

DOCUMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR DETERMINATION

Interim Final 2/5/99

RCRA Corrective Action

Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)

Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control

Facility Name: Honeywell International, Inc.
Facility Address: 1000 Wills Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21231
Facility EPA ID #: MDD 06 939 6711

1. Has **all** available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to the groundwater media, subject to RCRA Corrective Action (e.g., from Solid Waste Management Units (SWMU), Regulated Units (RU), and Areas of Concern (AOC)), been **considered** in this EI determination?
- If yes - check here and continue with #2 below.
- If no - re-evaluate existing data, or
- if data are not available, skip to #8 and enter "IN" (more information needed) status code.

BACKGROUND

Definition of Environmental Indicators (for the RCRA Corrective Action)

Environmental Indicators (EI) are measures being used by the RCRA Corrective Action program to go beyond programmatic activity measures (e.g., reports received and approved, etc.) to track changes in the quality of the environment. The two EI developed to-date indicate the quality of the environment in relation to current human exposures to contamination and the migration of contaminated groundwater. An EI for non-human (ecological) receptors is intended to be developed in the future.

Definition of "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" EI

A positive "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" EI determination ("YE" status code) indicates that the migration of "contaminated" groundwater has stabilized, and that monitoring will be conducted to confirm that contaminated groundwater remains within the original "area of contaminated groundwater" (for all groundwater "contamination" subject to RCRA corrective action at or from the identified facility (i.e., site-wide)).

Relationship of EI to Final Remedies

While Final remedies remain the long-term objective of the RCRA Corrective Action program the EI are near-term objectives which are currently being used as Program measures for the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, GPRA). The "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" EI pertains ONLY to the physical migration (i.e., further spread) of contaminated ground water and contaminants within groundwater (e.g., non-aqueous phase liquids or NAPLs). Achieving this EI does not substitute for achieving other stabilization or final remedy requirements and expectations associated with sources of contamination and the need to restore, wherever practicable, contaminated groundwater to be suitable for its designated current and future uses.

Duration / Applicability of EI Determinations

EI Determinations status codes should remain in RCRIS national database ONLY as long as they remain true (i.e., RCRIS status codes must be changed when the regulatory authorities become aware of contrary information).

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)**

Page 2

2. Is **groundwater** known or reasonably suspected to be “contaminated”¹ above appropriately protective “levels” (i.e., applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, guidance, or criteria) from releases subject to RCRA Corrective Action, anywhere at, or from, the facility?

_____ If yes - continue after identifying key contaminants, citing appropriate “levels,” and referencing supporting documentation.

___x_ If no - skip to #8 and enter “YE” status code, after citing appropriate “levels,” and referencing supporting documentation to demonstrate that groundwater is not “contaminated.”

_____ If unknown - skip to #8 and enter “IN” status code.

Rationale and Reference(s):

1. Background

The Allied Baltimore Works facility is located on 20+ acres of a peninsula extending from the north side of Baltimore’s inner harbor on the Potapsco River. The facility includes a former manufacturing area, an area referred to as the southeast quadrant, and newly acquired contiguous properties. The processing of chrome ore into chemicals containing chromium took place at the facility for approximately one hundred years, through 1985. Allied investigated releases from the facility initially pursuant to an order issued by the State of Maryland Department of the Environment and later pursuant to a Consent Decree issued jointly by EPA and MDE. Information on the findings through 1991 are described in the Statement of Basis issued in 1991. Findings related to subsequent investigations of newly acquired properties are located in the project file.

2. Selected Remedy

The selected remedy for the former manufacturing area includes a deep barrier wall constructed over three (3) feet wide and over 70 feet deep into the transition zone of the bedrock, a multimedia cap, and an inward pumping system designed to maintain a 30-day average inward gradient of 0.01 feet. Groundwater is extracted from the system as needed to maintain an inward gradient on an hourly basis. Extracted groundwater is stored in tanks and transferred offsite for treatment. Construction of the barrier wall was completed in February 1996. The multimedia cap was completed in April, 1999. The 30-day average inward gradient performance standard was first achieved in April, 1999.

3. Cleanup Levels

The appropriately protective level for groundwater is defined in the Consent Decree and its exhibits as a surface water performance standard (50 ppb of total dissolved chromium). The standard was selected based on Ambient Water Quality Criteria established for a marine environment at the time the Consent Decree was entered in 1989. The appropriately protective levels exclude MCLs because the groundwater and surface water are not potential drinking water sources. MDE classified the deep (Patuxent) aquifer by the facility as a Type III aquifer in 1989. Information presented in Maryland Geological Survey 1985 Report of Investigations No. 43 identifies a large area of high salinity in the deep aquifer immediately downgradient of where Allied identified a chromium groundwater plume extending across the river and below the harbor. The shallow Potapsco aquifer discharges directly from the site into the adjacent surface waters of Baltimore’s inner harbor, classified as fresh water in MDE regulations.

