#### DOCUMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR DETERMINATION

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

Facility Name: Rockwood Pigments

Facility Address: 7011 Muirkirk Road, Beltsville, MD 20705

Facility EPA ID #: MDD062011796

1.	Has <b>all</b> 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 <b>considered</b> 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 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" El 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**

El 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.	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?		
	$\boxtimes$	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):

Shallow groundwater at the site has been investigated since 1985. Initially, seven monitoring wells were installed and tested for chromium, lead and zinc. Source removal was also conducted at this time. Later, as required by the 1987 Consent Order with Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE), semi-annual monitoring was conducted until the plan was amended in 1993 by Consent Order C-O-94-038 to a quarterly monitoring of three wells, MP-3, MP-6 and MP-7. In addition to parameters of temperature, pH, and specific conductivity, the wells have only been monitored for chromium. A second source area removal was conducted in 1997.

In accordance with a requirement of the 1993 Consent Order, the company submitted to the Department, at the end of a 5-year monitoring period, reports evaluating human health and ecological risks, and remedial options. The company concluded that no risk to human health is present as long as the groundwater is not used for domestic purposes, and that there was no ecological threat. The company also recommended institutional control/natural attenuation, from among the tested remediation alternatives, for implementation.

On July 6, 2000, MDE issued Amended Consent Order ACO-01-001, requiring the facility to continue to monitor wells MP-3 and MP-7 and report semi-annually for five years. The company was also required to submit a report at the end of the 5-year period, evaluating whether the monitoring results demonstrate natural attenuation of hexavalent chromium. This report was submitted on January 20, 2005, and it presented the conclusion that the natural attenuation of chromium is occurring.

During a 2008 geoprobe groundwater sampling event, hexavalent chromium was present in GW-1 at 9.17 parts per million (ppm), in GW-4 at .227 ppm, and in GW-6 at 2.17. The MCL for Total Chromium is .1 mg/l or ppm.

Rockwood Holdings was acquired in its entirety by Albemarle Corporation on January 13, 2015. Albermarle then began to lead the investigation of groundwater contamination.

During August 2016 groundwater sampling event, hexavalent chromium was present in Well A at .327 parts per million (ppm), in Well B at 2.7 ppm, and in Well C at 1.34 which are offsite wells and southeast of the site.

## Reference:

EPA RCRA Facility Inspection December 1, 2004 Rockwood Power Point presentation to EPA May 9, 2009 Arcadis Groundwater Sampling Memo January 29, 2018

## 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.	remain within "existing area of contaminated groundwater" as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination)?			
	$\boxtimes$	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):

On July 12, 2017, a sampling event was conducted of Beltsville Agricultural Research Center (BARC) wells 3, 4, and 6 for total and hexavalent chromium (unfiltered) downgradient of the Rockwood facility. No chromium was found in the groundwater. Records from an offsite FDA well southwest of the site show no chromium. The FDA well is sampled semiannually. Groundwater monitoring wells that were installed and existing offsite wells have delineated the plume. Groundwater sampling results over the years show the plume is stable and chrome concentrations are decreasing.

A review of long-term trends at MP-3 and MP-7 indicate that chromium concentrations have decreased over time and are currently approximately 30X the MCL of 0.1 mg/L (Figure 5). Concentrations are predicted to reach MCLs within 30 years based on linear regression analysis of the last eight monitoring events.

The plume limits do not make it to surface waters so there is no surface water discharge.

#### Reference(s):

EPA RCRA Facility Inspection December 1, 2004 Rockwood Power Point presentation to EPA May 9, 2009 Arcadis Groundwater Sampling Memo January 29, 2018

<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.

4.	Does "contaminated" groundwater discharge into surface water bodies?		
		If yes - continue after identifying potentially affected surface water bodies.	
	$\boxtimes$	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.	
The co	ontamina	Reference(s): ted groundwater plume does not reach any surface water bodies based on the groundwater sampling data that the plume.	
Refer	ence(s).		

Arcadis Groundwater Sampling Memo January 29, 2018

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)?		
ě	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 concentration3 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	le and Re	ference(s):	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> As measured in groundwater prior to entry to the groundwater-surface water/sediment interaction (e.g., hyporheic) zone.

6.	Can the <b>discharge</b> of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water be shown to be " <b>currently acceptable</b> " (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 <sub>4</sub> )?		
		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 ecosystems), 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 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.	
Ration	ale and F	Reference(s):	
		×	
		areas of inflowing groundwater can be critical habitats (e.g., nurseries or thermal refugia)	

<sup>4</sup> 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.

s 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 <b>monitoring</b> / 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.	
Ratio	nale and	Reference(s):	
consti	tuents inc	remedy will consist of ongoing groundwater monitoring of the existing well network for site related luding chrome and hexavalent chromium. The proposed monitoring program would include at least annual icility wells.	
Refer	ence(s):		

Arcadis Groundwater Sampling Memo January 29, 2018

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).				
		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 Rockwood Pigments EPA ID # MDD062011796, 7011 Muirkirk Road, Beltsville, MD 20705. 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 grou	indwater is observed or expected.		
		IN - More information is needed to make a determination.			
	Completed by	(signature) Loner of Elb Hone Leonard E. Hotham Environmental Engineer	Date 5 /8/2018		
	Supervisor	(signature) Luis Pizarro	Date <u>5 /8 / 18</u>		
		Associate Director Land and Chemicals Division EPA Region III			
Locati	ons where Reference	ces may be found:			
US EPA Region III Waste & Chemicals Management Division 1650 Arch Street Philadelphia, PA 19103					
Contac	ct telephone and e-r Leonard E. Hoth				
	215-814-5778	(Alama cau			
	Hotham.Leonard@epa.gov				