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	y Name:	SKF USA Inc.
Facility	y Address:	1000 Logan Boulevard, Altoona, PA 16601
Facility	y EPA ID#:	PAD004344172
1.	groundwater med	relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to the dia, subject to RCRA Corrective Action (e.g., from Solid Waste Management Units ated Units (RU), and Areas of Concern (AOC)), been considered in this EI determination?
	<u>X</u>	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).

2.	"levels	" (i.e., ap	plicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, eria) from releases subject to RCRA Corrective Action, anywhere at, or from, the facility?
		<u>X</u>	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.
	Ration	ale and I	Reference(s):
perforr cutting	acturing p med. As a soil, mach	rocesses, a result of nining chi	operated a ball bearings manufacturing facility in Altoona from 1951 to 2004. In the machining, heat treating, grinding, honing, and assembly and packaging operations were f these operations, wastes were generated including waste hydraulic oil, synthetic coolant, ps, grinding scrap, spent solvents, and acid. During closures of some of the SWMUs, wered at the SKF facility.
tetrach Depart specific 28, 200	roethane, loroethen ment of E c concent	1,1-dichle e, 1,1,1-ti Environme rations (N ned Reme	is found contaminated with volatile organic compounds including 1,1-dichloroethane, 1,2-broethene, cis-1,2-dichloroethene, 1,4-dioxane, dichloromethane (methylene chloride), richloroethane, trichloroethene, and vinyl chloride at levels above the Pennsylvania ental Protection (PADEP) Statewide Health Standard (SHS) non-residential medium - MSCs) for used aquifers and the federal maximum contaminant levels (MCLs). (February edial Investigation Report, Risk Assessment report, and Final Report, Former SKF USA.).
Footno	otes:		
	dissolve	ed, vapor	" and "contaminated" describes media containing contaminants (in any form, NAPL and/or s, or solids, that are subject to RCRA) in concentrations in excess of appropriate "levels" the protection of the groundwater resource and its beneficial uses).
3.	expecte	d to rema	on of contaminated groundwater stabilized (such that contaminated groundwater is ain within "existing area of contaminated groundwater" as defined by the monitoring ated at the time of this determination)?
		<u>X</u>	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 - skin to #8 and enter "IN" status code

Rationale and Reference(s):

SKF maintained and operated a pump-and-treat groundwater remediation system from March 1995 to November 2006. The groundwater recovery system had been shown to be effective as an inplace control limiting the expansion of the existing groundwater plume. Furthermore, the groundwater remediation system had demonstrated effectiveness in mitigating dissolved phase chlorinated hydrocarbon impact to groundwater in the northern portion of the property, as evidence by historical analytical groundwater monitoring data indicating that target constituents generally demonstrated overall decreased concentrations during the period of operation. From June 2006 to March 2007, SKF implemented a groundwater remediation program involving in-situ chemical oxidation of chlorinated compounds using a modified Fenton's reagent in an effort to address the dissolved-phase chlorinated hydrocarbon groundwater impacts in the northern portion of the property. Following these remediation programs, groundwater fate and transport modeling was performed to determine if affected groundwater was migrating off the site at unacceptable concentrations. The 5 compounds 1,1-DCA, 1,2-DCA, 1,1-DCE, 1,4-dioxane, and methylene chloride were modeled to stabilize at concentrations below respective residential MSCs and MCLs at the property boundary. The 5 compounds cis-1,2-DCE, PCE, 1,1,1-TCA, TCE, and vinyl chloride were modeled to stabilize at their respective residential MSCs and MCLs at distances ranging from 5 to 134 feet beyond the property boundary. The facility attained the Act 2 site specific standard for groundwater through risk assessment and pathway elimination. The migration of contaminated groundwater is considered stabilized. (February 28, 2008 Combined Remedial Investigation Report, Risk Assessment report, and Final Report, Former SKF USA Inc. Facility, Altoona, PA; PADEP's approval of Remedial Investigation/Risk Assessment/Final Report, PADEP Letter dated July 3, 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.

