occurred at the Site. As a result of this determination, remedial action alternatives were developed for the Site sediments and soils.

Response Actions

In September 1995, EPA issued a ROD for Site soils (Operable Unit One (OU-1)). The remedial action objective (RAO) was as follows:

- Minimize leaching of contaminants, particularly nickel, in the subsurface soils and sediments to the groundwater.

In order to achieve the RAO for the Site soils, EPA selected the following remedy components:

- Excavation via a vacuum truck and off-site disposal of approximately 56 cubic yards of sediments and soils from the six dry wells in AEC #2 and drywell DW-2 in AEC #14;
- Excavation and off-site disposal of approximately 215 cubic yards of surface soils within AEC #8;
- Abandonment of the on-site production well, including excavation and off-site disposal of sediments and soils around and inside the well vault; and
- Taking steps to secure the placement of deed restrictions on the property to limit it to a non-residential use.

The contaminant of concern in the six dry wells, the surface soils and the production well vault was nickel. The contaminants of concern in the dry well in AEC #14 were semi-VOCs, namely benzo(a)anthracene and chrysene.

In September 1998, EPA issued a second ROD for groundwater (Operable Unit Two (OU-2)). The RAO was as follows:

- Prevent the ingestion of drinking water containing concentrations of nickel above the 100 µg/l NYS Class GA GWQS, which is an ARAR at the Site.

The remedy selected for groundwater was monitored natural attenuation (MNA) and institutional controls (ICs) in the form of use restrictions on the development of potable water supply wells at the Site.

Status of Implementation

In September 1996, EPA signed a consent decree (CD) with the following PRPs: ElectroSound, First Holbrook, Genco, Red Ground Company and Red Ground Corporation. The CD required that ElectroSound implement the remedial action selected in the OU-1 ROD, pursuant to the EPA-approved remedial action work plan (RAWP) which was incorporated into the CD and provided additional details regarding the implementation of the selected remedy, namely, the excavation of Site soils and sediments. EPA considered the RAWP to satisfy the requirements of a remedial design. The CD was lodged on February 12, 1997 and entered by the District Court on May 15, 1997.

The RAWP and the CD identified the various construction activities which were required to implement the selected remedy for the OU-1 ROD. Excavation activities were completed in June 1997.

Post-excavation sampling was performed in order to determine whether the post-excavation levels (cleanup criteria) identified in the RAWP, *i.e.*, 130 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) for nickel, had been achieved. The post-excavation data indicated that all contaminated soils and

sediments above the cleanup criteria had been excavated and that residual levels were well below the cleanup criteria. Sampling results for AEC #14 showed that no concentrations of benzo(a)anthracene and chrysene were reported above the detection limit of 0.350 mg/kg for the contaminants, indicating that all semi-VOCs, targeted for removal for this AEC, had been removed.

No construction activities were required for the OU-2 ROD.

Institutional Controls (IC) Summary

Table 3 - IC Summary Table

Media, engineered controls, and areas that do not support UU/UE based on current conditions	ICs Needed	ICs Called for in the Decision Documents	Impacted Parcel(s)	IC Objective	Title of IC Instrument Implemented and Date (or planned)
Groundwater	Yes	Yes	Site	To prevent installation of potable groundwater production wells and withdrawal of groundwater	Suffolk County Sanitary Code – Article 4 Water Supply (rev. Nov 2011) NYS ECL 15-1527 (2003)

The selected remedy for the OU-1 ROD included an IC to be enacted, *i.e.*, the placement of a deed restriction on the property to limit use of the property to non-residential use. Based upon the current Site conditions, *i.e.*, 1) stabilizing and/or decreasing nickel concentrations, 2) the successful completion of the 1998 remedial action, *i.e.*, Site soils being suitable for unrestricted use and unlimited exposure, 3) commercial/industrial zoning and 4) the NYS and local laws (including the Suffolk County Sanitary Code) governing the development of potable drinking water wells and the withdrawal of groundwater in Suffolk County, New York, EPA determined that a deed restriction on the Site property was not necessary in order to ensure protection of human health and the environment.

