DOCUMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR DETERMINATION

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

Facility	Name:	Ametek	
Facility Address: Facility EPA ID #:		900 Clymer Ave., Sellersville, PA 18960 PAD 002 342 236	
	<u>X</u>	If yes - check here and continue with #2 below.	
		If no - re-evaluate existing data, or	
		if data are not available skip to #6 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).

Page 2

2.	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?
	X 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

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

"contaminated."

Rationale and Reference(s):

As part of the RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI) Ametek installed approximately 40 wells throughout the facility's property and sampled several offsite residential and municipal wells to delineate the groundwater plume. Elevated volatile organic compounds (VOCs) above EPA's Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) were detected in several of the wells. Constituents of concern and their range of concentrations are listed below: (Ametek RFI Report 2/1997, Groundwater Sampling Report 1/2000, Additional Environ. Investigation Activities Report 5/03)

Constituents	Concentrations (ug/L)	MCLs (ug/L)
Trichloroethylene	3 - 48,000	5
Tetrachloroethene	2 - 6,200	5
1,1 - Dichloroethene (DCE)	ND - 1,600	7
cis - 1,2 -DCE	ND - 23,000	70
Vinyl chloride	ND - 26	2

ND: non-detect

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).

3.

3.	Has the migration of contaminated groundwater stabilized (such that contaminated groundwater is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated groundwater" as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination)?		
	<u>X</u>	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 F	Reference(s):	
1 mat	als anaratas a numn	and treat system to remediate and to control groundwater migration. Managined	

Ametek operates a pump-and-treat system to remediate and to control groundwater migration. Measured groundwater elevations indicate that the system has a sufficient cone of influence to control groundwater migration. Sentinel and offsite municipal wells are sampled routinely to monitor the extent of the groundwater plume. Recent groundwater results from these wells detected levels below MCLs. These results indicate that the groundwater plume is stabilized within the existing area of contamination and further confirm that the pump-and-treat system is effectively controlling groundwater migration. (Groundwater Sampling Report 1/2000, Additional Environ. *Investigation Activities Report 5/03)*

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.

4.	Does "contaminated" groundwater discharge into surface water bodies?		
		If yes - continue after identifying potentially affected surface water bodies.	
	X	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 surface water samples were collected along East Branch/Perkiomen Creek, which is located approximately a quarter mile north of the facility and in the direction of the groundwater flow. Levels of VOCs below EPA regulatory standards for fresh water were detected in surface water. The results indicate that the nearby surface water is not impacted by the groundwater plume. However, after further evaluation of the surface water elevations relative to the surrounding groundwater elevations, it was determined that the East Branch/Perkiomen Creek was a losing stream. Therefore, the groundwater plume maybe migrating beneath and beyond the Creek. To determine the extent of the groundwater plume in the direction of the Creek, Ametek installed two nested wells between the facility and the Creek. The results from these wells were well below MCLs, which conclude that groundwater plume is stabilized by the current pump-and-treat system and does not extent beyond the East Branck/Perkiomen Creek. (Ametek RFI Report 2/1997, Groundwater Sampling Report 1/2000, Additional Environ. Investigation Activities Report 5/03)

5.	maximum conce appropriate grou discharging cont	of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water likely to be " insignificant " (i.e., the ntration³ of each contaminant discharging into surface water is less than 10 times their ndwater "level," and there are no other conditions (e.g., the nature, and number, of aminants, or environmental setting), which significantly increase the potential for pacts 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 concentration ³ of <u>key</u> 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 concentration ³ of <u>each</u> 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 concentrations ³ 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 F	Reference(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.
	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.

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?"		
	X	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.	
	Rationala and E	Pataranca(s):	

Rationale and Reference(s):

Presently the facility will sample the wells quarterly to monitor the groundwater plume and to verify that the plume is not migrating beyond the existing areas of contamination. In the future as conditions change, the facility may propose modifications to the monitoring program to reflect current groundwater conditions and to ensure continual effective monitoring of the groundwater plume. (Groundwater Sampling Report 1/2000, Additional Environ. Investigation Activities Report 5/03)

Page 8

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 Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" has be 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 Ametek facility, EPA ID # PAD 00 342 236, located at 900 Clymer Ave., Sellersville, PA 18960. Specifically, 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.			tained in this EI ration of Contaminated cility, EPA ID # PAD 002 PA 18960. Specifically, this minated" groundwater is d to confirm that ting area of contaminated ted when the Agency
	NO - Unacceptable migration of contaminated groundwater is observed or expecte		
	IN - More in	nformation is needed to make a determ	ination.
Completed by	(signature)	/s/	Date 5/9/03
1 3	(print)	Khai M. Dao	
	(title)	RCRA Project Manager	
Supervisor	(signature)	/s/	Date <u>5/9/03</u>
	(print)	Paul Gotthold	
	(title)	Branch Chief, RCRA Corrective	
		Action, PA Operations	<u> </u>
	(EPA Regio	n or State) Region 3	

Locations where References may be found:

US EPA Region III Waste and Chemical Mgmt. Division 1650 Arch Street Philadelphia, PA 19103

Contact telephone and e-mail numbers:

(name)	Khai M. Dao
(phone #)	(215) 814-5467
(e-mail)	dao.khai@epa.gov