



UNITED STATES  
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
REGION III

STATEMENT OF BASIS

PEMCO INC. LOT 28 PARCEL  
5601 EASTERN AVE  
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

EPA ID NO. MDD0003093499

Prepared by  
Land Chemicals and Redevelopment Division  
May 2020

## Table of Contents

<b>Section 1: Introduction</b> .....	1
<b>Section 2: Facility Background</b> .....	2
<b>Section 3: Summary of Environmental Investigations</b> .....	3
<b>Section 4: Corrective Action Objectives</b> .....	9
<b>Section 5: Proposed Remedy</b> .....	10
<b>Section 6: Evaluation of Proposed Remedy</b> .....	13
<b>Section 7: Financial Assurance</b> .....	16
<b>Section 8: Public Participation</b> .....	17
<b>Section 9: Index to Administrative Record</b> .....	18

## List of Acronyms

AOC	Area of Concern
AR	Administrative Record
COC	Contaminant of Concern
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FDRTC	Final Decision Response to Comments
GPRA	Government Performance and Results Act
MCL	Maximum Contaminant Level
MDE	Maryland Department of the Environment
PAH	Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbon
RAP	Remedial Action Plan
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
SL	Screening Level
SVOC	Semi Volatile Organic Compound
SB	Statement of Basis
UST	Underground Storage Tank
VOC	Volatile Organic Compound

## Section 1: Introduction

---

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has prepared this Statement of Basis (SB) to solicit public comment on its proposed remedy for the seven-acre Lot 28 Parcel (Parcel), on the eastern side of the former Pemco Baltimore Plant located in Baltimore, Maryland (Facility). EPA's proposed remedy for the Parcel consists of the following components: 1) compliance with and maintenance of groundwater and land use restrictions to be implemented through institutional controls; 2) vapor intrusion controls; and 3) capping of the Parcel with clean soil, asphalt, or concrete. This SB highlights key information relied upon by EPA in proposing its remedy for the Parcel.

The Facility is subject to EPA's Corrective Action program under the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, commonly referred to as the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), 42 U.S.C. § 6901 *et seq.* The Corrective Action program requires that owners and operators of facilities subject to certain provisions of RCRA investigate and address releases of hazardous waste and hazardous constituents, usually in the form of soil or groundwater contamination, that have occurred at or emanated from their property. Maryland is not authorized for the Corrective Action program under Section 3006 of RCRA. Therefore, EPA retains primary authority in the State of Maryland for the Corrective Action program.

EPA will propose a remedy in a separate SB for the rest of the Facility's soils and Facility-wide groundwater, including the Parcel's groundwater, after they have been evaluated under a Corrective Measures Study. In the interim, in this SB, EPA is proposing groundwater use restrictions at the Parcel to prevent use of shallow groundwater until a final remedy for Facility-wide groundwater is selected.

EPA is providing a thirty (30)-day public comment period on this SB. EPA may modify this proposed remedy based on comments received during this period. After the public comment period and review of any comments received, EPA will announce its selection of a final remedy for the Parcel in a Final Decision and Response to Comments (FDRTC).

Information on the Corrective Action Program as well as a fact sheet for the Facility can be found at: <https://www.epa.gov/hwcorrectiveactionsites>. The Administrative Record (AR) for the Facility contains all documents, including data and quality assurance information, on which EPA's proposed remedy is based. See Section 8, Public Participation, below, for information on how you can participate in the public comment process and how you may review the AR.

## Section 2: Facility Background

---

### 2.1 Introduction

The entire Facility comprises approximately 20 acres of land in Baltimore City, Maryland.

Figure 1 shows the Facility layout. The Facility was previously owned by PEMCO and was formerly used to manufacture inorganic pigments and specialty glasses (known as frit). Frit manufacturing operations started in the early 1900s and ceased in September 2007. The pigments and frit were used to produce porcelain enamel and ceramic glaze coatings. For frit production, additives were mixed with the raw bulk materials and heated in smelting furnaces until molten. The molten glass was cooled in water-chilled rollers, and then broken into shards. The broken shards were either packaged or further milled to produce powdered frit.

The entire Facility was acquired by TRP-MCB 5601 Eastern LLC from Pemco Holding Corporation in April 2014. The Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) received an application from TRP-MCB 5601 Eastern LLC for its Voluntary Cleanup Program (VCP) on September 29, 2014. MDE accepted the Facility into the VCP on August 12, 2015.

### 2.2 Areas of Investigation

The Parcel has recently undergone redevelopment consistent with the remedy elements described in the MDE-approved Response Action Plan (RAP). The RAP detailed the remedy elements to address impacted soil, soil vapor, and groundwater contamination within the Facility boundaries in conjunction with the planned site redevelopment

- In March 2018, demolition of existing buildings and construction activities began at the Parcel. Capping activities were substantially complete (including placement of buildings, hardscaped areas, landscaped areas, and vapor intrusion controls in buildings) by December 2019. Five buildings with a flooring of 4 inches of concrete, sidewalks with 4 inches of concrete, parking lots and roadways with 4 inches of asphalt or 2 feet of clean soil in open areas serve as a cap at the Parcel. The installation of a permanent cover on the Parcel was completed in December 2019 as required by the RAP and stated in the Facility's January 2020 Monthly Report.