Under the current NYS law, the following IC applies:

No person or public corporation shall hereafter install or operate any new or additional wells in the counties of Kings, Queens, Nassau or Suffolk to withdraw water from underground sources for any purpose or purposes whatsoever where the installed pumping capacity of any such new well or wells singly or in the aggregate, or the total installed pumping capacity of old and new wells on or for use on one property, is in excess of forty-five gallons a minute without a permit pursuant to this title. (See NYS ECL 15-1527 (2003)).

The current SCDHS regulations require that all new residences and businesses connect to public water supplies whenever public water mains are available. SCDHS is expected to adequately enforce its regulations for at least as long as the groundwater is impacted by site-related

contamination. This governmental control meets the objective of the groundwater use restrictions included in the OU-2 ROD.

Operations, Maintenance and Monitoring

There are no treatment systems at the Site. The only long-term activity required is monitoring the groundwater until the nickel plume is reduced to below MCLs. Historically, five monitoring wells (MW-12, MW-16, MW-17D, MW-20S and MW-20D) were included in the long-term sampling program, since they showed historical higher nickel concentrations. Over the years, MW-17D was compromised and removed from the program. During the 2016 sampling event by EPA’s Division of Environmental Science and Assessment, MW-12, MW-13, MW-14, MW-16, MW-18, MW-20S and MW-20D were sampled.

As part of the FYR process, EPA also reviews the nickel groundwater data available from the SCWA CSW to ensure that the nickel concentrations remain below levels of concern. All nickel concentrations are well below the NYS MCL of 100 µg/L. These public supply wells are routinely sampled by the SCWA, in accordance with SCDHS and NYS drinking water supply regulations. There has been no disruption in the public water supply service regarding the availability of the CSW groundwater for public distribution as a result of minor nickel detections well below the MCL.

Potential Site impacts from climate change have been assessed, and the performance of the remedy is currently not at risk due to the expected effects of climate change in the region and near the Site.

IV. PROGRESS SINCE LAST FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

The groundwater was sampled once since the last FYR. No further activities have been conducted at the Site, other than inspection of the select monitoring wells.

This section includes the protectiveness determinations and statements from the last FYR, as well as the recommendations from the last FYR and the current status of those recommendations.

Table 4 - Protectiveness Determinations/Statements from the 2013 FYR

OU #	Protectiveness Determination	Protectiveness Statement
1	Protective	The soils remedy is protective of human health and the environment
2	Protective	The groundwater remedy is protective of human health and the environment.
Sitewide	Protective	The implemented remedies for the Site protect human health and the environment.

There were no recommendations or follow-up actions identified in the 2013 FYR.

As a result of the December 2017 Site inspection, EPA noted that some of the monitoring wells in the original monitoring well network have been abandoned but have not been formally decommissioned. The Site property is zoned commercial and a vacant portion of it is currently being advertised for future commercial development.

V. FIVE-YEAR REVIEW PROCESS

Community Notification, Involvement and Site Interviews

On October 2, 2017, EPA Region 2 posted a notice on its website indicating that it would be reviewing site cleanups and remedies at 31 Superfund sites in New York and New Jersey, including the Goldisc Recordings site. The announcement can be found at the following web address: https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-10/documents/five_year_reviews_fy2018_final.pdf

In addition to this notification, a public notice was made available on EPA's Goldisc Recordings website: <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/goldisc-recording>. On January 23, 2018, the public notice was also sent to the Town Clerk of the Town of Islip. The purpose of the public notice is to inform the community about the FYR and to list where the final report will be posted. The notice also included the RPM and the CIC address and telephone numbers for questions or comments related to the FYR process or the Site. Once the FYR is completed, the results will be made available on EPA's Goldisc Recordings Inc. site webpage and at the site repositories located at EPA, 290 Broadway, 18th Floor, New York, New York and at the Town of Islip Town Hall.

