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: NewChem, Inc. (Formerly Thiokol-Specialty Chemicals Division Facility Address: 7743 Ohio River Blvd, New Cumberland, West Virginia 26047.

Facility EPA ID #: WVD 074968413

1.	media	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?			
	\boxtimes	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			

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).

2.	(i.e., ap	Is groundwater known or reasonably suspected to be " contaminated " 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?		
	\boxtimes	If yes - continue after identifying key contaminants, citing appropriate "levels," and referencing supporting documentation.		
		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.		
Rationa	le and Re	ference(s):		

Groundwater samples collected in May 2006, November 2009, and May 2010 revealed concentrations of trichloroethene (TCE) which exceeded the Maximum Contaminant Levels ("MCLs") in site-adjacent well sample MW-MP6 (31 ug/l) and on-site well MW-2D (12 ug/l). Additional volatile and semivolatile contaminants including chlorobenzene (up to 49 ug/l), 4-chloroaniline (up to 140+ ug/l), caprolactam (up to 200+ ug/l), isopropyl benzene (up to 24 ug/l), and 1,1,1-trichloroethane (up to 3.4 ug/l) were also reported in on-site and site-adjacent groundwater samples. Reported concentrations of these five contaminants were below MCLs (where available) and/or tapwater RBCs.

See References on page 8.

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).

	n within "existing area of contaminated groundwater" as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the 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.

3. Has the migration of contaminated groundwater stabilized (such that contaminated groundwater is expected to

Rationale and Reference(s): Analytical results from groundwater sampling events during 2006, 2009, and 2010 revealed a few incidents where the concentration of TCE slightly exceeded the MCL for that constituent. However, groundwater in the immediate site vicinity is not used for drinking water purposes. Furthermore, a monitoring well several hundred feet downgradient of the contaminated wells revealed no organic contamination, indicating that the contamination is likely removed through natural degradation processes before reaching the downgradient well.

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.

١.	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):

Several site investigations have been conducted during the operational history of the Facility. A May 2006 Site Inspection Reassessment sampling event was conducted at the facility by Triad Engineering under contract with the WVDEP. This investigation included surface water sampling of nearby Dry Run and two large ponds located a few hundred feet down gradient of the facility. Surface water samples did not reveal any site-related contamination. Therefore, future sampling events did not include surface water sampling and analyses.

See References page 8.

5.	Is the discharge of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water likely to be " insignificant " (i.e., the maximum concentration ³ 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.		
Ration	nale and R	teference(s):		

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

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 implemented ₄)?		
		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.	
Ration	nale and I	Reference(s):	

- ⁴Note, 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.

7.	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):

EPA's corrective action goal for Facility groundwater is to restore groundwater to drinking water standards established by the MCLs. EPA's proposed remedy for the NewChem site is the treatment of groundwater at select monitoring well locations (monitoring wells MP6, MW-6D, and MW-2D at a minimum) along with the verification evaluation of the effectiveness of the selected treatment method through the completion of a groundwater monitoring program.

The goal of the proposed injection treatment element of the remedy is to promote the natural degradation of the chlorinated organic compounds like TCE. A number of companies have developed compounds that are used to enhance and accelerate the natural attenuation process. NewChem will evaluate some of these compounds for use at the Facility. The goal of the monitoring element of the remedy is to ensure that groundwater contamination is not migrating off-site at concentrations that exceed respective cleanup levels and that on-site concentrations of contaminates continue to be reduced through natural attenuation; and to verify the effectiveness of the treatment element of the remedy.

NewChem will be required to perform the Enhanced Natural Attenuation and Monitoring Program at the Facility until drinking water standards are restored throughout the groundwater plume. If the goal of restoring drinking water standards is not attainable within a reasonable time frame, to be determined by EPA, based on an engineering perspective, NewChem will evaluate other remediation options as necessary.

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).				
		YE - Yes, "Migration of Contamin on a review of the information con "Migration of Contaminated Grow Thiokol- Specialty Chemicals Di River Blvd, New Cumberland, V indicates that the migration of "co will be conducted to confirm that contaminated groundwater" This of aware of significant changes at the	ntained in this EI determination indwater" is "Under Control" a ivision), EPA ID# WVD 0749 West Virginia 26047. Specific intaminated" groundwater is ur contaminated groundwater rendetermination will be re-evaluated.	n, it has been determined that the the NewChem (formerly 168413, located at 7743 Ohio cally, this determination der control, and that monitoring mains within the "existing area of	
		NO - Unacceptable migration of c	ontaminated groundwater is ob	oserved or expected.	
		IN - More information is needed t	o make a determination		
	Refere	nces:			
		spection Reassessment Final Report ia 26505. March 19, 2007.	Reassessment Final Report, Submitted by Triad Engineering , Inc., Morgantown, West . March 19, 2007.		
	Cumbe	nmental Site Assessment Report, Deerland, Hancock County, West Virgi Morgantown, West Virginia 26505.	nia. Prepared by Triad Engine		
	Completed by	Bill Wentworth Remedial Project Manager	Date 1/5/2011		
	Supervisor	Luis Pizarro Associate Director EPA Region III	Date 1/10/2011		
Locatio	ons where Referer	nces may be found:			
	US EPA Region Waste & Chemi 1650 Arch Stree Philadelphia, PA	icals Management Division et			
Contac	t telephone and e- Bill Wentworth 215-814- 3184 wentworth.willi		_		