

**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: Ephrata Manufacturing Company

Facility Address: 104 West Pine Street Ephrata, PA 17522

Facility EPA ID #: PAD061105441

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” (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).

**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?

\_\_\_\_\_ 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.”

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

**Rationale and Reference(s):** Operations at the facility resulted in the deposition of heavy-metal contaminated sludge and foundry sands at the site. A site investigation following the placement of a clay cover over the foundry sands and disposal pit revealed the presence of metal contaminants in groundwater springs. No groundwater was apparent during the subsurface investigation conducted as part of a recent Phase II investigation. A summary of evaluation of the groundwater springs data to ambient water quality criteria (AWQC) as presented in the Site Investigation (SI) report (NUS, 1991) is provided herein.

Groundwater was not encountered during the Phase II ESA investigation in August 2006 (AES, September 2006). Twenty borings were advanced in the vicinity of the USTs, of which 15 were advanced to maximum depths ranging from 12 to 16 feet bgs.

Historically, sludge, wastewater, and flyash that were disposed in the disposal pit contained hazardous levels of lead, mercury and cadmium. The depth of the disposal pit is reported to be approximately 13 feet bgs, which is shallower than the deepest boring at the site (16 feet bgs) that did not encounter groundwater. Given the absence of groundwater to a depth of the deepest boring, the spring water samples collected along the northern hillside may be considered as being representative of groundwater. Of the hazardous constituents, the spring water samples collected during the SI contained lead (35.3 µg/L and 4.3 µg/L), but no detectable concentrations of mercury (less than 0.2 µg/L) or cadmium (less than 3 µg/L). The lead concentration in the springs did not exceed the National Interim Primary Drinking Water Regulations of 50 µg/L (1991); however, the lead concentration in one sample exceeds the current residential and non-residential MSC for Used Aquifers (5 µg/L).

The SI report evaluated the spring samples as surface water. Of the historic hazardous constituents, only the lead concentrations in the spring samples exceeded the ambient water quality criterion (AWQC) of 3.2 µg/L. However, lead was not detected in the creek samples above its detection limit of 2 µg/L.

Among the other metals detected in the spring samples, copper (17.3 µg/L), iron (7,960 µg/L), and aluminum (5,010 µg/L) exceeded their AWQCs, which were 12 µg/L, 1,000 µg/L, and 87 µg/L, respectively. However, copper was not detected in the creek samples above its detection limit (3 µg/L). Iron was not detectable significantly above the field blank contamination level in the creek samples. Aluminum concentrations in the creek samples exceeded its AWQC (87 µg/L) with an increase from 91 µg/L upstream to 225 µg/L downstream of the confluence of the tributary with the creek.

Although springs were encountered northeast of the facility in 1990, shortly following the capping of the disposal area, their presence may have been the result of the remnant of drainage from saturated soil and groundwater. The existing clay cover and pavement likely limits the infiltration of rain into the area of the sludge disposal pit where sources of metal contamination are present.

---

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).

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control  
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)**

Page 3

The continued presence of maintained pavement covering the cap and surrounding area, and reduction in potential areas of ponded water because of the presence of the onsite storm-water drainage has likely reduced the shallow groundwater recharge, and may be the reason for the absence of groundwater springs in 2008 and 2009. However, the absence of groundwater springs should be verified after a period of precipitation, and during the Spring season.

Groundwater was not encountered during the documented subsurface investigations which ultimately leads to a data gap in the groundwater quality. The EPA and PADEP will continue to assist the stakeholders with identifying and designing a path forward to close this gap and promote the redevelopment of the property.

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”<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):

---

<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.

\_\_\_\_\_ 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):

**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<sup>4</sup>)?

\_\_\_\_\_ 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 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.

**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):