Community interest in the Site has been historically low. The SCWA was notified of this FYR and provided its CSW production well data for this review. No interviews were conducted during the Site inspection.

Data Review

As stated above, in October 2016, the groundwater was sampled in MW-12, MW-13, MW-14, MW-16, MW-18, MW-20S and MW-20D. MW-18 (see **Figure 1**) was not part of the original monitoring program and has not been sampled in many years. However, EPA's evaluation found the well viable and decided to sample it to establish upgradient conditions. The data showed that only well MW-20D showed a nickel concentration (150 µg/L) above the MCL. Historically, the nickel concentrations in MW-20D have been variable. The remaining wells all show nickel concentrations well below the MCL and are consistent with historical levels. **Table 5** shows both current and historical nickel results (1994 to 2016).

Since 1996, and even prior to that time, the nickel levels in the CSW have been below the MCL of 100 µg/L. **Table 6** shows the SCWA CSW data from 2013 to 2017. Nickel concentrations in CS#1A are all below 3 µg/L; concentrations in CS#2 range from 4.6 to 31.2 µg/L; and, concentrations in CS#3 range from non-detect to 7.85 µg/L. From 2013 to 2017, the raw water from CS#2 and CS#3 are blended with resulting nickel concentrations averaging 7.8 µg/L. The drinking water supply continues to meet NYS drinking water standards.

Over the last five years, the following VOCs were reported by the SCWA for the CSW: 1,1,1-trichloroethane, 1,1-dichloroethene, 1,1-dichloroethane, bromodichloromethane, bromoform, chloroform, dibromochloromethane, methyl-t-butyl ether and tetrachloroethene. For CSW- #1A, chloroform only was reported. For CSW-#2 and #3 combined, bromodichloromethane, bromoform, chloroform and dibromochloromethane were reported. For CSW- #2, 1,1,1-trichloroethane, 1,1-dichloroethene, 1,1-dichloroethane, bromodichloromethane bromoform, chloroform and tetrachloroethene were reported. For CSW-#3, 1,1,1-trichloroethane, 1,1-dichloroethene, bromodichloromethane, bromoform, chloroform and dibromochloromethane were reported. The NYS standard for these compounds is 5 µg/L or higher. All VOC concentrations reported were below NYS drinking water standards.

Site Inspection

A FYR Site visit and inspection was conducted on December 14, 2017 to observe the current physical status and use of the Site and vicinity and to assess conditions of monitoring wells and other Site features. Currently, the Site buildings are occupied by commercial companies, including Furn-A-Kit, and a Kitchen and Bath Design Company associated with a Consumers Warehouse Center. Another three to four acres is used as an asphalt paved parking area. A Federal Express shipping/distribution center occupies another portion of the Site property. Approximately 19 acres of the property remain undeveloped. The area is zoned commercial/industrial.

The inspection team included Damian Duda, EPA RPM, Robert Alvey, EPA hydrogeologist and John Sheehan, NYSDEC engineering geologist. Previous monitoring well sampling reports and a map of the Site and monitoring well locations were reviewed.

EPA has a pair of monitoring wells (MW-20S and MW-20D) within the downgradient fenced SCWA CSW property. A SCWA employee provided the inspection team access to the CSW area so that the team could inspect these two wells. Both wells are secure and locked. Bollards protect the monitoring wells from vehicular traffic, and the locked aboveground well-heads are in good condition. The team inspected the remainder of the monitoring well network and noted that several older, unused wells have been compromised and/or are in poor condition. The former dry wells that were the source of nickel contamination remain sealed after the excavation and closure.

As a result of the Site inspection, the following suggestions are provided here to improve the accuracy of any Site investigatory, inspection and sampling activities:

1. Transfer the ownership of monitoring wells MW-20S and MW-20D to the SCWA, since these wells were originally installed as sentinel wells for the CSW. The SCWA can then monitor the groundwater in these wells on a regular basis.
2. Properly decommission the abandoned monitoring wells.
3. Assess the integrity and viability of the current monitoring well network, including potential well redevelopment actions.
4. Improve the identification of the select monitoring wells so that they can be easily located on the Site property during the sampling activities.

