status

#### 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:	McKinney Products Company
Facility Address:	820 Davis Street, Scranton, Pennsylvania 18505
Facility EPA ID #:	PAD004320248

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?

$\boxtimes$	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) 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).

- 2. Is **groundwater** known or reasonably suspected to be **"contaminated"**<sup>1</sup> 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.
  - 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):

### General Facility Information

McKinney Products Company (McKinney or Facility) occupies 16-acres of a 33.6-acre parcel of land in the Borough of Moosic, Lackawanna County, Pennsylvania. The subject site is situated in an area that includes light industrial, commercial, and residential properties. McKinney has occupied the subject site since 1964. The Facility manufactured metal door hinges and other hardware at the site until manufacturing operations ceased in June 2007. The manufacturing processes were conducted in a 200,000 square foot building and included milling, drilling, tapping, blanking, broaching, parts washing, electroplating, powder coating, painting, and final assembly. ASSA ABLOY (parent company) bought McKinney in 1997 and is the current owner. The subject site is currently vacant.

Prior to 1964, the subject site was owned by Trane who manufactured heating and air conditioning units. Trane purchased the site from the Scranton Lackawanna Industrial Building Company (SLIBC) in 1956. SLIBC constructed the on-site building, but never performed operations at the Site. SLIBC purchased the site from the Scranton Industrial Development Company (SIDC) in 1948. During SIDC ownership, the site was undeveloped with no manufacturing operations. SIDC bought the site from an unknown owner in the early 1940s.

# Groundwater Investigation

In July and August 2007, as part of a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA), Cardinal Resources LLC (Cardinal) drilled four (4) exploratory borings at the site through unconsolidated material and into bedrock for the evaluation of groundwater conditions upgradient and downgradient of the site. The regional groundwater flow in the bedrock is to the northwest toward the Lackawanna River based on groundwater contour information. In developing the July 2007 Phase II ESA Work Plan, it was anticipated that monitoring wells would be installed within the first water-bearing unit encountered in each of the borings. However, during the field work, groundwater was not encountered at a drilling depth of 175 below ground surface (bgs). In addition, mine voids were encountered 92 to 118 feet bgs and the void areas ranged in thickness between 8 and 21 feet. Therefore, the proposed groundwater monitoring wells could not be installed due to the lack of groundwater and the presence of void areas. It is suspected that the voids are related to historic mining which has disrupted the normal flow of groundwater in this area.

The subject site is located in the middle third of Lackawanna County in the Wyoming-Lackawanna Valley. This is within the Appalachian Mountain Physiographic Section of the Valley and Ridge Province, which is also known as the Anthracite Coal Section. It averages six miles wide and trends in a southwest-northeast direction. Based on the regional information, the bedrock beneath the site is Llewellyn Formation of the Pennsylvania time period. This formation typically consists of interbedded sandstones, conglomerates, siltstone, shales, and numerous coal seams. The Llewellyn Formation contains a considerable quantity of water; however, historical subsurface mining performed in this area has impacted the regional groundwater throughout the area. In the coal basin, water from the Llewellyn Formation drains into the mines and becomes very acidic. In addition to the acidity, the historical mining operations have lowered the water table in the formation. The quality of the water is poor and is generally unfit for ordinary use due to the oxidation of the pyrite contained in the coal and associated shale.

With respect to groundwater as a source of drinking water, residents in the area are served by either public water supplies or by domestic wells. Pennsylvania American Water Company (PAWC) services the subject site and adjoining areas with potable water.

### **References:**

- (1) UST Closure/Site Characterization Report, Prepared by EPSI, 1993
- (2) Environmental Indicator Inspection Report, Prepared by URS, January 2007
- (3) Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Prepared by Cardinal Resources LLC, October 2006
- (4) Addendum to Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Prepared by Cardinal Resources LLC, July 2007
- (5) Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, Prepared by Cardinal Resources LLC, August 2007

### Footnotes:

"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. Has the **migration** of contaminated groundwater **stabilized** (such that contaminated groundwater is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated groundwater"<sup>2</sup> 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"<sub>2</sub>).
  - If no (contaminated groundwater is observed or expected to migrate beyond the designated locations defining the "existing area of groundwater contamination"<sub>2</sub>) 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):

<sup>2</sup> "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 af If no - skip to #7 (a

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):

- 5. Is the **discharge** of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water likely to be "**insignificant**" (i.e., the maximum concentration<sup>3</sup> 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 concentration<sub>3</sub> 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):

<sup>3</sup> 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<sub>4</sub>)?

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 <sub>5</sub> , 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):

<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> 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. 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):

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).

$\boxtimes$	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 McKinney Products
	Company facility, EPA ID # PAD004320248, located at 820 Davis Street, Scranton,
	Pennsylvania 18505. This determination will be re-evaluated if 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 4/27/2011
	(print) Jeanna R. Henry	
	(title) Remedial Project Manager	
	Office of Pennsylvania Remediation	
	EPA Region 3	
Supervisor	(signature)	Date <u>4/27/2011</u>
	(print) Paul Gotthold	
	(title) Associate Director	
	Office of Pennsylvania Remediation	
	EPA Region 3	

Locations where References may be found:

US EPA Region III Land & Chemicals Division 1650 Arch Street Philadelphia, PA 19103

Contact telephone and e-mail numbers

(name)	Jeanna R. Henry
(phone #)	215-814-2820
(e-mail)	henry.jeannar@epa.gov