4. Supporting Documentation

Supporting documentation on the level of contamination in groundwater and surface water is presented in quarterly progress reports submitted by Allied. Monthly surface water monitoring results demonstrate that the level of total dissolved chromium in the surface water dropped below the 50 ppb surface water performance standard established

in the Consent Decree and its exhibits at all monitoring locations in the months immediately following completion of construction of the barrier wall in February, 1996.

The level of total dissolved chromium has remained below the 20 ppb detection limit since mid 1996 and below the new 10 ppb detection limit since April, 1999 (note the new detection limit results from a change in laboratories). These levels are less than the 50 ppb total dissolved chromium surface water standard established in the Consent Decree and its exhibits for a marine environment and are below the ambient water quality criteria for a fresh water environment (11 ppb hexavalent chromium). Chromium in shallow groundwater outside the containment structure continues to be monitored for its effect on the harbor.

In April, 1999, groundwater from down gradient locations on contiguous property owned by Allied, the former Michael Silver property, was collected and analyzed for contaminants present in the soil on the property. The analytes included lead, and the following polynuclear aromatic compounds: naphthalene, benzo(a)anthracene, chrysene, benzo(b)fluoranthene, benzo(k)fluoranthene, benzo(a)pyrene, dibenz(a,h)anthracene, and indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene. As these locations were immediately east of a groundwater location where cyanide is present outside of the containment structure, the presence of cyanide was also analyzed. The analytical methods were selected on their ability to detect the presence of the analytes below applicable ambient water quality criteria. Note that no such method exists for benzo(a)pyrene and dibenz(a,h)anthracene, however the analytical method was selected for its ability to achieve the lowest possible detection limits. The unvalidated results preliminarily demonstrate that there were no detections of any of the specified analytes in groundwater.

Footnotes:

¹“Contamination” and “contaminated” describes media containing contaminants (in any form, NAPL and/or dissolved, vapors, or solids, that are subject to RCRA) in concentrations in excess of appropriate “levels” (appropriate for the protection of the groundwater resource and its beneficial uses).

Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)

Page 3

3. Has the **migration** of contaminated groundwater **stabilized** (such that contaminated groundwater is expected to remain within “existing area of contaminated groundwater”² as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination)?

----- If yes - continue, after presenting or referencing the physical evidence (e.g., groundwater sampling/measurement/migration barrier data) and rationale why contaminated groundwater is expected to remain within the (horizontal or vertical) dimensions of the “existing area of groundwater contamination”²).

----- If no (contaminated groundwater is observed or expected to migrate beyond the designated locations defining the “existing area of groundwater contamination”²) - skip to #8 and enter “NO” status code, after providing an explanation.

----- If unknown - skip to #8 and enter “IN” status code.

Rationale and

Reference(s): _____

² “existing area of contaminated groundwater” is an area (with horizontal and vertical dimensions) that has been verifiably demonstrated to contain all relevant groundwater contamination for this determination, and is defined by designated (monitoring) locations proximate to the outer perimeter of “contamination” that can and will be sampled/tested in the future to physically verify that all “contaminated” groundwater remains within this area, and that the further migration of “contaminated” groundwater is not occurring. Reasonable allowances in the proximity of the monitoring locations are permissible to incorporate formal remedy decisions (i.e., including public participation) allowing a limited area for natural attenuation.

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)**

Page 4

4. Does “contaminated” groundwater **discharge** into **surface water** bodies?

----- If yes - continue after identifying potentially affected surface water bodies.

----- If no - skip to #7 (and enter a “YE” status code in #8, if #7 = yes) after providing an explanation and/or referencing documentation supporting that groundwater “contamination” does not enter surface water bodies.

----- If unknown - skip to #8 and enter “IN” status code.

Rationale and

Reference(s): _____

Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)

Page 5

5. Is the **discharge** of “contaminated” groundwater into surface water likely to be “**insignificant**” (i.e., the maximum concentration³ of each contaminant discharging into surface water is less than 10 times their appropriate groundwater “level,” and there are no other conditions (e.g., the nature, and number, of discharging contaminants, or environmental setting), which significantly increase the potential for unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or eco-systems at these concentrations)?

----- If yes - skip to #7 (and enter “YE” status code in #8 if #7 = yes), after documenting: 1) the maximum known or reasonably suspected concentration³ of key contaminants discharged above their groundwater “level,” the value of the appropriate “level(s),” and if there is evidence that the concentrations are increasing; and 2) provide a statement of professional judgement/explanation (or reference documentation) supporting that the discharge of groundwater contaminants into the surface water is not anticipated to have unacceptable impacts to the receiving surface water, sediments, or eco-system.

