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: Penreco

Facility Address: 138 Petrolia Street, Karns City PA 16041

Facility EPA ID #: PAD065626822

| 1. | media | Has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to the groundwate media, subject to RCRA Corrective Action (e.g., from Solid Waste Management Units (SWMU), Regulated Unit (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 no - re-evaluate existing data, or | | |
| | | if data are not available, skip to #8 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).

| 2. | (i.e., applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, guidance, or criter from releases subject to RCRA Corrective Action, anywhere at, or from, the facility? | | |
|----|---|---|--|
| | \boxtimes | 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):

Key contaminants are total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH), which include primarily benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylene (BTEX) compounds. The facility operates a groundwater pumping system along the east bank of the south branch of Bear Creek to recover free product. Groundwater pumped by the system is treated by the on-site wastewater treatment system and is discharged to the south branch of Bear Creek via their NPDES permit.

Resorcinol and/or sulfonic acids are other contaminants that may be present in groundwater beneath the Penreco facility. These contaminants originated from other facilities in the vicinity of Penreco; Penreco's operations do not contribute to this source of contamination.

References: Phase I-IV Area Investigations, 1994-96; Revised Corrective Action Plan, 1999.

| 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):

Groundwater on both sides of the facility flows toward the south branch of Bear Creek and is intercepted by the groundwater pump-and-treat system. Prior to this system's operation, sheens were occasionally discovered on the south branch of Bear Creek downstream of the facility. Since the system began operation, sheens have no longer been observed on Bear Creek downstream of the facility. At specified locations throughout the facility, light non-aqueous phase liquid (LNAPL) thickness has been measured quarterly since system installation in 1999. LNAPL thickness has decreased significantly, from detections in several wells and a maximum thickness of 1.76 ft in April 2001 to one detection of 0.02 ft in November 2007.

Resources: Revised Corrective Action Plan, 1999; Quarterly Project Status Reports, October 2001 and January 2008.

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. | |
| | | | |

Rationale and Reference(s):

Since startup of the groundwater pumping system, groundwater contaminated by the facility has been recovered and discharged to an API separator to remove LNAPL, which is recovered and used as a fuel source on-site. The remaining water is pumped to an equalization basin and then to the on-site wastewater treatment plant, where the water is further treated and ultimately discharged to the south branch of Bear Creek via the facility's NPDES permit. The pumps used in the recovery system pump at a rate equal to the well yields, which maintain "drawdown" levels necessary for adequate groundwater capture. Since installation of this system, sheens have not been reported on Bear Creek in the vicinity of the facility.

Resources: Letter to K. Alan Dodd of Penreco from Baker Environmental, February 25, 2000; Quarterly Project Status Reports, 2001-2003, January 2008.

| 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)? | | | |
|---------|--|---|--|--|
| | | 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 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 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 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. | | |
| Rationa | ale and Re | eference(s): | | |
| | | | | |
| 3 As me | asured 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. 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 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. | |
| Ratio | nale and l | 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.

| 7. Will groundwater monitoring / measurement data (and surface water/sediment/ecological dat necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated groundwater has remained with horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area of contaminated ground" | | y) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated groundwater has remained within the | |
|---|---------|--|--|
| _ , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | | groundwater contamination will not be migrating horizontally (or vertically, as | |
| If no - enter "NO" status code in #8. | | If no - enter "NO" status code in #8. | |
| | | If unknown - enter "IN" status code in #8. | |
| Rationale and Reference(s): | | | |
| for four | consecu | NAPL thickness at specified locations will continue until no measurable LNAPL has been detected tive quarters of monitoring. These locations include piezometer P2-TB-4 and monitoring well P1-locations are the only two that contain measurable LNAPL thickness from the fourth quarter 2007 | |

report.

Resources: Revised Corrective Action Plan, 1999; Quarterly Project Status Report, January 2008.

| 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). | | | | |
|---------|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | on a review of the information contained in the "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater" is PAD065626822, located at 138 Petrolia Street | - Yes, "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" has been verified. Based a review of the information contained in this EI determination, it has been determined that the gration of Contaminated Groundwater" is "Under Control" at the Penreco facility, EPA ID # D065626822, located at 138 Petrolia Street, Karns City, Pennsylvania 16041. This ermination will be re-evaluated when the Agency becomes aware of significant changes at the lity. | | |
| | | NO - Unacceptable migration of contaminated groundwater is observed or expected. IN - More information is needed to make a determination. | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Completed by | (signature) /s/ (print) Griff Miller (title) Remedial Project Manager | Date7/31/08 | | |
| | Supervisor | (signature) /s/ (print) Paul Gotthold (title) PA Operations Branch Chief (EPA Region or State) EPA Region 3 | Date | | |
| Locatio | ns where Reference | ces may be found: | | | |
| | US EPA Region 1650 Arch Stree Philadelphia, PA | t | | | |
| Contact | (phone #) 215- | -mail: Miller -814-3407 er.griff@epa.gov | | | |