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 (former Petrowax PA, Inc., McKean Plant)

Facility Address: P.O. Box 3367, Farmers Valley, Pennsylvania

Facility EPA ID #: **PAD 04 676 1763**

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?		
X	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.	

Has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to the

BACKGROUND

1.

<u>Definition of Environmental Indicators (for the RCRA Corrective Action)</u>

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 is under control, and that monitoring will be conducted to confirm that contaminated groundwater remains within the "existing 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 stabilizing the 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).

opriately protective
ards, guidelines,
t, or from, the facility?
ı

X	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):

a) Environmental indicator inspection report, dated October 2001.
b) the PADEP approval to discontinue GW monitoring program for the former Burn Dump, dated 1988.
c) Closure certification for the former hazardous waste Drum Storage, PADEP, November 9, 1995.
d) Semiannual GW monitoring for July-December, 1999.
Report dated February 16, 2000.
e) Installation operation and evacuation of dual-phase recovery system, 1995.
f) Waste disposal areas characterization report, dated October 1998.
g) Site characterization report, July 12, 1996.
h) RCRA report, US EPA Region III, Environmental Monitoring and Surveillance Branch, dated April 15,1993.

From 1985 until now several environmental investigations and corrective actions took a place at the plant. In June of 1992 as a result of the PADEP Notice of Violation 2,400 tons of residual waste were removed off-site for off-site disposal. According to the Report of October 2001 a Floating Separate Phase Hydrocarbons (FSPH) was detected in the groundwater (GW) samples. Some of the GW samples exceeded MSC for analyzed organic compound - benzo(a)pyrene, as well as for aluminum, beryllium, antimony, chromium, lead, and nickel. After evaluating the results of the Report the site-specific risk-based concentrations were recommended to be considered for GW and soil remediation.

Under the PADEP Land Recycling and Environmental Standards Act, Act 2, the concentrations of site-related constituent would be evaluated at the point where GW leaves the site - the Cole Creek, which is used for recreational activities. The GW contamination is currently maintained within the facility boundaries. The facility operates a FSPH recovery system in the Main Plant Area.

An additional GW and soil investigation in accordance with the provisions of EPA and the PADEP Land Recycling and Environmental Standards Act (Act 2) is necessary to protect human health and the environment.

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. Is 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): see page 2.

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?		
	X	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.	
	Ration	ale and Reference(s): see page 2.	

- 5. Is the discharge of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water likely to be "insignificant" (i.e., the maximum concentration 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)?
 - X 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 suspected 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 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): see page 2

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 implemented4)?
 - 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-assessment5 with documentation demonstrating that 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 include: surface water body size, flow, use/classification/habitats and contaminant loading limits, 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 yes - continue after either: 1) identifying the Final Remedy decision incorporating these

 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): see page 2.

 \mathbf{X}

- 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. 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?"
 - 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.

Rationale and Reference(s): see page 2.

- 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). 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.
 - 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., EPA ID # PAD 04 676 1763, located in Farmers Valley, Pennsylvania.

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

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

Locations where References may be found:

1650 Arch Street, 3WC22, EPA files.

Contact telephone and e-mail numbers:

(name) Ioff, Victoria (phone #) 215-814-3415

(e-mail) ioff.vickie@epa.gov

Completed by (signature) Date: <u>07-31-02</u>

(print) Ioff, Victoria

(title) Remedial Project Manager

Supervisor (signature) Date: <u>08-21-02</u>

(print) Gotthold, Paul

(title) PA Operations Branch Chief (EPA Region or State) EPA, Region 3