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: American National Can Company

Facility Address: 221 South 10th Street, Lemoyne, PA 17043

Facility EPA ID #: PAD003024551

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 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 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).

۷.	(i.e., applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, guidance, or crite 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):

Background: The facility consisted of an approximately 38 acres property bordered on the east and northeast by South10th Street. The north and northwest was bound by a railroad line. The west and south side is bound by South 18th Street and S.R. 581 (Harrisburg Expressway).

The former facility consisted of seven buildings which occupied an overall footprint of approximately 260,000 square feet. The buildings were expanded to cover a total area of approximately 886,000 square feet with structures and associated paved areas covering approximately 85 percent of the total area of the property. The property is currently a warehouse facility. American Can Company was the original owner and operator of the facility, later known as American National Can Company until it ceased operations in 1993. The facility is currently owned by Keystone Lemoyne Partners, LP.

Wastes generated from the manufacturing process included wastewater containing lead, and solvents, methyl isobutyl ketone (MIBK), xylene, toluene, acetone, lacquer, methylene chloride, tetrachloroethylene (PCE). The facility received Act 2 release in 2001 that required land and groundwater uses restrictions.

Groundwater investigations were conducted at the facility. Five onsite groundwater monitoring wells were installed at the facility (MW-1 – MW-5). Based on site investigations, the main groundwater flow system beneath the site is generally northeast/east toward South 10th Street. MW-1, MW-3 and MW-4 were downgradient wells to the northeast/east. A secondary groundwater flow system is generally south/southeast from the contaminant source area toward downgradient monitoring well MW-5 located near property boundary/Route 581. PCE was detected in groundwater beneath the facility at concentrations as high as 110 ug/l, above the MCL of 5 ug/l. TCE was detected in groundwater beneath the facility at concentrations as high as 8.8 ug/l, above the MCL of 5 ug/l.

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).

Г	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)?		
12	\boxtimes	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 results indicated that migration of contaminated groundwater stabilized. PCE has been degrading and PCE concentrations have been decreasing. The last groundwater results in 2001 showed that PCE was detected in onsite downgradient monitoring wells at concentration as high as 12 ug/l, slightly above the MCL. TCE was detected in these wells at concentrations as high as 2 ug/l, below the MCL. As PCE continues to attenuate naturally, PCE is predicted to migrate off-site at very low concentrations along Route 581 and the PCE contaminated groundwater plume above the MCL is predicted to be shrinking and confined within the facility's property.

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 "	aminated" 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):			

5.	concentration grounds or environments	the discharge of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water likely to be "insignificant" (i.e., the maximum neentration ³ of each contaminant discharging into surface water is less than 10 times their appropriate bundwater "level," and there are no other conditions (e.g., the nature, and number, of discharging contaminants, environmental setting), which significantly increase the potential for unacceptable impacts to surface water, liments, 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.		
Dations	la and Da	formula (a)		

Rationale and Reference(s):

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 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-assessments, 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.	
Ration	ale and R	eference(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 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.	
Rationa	le and Re	ference(s):	
decreasi		water monitoring results showed that PCE continued to attenuate naturally and PCE concentrations were	

 Check the appropriate RCRIS status codes for the Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Ur Control EI (event code CA750), and obtain Supervisor (or appropriate Manager) signature and EI determination below (attach appropriate supporting documentation as well as a map of the f 			opriate Manager) signature and date on the
		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 American National Can Company facility, EPA ID # 003024551, located at 221 South 10 th Street, Lemoyne, PA, 17043. 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.	
		NO - Unacceptable migration of contaminated	d groundwater is observed or expected.
		IN - More information is needed to make a de	termination.
	Completed by Supervisor	(signature) An A A A Tran Tran RCRA Project Manager (signature) Paul Gotthold Associate Director EPA Region 3	Date 11/6/2017 Date 11/6/2017
Location	ns where Reference	es may be found:	
	US EPA Region Land & Chemica 1650 Arch Street Philadelphia, PA	als Division	
Contact			