VI. TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT

Question A: Is the remedy functioning as intended by the decision document?

The OU-1 and OU-2 remedies are functioning as intended by the Site decision documents. The selected remedy for the OU-1 ROD required the excavation and off-site disposal of surface soils, sediments/soils from dry wells and soils in and below an on-site production well vault, followed by the abandonment of the production well. These remedial activities were necessary in order to reach the RAO of minimizing contaminant leaching, particularly nickel, in the subsurface soils and sediments to groundwater. The OU-1 soil remedy was implemented in 1997 and confirmatory sampling results (post- excavation) showed levels well below the established cleanup goals. In addition, EPA subsequently evaluated the residual soils contamination at the Site and determined that no restrictions were warranted for use of or exposure to Site soils.

The selected remedy for Site groundwater as identified in the OU-2 ROD called for MNA and ICs. Groundwater sampling data indicate that only one monitoring well has nickel concentrations above 100 µg/L (the cleanup standard).

Since the last FYR, six select monitoring wells [MW-12, MW-13, MW-14, MW-18, MW-20S and MW-20D] were sampled in 2016. The groundwater data indicated an exceedance of the nickel MCL of 100 µg/L in only one monitoring well, MW-20D at 150 µg/L. In addition, EPA evaluated the nickel data from the CSW and all three production wells showed nickel concentrations well below the MCL. As noted above, the NYS and local laws, including the Suffolk County Sanitary Code which governs the withdrawal of groundwater in Suffolk County, New York provide further assurance that groundwater concentrations of nickel above 100 µg/L will not be ingested.

Question B: Are the exposure assumptions, toxicity data, cleanup levels, and RAOs used at the time of the remedy selection still valid?

There have been no physical changes to the Site that would adversely affect the protectiveness of the remedy. Land use assumptions, exposure assumptions and pathways and clean-up levels considered in the decision documents followed the Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund used by the Agency and remain valid. Although specific parameters may have changed since the time the risk assessment was completed, the process that was used remains valid.

Data collected from all three CSW production wells, which serve as the drinking water supply to the nearby areas, indicate nickel concentrations well below the MCL of 100 µg/L; thus, the RAO for groundwater, *i.e.*, prevent the ingestion of drinking water containing concentrations of nickel above the NYS Class GA GWQS continues to be met. In addition to ingestion at point of use, EPA policy and guidance expects to return groundwater to its beneficial use. Since the groundwater contamination is located in a sole source aquifer, restoration to MCLs is also an objective of the remedy.

The following cleanup criteria had been established for Site soils and sediments: 130 mg/kg for nickel, 224 mg/kg for benzo(a)anthracene and 400 mg/kg for chrysene. These cleanup numbers are still valid for commercial/industrial use scenarios. The 1998 RA Report concluded that post-excavation sampling showed the remaining sediments/soils were well below the established Site remediation cleanup goals. The current residential NYS soil cleanup objectives for nickel, benzo(a)anthracene and chrysene are 140 mg/kg, 1 mg/kg and 1 mg/kg, respectively. Although the remedial cleanup criteria established for benzo(a)anthracene and chrysene are significantly above the current NYS residential soil cleanup objective of 1 mg/kg, a review of the post-excavation sampling data indicates these compounds were not detected above the detection limit of 0.350 mg/kg. Post-excavation data indicated a maximum nickel concentration of 58.7 mg/kg in soil. In conclusion, post-excavation data indicate that the remediation of the soils and sediments for all three chemicals of concern are well below current NYS residential use cleanup objectives.

