

**DOCUMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR DETERMINATION**  
**RCRA Corrective Action**  
**Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)**

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control**

Facility Name: Electro-Platers of York  
Facility Address: 209 East Willow Street Wrightsville, PA 17368  
Facility EPA ID #: PAD015139470

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 #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” (foall 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 withsources 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**”<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?

  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 “contaminated.”

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

**Rationale and Reference(s):** Electroplaters of York (EPY) was an electroplating facility that was contracted by various businesses who supplied prefinished metal components for custom electroplating. EPY conducted operations at the facility from 1968 until December 21, 2004. Electroplating operations included: plating with zinc, cadmium, chromium, nickel, brass and silver; pickling steel; and depositing electroless nickel. Wastewater treatment for destruction of cyanide, chromium reduction, chemical precipitation, flocculation, coagulation, and settling with sludge dewatering occurred on site. The facility used trichloroethene (TCE) for vapor degreasing.

A Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) (ECS, March 2006) included installation of temporary monitoring wells. The limited investigation was performed in effort to determine whether historical uses of the property had resulted in adverse impacts to the environmental integrity of the property. The ESA presented groundwater sampling and analytical results from two of 12 direct-push borings, eight temporary monitoring wells, and two existing production wells. Trichloroethylene (TCE); 1,2-Dichloroethylene (1,2-DCE), vinyl chloride (VC), and Cadmium were identified in select wells exceeding their respective PADEP Non-Residential Used Aquifer MSCs.

The facility was previously used for industrial purposes and it is currently owned by the Wrightsville Borough with intended use for non-residential purposes (i.e., recreational uses). Therefore, for the purposes of this EI, a preliminary evaluation of the groundwater data using Non-Residential Used Aquifer MSCs was conducted.

**References:**

Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment - ECS, March 2006  
Environmental Indicator Report – Baker, September 2010  
EPA Region III Brownfield Assessment Grant Number 004096475 documents:  
Status Update – September 2015  
Quarterly Progress Report Third Quarter 2016  
Revised Work Plan and Schedule 9/7/2016  
Quarterly Progress Report Fourth Quarter 2016  
Quarterly Progress Report First Quarter 2017  
Quarterly Progress Report Second Quarter 2017

---

<sup>1</sup> “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”<sup>2</sup> as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination)?

  X   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”<sup>2</sup>.

       If no (contaminated groundwater is observed or expected to migrate beyond the designated locations defining the “existing area of groundwater contamination”<sup>2</sup>) - 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):**

The vertical and horizontal extent of groundwater contamination could not be determined within the scope of the Limited Phase II ESA due to only the installation of temporary monitoring wells; therefore, the Wrightsville Borough applied for, and received an EPA Region III Brownfield Assessment Grant (BAG) to perform investigation activities to determine the nature and extent of identified contamination.

As part of the BAG investigation, five pairs of nested groundwater monitoring wells (5 shallow @ ~25 ft deep and 5 deeper @ ~ 100 ft deep) were installed to complement the existing EPY wells in analyzing groundwater conditions. During the first sampling event, TCE and VC were detected at concentrations above their respective PADEP Non-Residential Used Aquifer MSCs and EPA Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) in 5 of the 12 groundwater wells. Based on the second round of groundwater sampling, the results were the same or lower suggesting a stable or declining concentration plume. This trend continued through to the most recent sampling event (May 2016).

---

<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.

**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.

  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):**

The First Quarter 2017 Quarterly Progress Report discusses that concentrations of identified contaminants have been modeled to confirm no unacceptable risks with respect to discharge to the river. The Second Quarter 2017 Quarterly Progress Report explains there was continued work with the groundwater fate and transport modeling for potential discharges to the adjacent river. However, the most recent round of groundwater monitoring results (May 2016) available to the EPA indicate that no wells adjacent the river have concentrations of contaminants exceeding any of their respective MSCs or MCLs. Groundwater modeling is being finalized and expected to be presented in the Remedial Investigation and Cleanup Report to confirm that contaminated groundwater does not discharge into surface water.

**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 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<sup>3</sup> 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 concentration<sup>3</sup> 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 concentrations<sup>3</sup> 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.

**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 implemented)?

\_\_\_\_\_ 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,<sup>5</sup> appropriate to the potential for impact, that shows the discharge of groundwater contaminants into the surface wateris (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):