١.	Does "contaminated" groundwater discharge into surface water bodies?	
		If yes - continue after identifying potentially affected surface water bodies.
	<u>X</u>	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 contaminants were modeled to stabilize at their respective residential MSCs and MCLs at distances ranging from 5 to 134 feet beyond the property boundary to the north of the property. The nearest surface water

bodies are Mill Run (located approximately 1/4 mile west of the property) and Brush Run (located approximately ½ mile to the east of the property), both of which generally exhibit a north-south orientation and flow toward the south (February 28, 2008 Combined Remedial Investigation Report, Risk Assessment report, and Final Report, Former SKF USA Inc. Facility, Altoona, PA).

Is the discharge of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water likely to be "insignificant" (i.e., the

5.

	appropriate grou discharging cont	ntration' of each contaminant discharging into indwater "level," and there are no other condi- taminants, or environmental setting), which sign pacts to surface water, sediments, or eco-system	tions (e.g., the nature, and number, of gnificantly increase the potential for
•		If yes - skip to #7 (and enter "YE" status co the maximum known or reasonably suspected discharged above their groundwater "level," there is evidence that the concentrations are professional judgement/explanation (or refedischarge of groundwater contaminants into unacceptable impacts to the receiving surface	ed concentration ³ of key contaminants the value of the appropriate "level(s)," and if increasing; and 2) provide a statement of rence documentation) supporting that the the surface water is not anticipated to have
		the value of the appropriate "level(s)," and i increasing; and 2) for any contaminants disc greater than 100 times their appropriate grow (mass in kg/yr) of each of these contaminants	the maximum known or reasonably and discharged above its groundwater "level," of there is evidence that the concentrations are charging into surface water in concentrations and undwater "levels," the estimated total amount its that are being discharged (loaded) into the mination), and identify if there is evidence that
		If unknown - enter "IN" status code in #8.	*
	Rationale and R	leference(s):	
	³ As measured in hyporheic) zone.	n groundwater prior to entry to the groundwat	er-surface water/sediment interaction (e.g.,
5.	acceptable" (i.e.	ge of "contaminated" groundwater into surfac, not cause impacts to surface water, sedimen a final remedy decision can be made and imp	ts or eco-systems that should not be allowed
		conditions, or other site-specific criteria (de water, sediments, and eco-systems), and refedemonstrating that these criteria are not exce 2) providing or referencing an interim-assessimpact, that shows the discharge of groundward.	eeded by the discharging groundwater; OR

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 interimassessment (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.

	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 R	eference(s):
for many species,	areas of inflowing groundwater can be critical habitats (e.g., nurseries or thermal refugia), appropriate specialist (e.g., ecologist) should be included in management decisions that hese areas by significantly altering or reversing groundwater flow pathways near surface
rapidly developin methods and scal	ling of the impacts of contaminated groundwater discharges into surface water bodies is a glifeld and reviewers are encouraged to look to the latest guidance for the appropriate e of demonstration to be reasonably certain that discharges are not causing currently eacts to the surface waters, sediments or eco-systems.
necessary) be col	monitoring / measurement data (and surface water/sediment/ecological data, as lected in the future to verify that contaminated groundwater has remained within the tical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area of contaminated groundwater?"
<u>X</u>	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.

Rationale and Reference(s):

7.

The facility attained Act 2 cleanup standards.(PADEP's approval of Remedial Investigation/Risk Assessment/Final Report, Letter dated July 3, 2008). No further groundwater monitoring is necessary.

If unknown - enter "IN" status code in #8.

	iate RCRIS status codes for the Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control 750), and obtain Supervisor (or appropriate Manager) signature and date on the EI
	w (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 El letermination, it has been determined that the "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater" is "Under Control" at the SKF USA Inc. facility, EPA ID # PAD004344172, located at 1000 Logan Boulevard, Altoona, PA 16601. 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 secomes aware of significant changes at the facility.
1	NO - Unacceptable migration of contaminated groundwater is observed or expected.
I	N - More information is needed to make a determination.
	(signature) Am Am Agama Date 7/31/08 (print) Tran Tran (title) RCRA Project Manager
Supervisor	(signature) (print) Paul Gotthold (title) Chief, PA Operations Branch
_	(EPA Region or State) EPA Region 3
USEPA Region 3	References may be found: cal Management Division
107	
Contact telephone	and e-mail numbers:
(name)	Tran Tran
(phone #	215-814-2079
(e-mail)	tran.tran@epa.gov