The OU-2 groundwater investigation focused on two exposure pathways: direct ingestion and inhalation of volatiles by nearby residents using the CSW as the exposure point. Since there are no private wells in use on-site or in the plume area, and the CSW consistently produces potable water with nickel concentrations below the groundwater remedial goal of 100 µg/l, the direct ingestion pathway is incomplete for nickel. Data collected from the CSW shows no VOC exceedances above MCLs, thus, eliminating the exposure pathway for VOC inhalation. Furthermore, as part of the last FYR, EPA has concluded that VOCs detected in the CSW are not contaminants of concern at the Site.

Soil gas vapor intrusion (VI) into indoor air is evaluated when soils and/or groundwater are known or suspected to contain VOCs. While historical activities at the Site resulted in disposal of certain VOCs, the baseline human health risk assessment did not identify any volatiles as contaminants of concern. Furthermore, as a result of low concentrations of VOCs on Site during Phase II groundwater investigations, the last FYR concluded that the VI pathway is incomplete and not of concern for the Site. During the past FYR period considered in this document, there has been no new information that would call into question this determination. Hence, as reflected in the CSW VOC data, the VI pathway remains incomplete for the Site; and, thus, VI is not of concern.

Although the ecological risk assessment screening values used to support the 1998 ROD may not necessarily reflect the current values, the exposure assumptions remain appropriate and, thus, the remedy remains protective of ecological resources. The terrestrial exposure pathway has been addressed by the removal of contaminated surface soil. Additionally, as noted in the ROD, groundwater does not discharge into any water bodies in the vicinity of the site.

Question C: Has any other information come to light that could call into question the protectiveness of the remedy?

No other information has come to light that would call into question the protectiveness of the remedy.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS AND FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS

Issues/Recommendations
OU(s) without Issues/Recommendations Identified in the Five-Year Review: OU-1 and OU-2

IX. PROTECTIVENESS STATEMENT

Protectiveness Statement(s)		
<i>Operable Unit:</i> 01	<i>Protectiveness Determination:</i> Protective	<i>Addendum Due Date (if applicable):</i> N/A
<i>Protectiveness Statement:</i> The soils remedy is protective of human health and the environment.		
<i>Operable Unit:</i> 02	<i>Protectiveness Determination:</i> Protective	<i>Addendum Due Date (if applicable):</i> N/A
<i>Protectiveness Statement:</i> The groundwater remedy is protective of human health and the environment.		
Sitewide Protectiveness Statement (if applicable)		
<i>For sites that have achieved construction completion, enter a sitewide protectiveness determination and statement.</i>		
<i>Protectiveness Determination:</i> Protective		<i>Addendum Due Date (if applicable):</i> N/A
<i>Protectiveness Statement:</i> The implemented remedies for the Site protect human health and the environment.		

VII. NEXT FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

The next FYR report for the Goldisc Recordings, Inc. Superfund site is required five years from the completion date of this review.

TABLE 1
CHRONOLOGY OF SITE EVENTS

Event	Date
Site placed on the National Priorities List.	June 1986
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) Administrative Order on Consent (AOC) with the potentially responsible parties (PRPs).	1988
EPA takes over the Site from NYSDEC.	1990
EPA entered into AOC for the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) with the PRPs (First Holbrook and ElectroSound).	June 1991
Site Summary Report prepared.	October 1993
Phase II RI Report prepared.	August 1995
Final FS Report prepared.	August 1995
ROD for Operable Unit One issued.	September 1995
Remedial Action Work Plan issued.	September 1996
Consent Decree with PRPs for the Remedial Design/Remedial Action (RD/RA) entered.	May 1997
Notice to Proceed issued to PRPs' Contractor.	May 1997
RA Report for the Soil Remedy prepared.	September 1997
RA Report for the Soil Remedy prepared.	January 1998
ROD for Operable Unit Two issued.	September 1998
Preliminary Close-Out Report prepared	September 1998

TABLE 2

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED FOR FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

Record of Decision - Operable Unit One - Goldisc Recordings Site, USEPA, September 29, 1995.

Remedial Action Report for the Soil Remedy at the Former Goldisc Recordings Facility, ERM-Northeast, Holbrook, New York, January 19, 1998.