----- If no - (the discharge of “contaminated” groundwater into surface water is potentially significant) - continue after documenting: 1) the maximum known or reasonably suspected concentration³ of each contaminant discharged above its groundwater “level,” the value of the appropriate “level(s),” and if there is evidence that the concentrations are increasing; and 2) for any contaminants discharging into surface water in concentrations³ greater than 100 times their appropriate groundwater “levels,” the estimated total amount (mass in kg/yr) of each of these contaminants that are being discharged (loaded) into the surface water body (at the time of the determination), and identify if there is evidence that the amount of discharging contaminants is increasing.

----- If unknown - enter “IN” status code in #8.

Rationale and

Reference(s): _____

³ As measured in groundwater prior to entry to the groundwater-surface water/sediment interaction (e.g., hyporheic) zone.

Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)

Page 6

6. Can the **discharge** of “contaminated” groundwater into surface water be shown to be “**currently acceptable**” (i.e., not cause impacts to surface water, sediments or eco-systems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented⁴)?

----- If yes - continue after either: 1) identifying the Final Remedy decision incorporating these conditions, or other site-specific criteria (developed for the protection of the site’s surface water, sediments, and eco-systems), and referencing supporting documentation demonstrating that these criteria are not exceeded by the discharging groundwater; OR 2) providing or referencing an interim-assessment,⁵ appropriate to the potential for impact, that shows the discharge of groundwater contaminants into the surface water is (in the opinion of a trained specialists, including ecologist) adequately protective of receiving surface water, sediments, and eco-systems, until such time when a full assessment and final remedy decision can be made. Factors which should be considered in the interim-assessment (where appropriate to help identify the impact associated with discharging groundwater) include: surface water body size, flow, use/classification/habitats and contaminant loading limits, other sources of surface water/sediment contamination, surface water and sediment sample results and comparisons to available and appropriate surface water and sediment “levels,” as well as any other factors, such as effects on ecological receptors (e.g., via bio-assays/benthic surveys or site-specific ecological Risk Assessments), that the overseeing regulatory agency would deem appropriate for making the EI determination.

----- If no - (the discharge of “contaminated” groundwater can not be shown to be “**currently acceptable**”) - skip to #8 and enter “NO” status code, after documenting the currently unacceptable impacts to the surface water body, sediments, and/or eco-systems.

----- If unknown - skip to 8 and enter “IN” status code.

Rationale and

Reference(s): _____

⁴ Note, because areas of inflowing groundwater can be critical habitats (e.g., nurseries or thermal refugia) for many species, appropriate specialist (e.g., ecologist) should be included in management decisions that could eliminate these areas by significantly altering or reversing groundwater flow pathways near surface water bodies.

⁵ The understanding of the impacts of contaminated groundwater discharges into surface water bodies is a rapidly developing field and reviewers are encouraged to look to the latest guidance for the appropriate methods and scale of demonstration to be reasonably certain that discharges are not causing currently unacceptable impacts to the surface waters, sediments or eco-systems.

Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)

Page 7

7. Will groundwater **monitoring** / measurement data (and surface water/sediment/ecological data, as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated groundwater has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the “existing area of contaminated groundwater?”

----- If yes - continue after providing or citing documentation for planned activities or future sampling/measurement events. Specifically identify the well/measurement locations which will be tested in the future to verify the expectation (identified in #3) that groundwater contamination will not be migrating horizontally (or vertically, as necessary) beyond the “existing area of groundwater contamination.”

----- If no - enter “NO” status code in #8.

----- If unknown - enter “IN” status code in #8.

Rationale and

Reference(s): _____

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)**

Page 8

8. Check the appropriate RCRIS status codes for the Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control EI (event code CA750), and obtain Supervisor (or appropriate Manager) signature and date on the EI determination below (attach appropriate supporting documentation as well as a map of the facility).

_x_____YE - Yes, "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" has been verified. Based on a review of the information contained in this EI determination, it has been determined that the "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater" is "Under Control" at the **Honeywell International, Inc.** facility , EPA ID # **MDD 06 939 6711**, located at **1000 Wills Street in Baltimore, Maryland 21231**. Specifically, this determination indicates that the migration of "contaminated" groundwater is under control, and that monitoring will be conducted to confirm that contaminated groundwater remains within the "existing area of contaminated groundwater" This determination will be re-evaluated when the Agency becomes aware of significant changes at the facility.

_____ NO - Unacceptable migration of contaminated groundwater is observed or expected.

_____ IN - More information is needed to make a determination.

Completed by (signature) _____ Date: 10-19-99
(print) Diane Schott
(title) Remedial Project Manager

Supervisor (signature) _____ Date 11-05-99
(print) Robert E. Greaves
(title) Chief, General Operations Branch
(EPA Region or State) EPA, Region 3

Locations where References may be found:

The RCRA File Room
The Administrative Record File
The RPM's office files

Contact telephone and e-mail numbers:

(name) __Diane Schott_____
(phone #) __215-814-3430_____
(e-mail) ____schott.diane@epa.gov_____