DOCUMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR DETERMINATION

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

Facility Name: Former Trojan Yacht

Facility Address: 167 Greenfield Road, Lancaster, PA 17601

Facility EPA ID #: PAD052922556

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).

· .	(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.	
Rational	e and Re	ference(s):	

The facility was situated on an approximately 26 acres of land in East Lampeter Township, Lancaster County, PA. In 1952, Shippen Realty Partners purchased the Site which was originally farmland. In 1954, Trojan Yacht leased the property and built the production building in 1955 for wooden pleasure boat production. Trojan Yacht owned the business until 1967 when Whittaker Corporation, located in Los Angeles, California took over. Whittaker owned the operation until approximately 1983 when Bertram-Trojan Incorporated (BTI), a division of Bertrex Corporation based in Miami, Florida, bought the business. In 1988, Bertrex Corporation was purchased by the investment group of G.L. Ohrstrom and Company. The construction of the boats began changing from wood to fiberglass in late 1960's. By 1980's, only fiberglass boats were produced. The manufacturing of yachts ceased in 1989.

Groundwater was investigated from 1992 through 2006. Detectable levels of acetone, PCE, 1,1,1-TCA, cis-1,2-DCE, MTBE, styrene, and MEK were identified in one or more of the samples. PCE concentrations exceeded its MCL and Act 2 groundwater MSC of 5 ug/l. The remaining parameters were found at levels less than their respective Act 2 Residential GW MSCs and MCLs. Groundwater attainment samples were collected in November 6, 2006, July 2007 and January 2008. The attainment sampling results were consistent with the characterization results. Only PCE was found at concentrations exceeding its MCL and Act 2 GW MSC. PCE was not used in the facility's manufacturing process. The groundwater investigation at the facility revealed that the contamination of PCE in the groundwater underneath the facility is not caused by the facility's releases, however, by the off-site sources. The regional contamination by PCE exists because of the historic industrial use in the site's vicinity. On November 20, 2007, PADEP approved the Areawide Non-use Aquifer Designation for City of Lancaster, PA (June 2008 Act 2 – Final Report, Former Trojan Yacht, East Lampeter Township, Lancaster County, PA).

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" 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):

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.	
		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.	
Rationa	ile and Re	eference(s):	

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 concentration 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.		
g.		If no - (the discharge of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water is potentially significant) - continue after documenting: 1) the maximum known or reasonably suspected concentrations 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 concentrationss 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.		
Rational	e and Re	ference(s):		

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

6.	not caus	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			
10		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 El 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.			
Rational	e and Re	ference(s):			

F

- 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?			
		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.		
Ration	ale and R	eference(s):		

7

		Environmental indicator (E1) KCKIS code (CA/50)
8.	Control EI (ever	priate RCRIS status codes for the Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under at code CA750), and obtain Supervisor (or appropriate Manager) signature and date on the a below (attach appropriate supporting documentation as well as a map of 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 Former Trojan Yacht facility, EPA ID # 052922556, located at 167 Greenfield Road, Lancaster, PA 17601. 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 reevaluated when 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 Supervisor	(signature) M. M. Date 3/15/2010 (print) Tran Tran (title) RPM (signature) Date 3/15/2010
		(title) Associate Director (EPA Region or State) USEPA Region 3
Locatio	ons where Reference	ces may be found:
	US EPA Region Waste & Chemic	III cals Management Division

1650 Arch Street Philadelphia, PA 19103

PADEP Southcentral Regional Office 909 Elmerton Avenue Harrisburg, PA 17110

Contact t	elephone and e-mail numbers	
	(name) Ms. Tran Tran	
	(phone #) 215-814-2079	
	(e-mail) tran.tran@epa.gov	