Record of Decision - Operable Unit Two and Preliminary Close-Out Report - Goldisc Recordings Site, USEPA, September 30, 1998.

Five-Year Review Report, EPA, November 2013.

Sampling Report for the Goldisc Recordings Site, EPA Region 2 Superfund Support Team, October 2016.

Water Quality Data Reports, Church Street Wells (CS-#1A, CS-#2 and CS-#3), Suffolk County Water Authority, March 2013 – June 2017.

EPA guidance for conducting five-year reviews and other relevant guidance and regulations to determine if any new Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements relating to the protectiveness of the remedy have been developed since the EPA issued the RODs were issued.

TABLE 5**MONITORING WELL DATA FOR THE GOLDISC RECORDINGS SUPERFUND SITE**
[CONTAMINANT OF CONCERN - NICKEL]

MW NO.	SCREEN INTERVAL (FT)	MONITORING WELL SAMPLING DATES and NICKEL CONCENTRATIONS (µg/l)															
		9/94	9/94	5/97	12/97	8-9/98	3/00	6/00	10/00	4/01	4/02	1/07	6/07	8/11	8/12	10/16	
MW-8	20 to 30	40.8J	42	42.8	ND	16.3 A	ND	NS	12.1 A	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	
MW-11	23 to 33	140J	127	ND	ND	2.8 A	ND	ND	5.6 A	2.4 A	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	
MW-12	24.5 to 34.5	959	980	394	300	54.8	209	341	181	142	120	ND	17.4	79.6	134.2	54	
MW-13	N/A	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	3.4	
MW-14	23 to 33	NS	NS	24.3	ND	1.3 A	ND	NS	10.2 A	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	7.1	
MW-16	30.7 to 40.7	278	277	94.6	81.1	85.2	148	229	193	187	116	146	106	76.1	80.4	50	
MW-17S	18 to 38	13.3 BJ	ND	ND	23.5	4.5 A	ND	ND	ND	4.6 A	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	
MW-17I	69 to 89	16.2 BJ	ND	ND	ND	3.5 A	ND	NS	2.3 A	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	
MW-17D	137 to 157	ND	ND	ND	ND	1.5 A	ND	ND	2.4 A	2.7 A	12.8	ND	3.96	NS	NS	NS	
MW-18	N/A	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	9,7	
MW-20S	50 to 60							77.4	121	124	115	99.6	66.4	59.5	24.4	24.2	23
MW-20D	80 to 90							106	180	59.4	66.8	56.7	192	219	117.2	181	160

* Monitoring wells are screened in the Upper Glacial Aquifer.

µg/L - Micrograms per liter

NS - Not sampled

ND - Non-detect

A - Between IDL and CRDL

TABLE 6

SUFFOLK COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY
PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY WELLS – NICKEL DATA

DATE	WELL CS#1A	WELL CS#2	WELL CS#3
03/05/13			0.74
06/06/13		22.4	ND
06/10/13 (2)	2.55/2.73		
09/03/13			ND
10/24/13		25.5	
12/03/13			1.26
12/10/13 (2)	1.73/2.11		
03/04/14			0.98
06/10/14		20.9	1.42
06/16/14 (2)	2.37/2.74		
09/02/14			1.36
10/27/14		9.82	
12/01/14 (2)			1.15/1.26
12/09/14 (2)	1.93/2.21		
03/03/15			0.98
06/03/15		28.3	0.82
06/10/15 (2)	2.02/2.39		
10/16/15		31.2	
12/01/15 (2)			1.06/1.03
12/10/15 (2)	1.73/2.23		
03/15/16			0.72
06/07/16		21.8	0.97
06/14/16 (2)	1.82/2.16		
09/05/16			7.85
10/18/16		34.4	
12/05/16 (2)			0.62/0.53
12/12/16 (2)	1.48/1.57		
12/27/16	1.65		
06/06/17		4.76	0.87
06/13/17 (2)	2.15/2.39		

Units – µg/L (micrograms per liter)
ND – Not detected