## Section 3: Summary of Environmental Investigations of Lot 28 Parcel

---

### 3.1 Environmental Investigations

For all environmental investigations conducted at the Parcel, groundwater concentrations were screened against federal Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) promulgated pursuant to Section 42 U.S.C. § 300f *et seq.* of the Safe Drinking Water Act and codified at 40 CFR Part 141, or if there was no MCL for a contaminant, EPA Regional Screening Levels (SLs) for tapwater. Soil concentrations were screened against SLs for residential soil.

#### 3.1.1 Soil Sampling

Contaminant concentrations above the SLs for direct contact with residential soil were detected at the Facility. More than 150 soil samples from across the Facility were collected for laboratory analyses between 1997 and 2010.

##### *Soil Results for Metals*

With few exceptions, metals were detected in soils at the Parcel at levels that were below their respective SLs. Metals above their screening levels are listed in Table 1 and Figure 2.

As is typical for soils in Maryland where there are naturally occurring, high arsenic levels, arsenic was the most prevalent metal detected at levels above its residential SL, which is .68 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg). Arsenic was detected in most of the samples. Arsenic concentrations for these samples ranged from non-detect to 74 mg/kg at sample location ESB-27.

The only other metals that were detected in at least one soil sample at a concentration above its SL were cobalt and iron. Cobalt was detected in five soil samples at concentrations above its SL for residential soil of 23 mg/kg. These detections ranged from 26 mg/kg to 95 mg/kg. These sample locations were below or next to the former manufacturing building at sample locations ESB-8, ESB-27, ESB-30, ESB-31, and ESB-56 or within the landfill at sample location ESB-45.

Iron was detected at 100,000 mg/kg at sample location ESB-31, which is located adjacent to the southern side of the former main manufacturing building. The screening value for iron is 55,000 mg/kg.

##### *Soil Results for Volatile Organic Compounds*

Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) were not detected above their respective residential SLs for soils anywhere at the Parcel.

Statement of Basis

---

### ***Soil Results for Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds and Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs)***

Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs) and Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs) that were detected above their respective residential SLs are listed in Table 1. These SVOCs and PAHs were found in soils above their SLs throughout the Facility.

#### **Supplemental Facility Characterization in 2014-2017**

EPA and MDE requested that supplemental Facility characterization be performed at the Facility to better define areas of contamination. Supplemental Facility characterization activities included soil, soil gas (see Section ***Soil Gas Sampling in 2017*** for information on the supplement soil gas sampling), and groundwater sampling which occurred from 2014 through 2017.

##### ***Surface Soil***

VOCs were not detected above their respective residential SLs for soils at the Parcel.

SVOCs (benzo(a)pyrene, benzo(a)anthracene, and indeno(1,2,3, CD)pyrene) and metals (arsenic, cobalt, iron, and sodium) are the Facility Constituents of Concern (COCs) that have been detected in Parcel surface soils (0-2 feet below ground surface (bgs)) above their respective SLs. These soil sample results are in Table 1.

##### ***Subsurface Soil***

VOCs were not detected above their respective residential SLs for soils at the Parcel.

SVOCs (benzo(a)pyrene, benzo(a)anthracene, and indeno(1,2,3, CD)pyrene) and metals (arsenic, cadmium, and cobalt) are the COCs that have been detected in Parcel subsurface soils (greater than 2 feet bgs) above their respective SLs. These soil sample results are in Table 1.

#### **3.1.2 Groundwater Investigations**

Groundwater monitoring at this Facility has been on-going and has historically shown detections of perchloroethylene (PCE); trichloroethene (TCE); cis-1,2-dichloroethene (cDCE); and carbon tetrachloride above MCLs. However, groundwater is not used as a potable source at the Facility or in Baltimore City.

Groundwater occurs on site at depths of about 30 feet or deeper below ground surface (bgs) Groundwater samples were collected from the deeper wells installed at sample locations EGW-9D, EGW-10, EGW-10D, EGW-11, and EGW-12. Sample locations EGW-10 and EGW-10D are at approximate depths of 65 feet and 131 feet bgs, respectively.

##### ***Groundwater Sampling in 2018***

Statement of Basis

In March 2018, GTA personnel collected groundwater samples and groundwater elevation data from monitoring well sample locations GTA-MW-2 and GTA-MW-3. Dissolved cobalt was detected in GTA-MW-2 and GTA-MW-3 at concentrations of 12 and 25 micrograms per liter ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ ), above the tapwater SL ( $6 \mu\text{g/L}$ ). Dissolved sodium was detected in each well at concentrations of 150,000  $\text{ug/l}$  at GTA-MW-2 and 26,000  $\mu\text{g/L}$  at GTA-MW-3, above the MCL ( $1,000 \mu\text{g/L}$ ). Carbon tetrachloride was detected above the MCL ( $5 \mu\text{g/L}$ ) in each groundwater sample at sample locations GTA-MW-2 ( $410 \text{ug/l}$ ) and GTA-MW-3 ( $110 \text{ug/l}$ ). Chloroform was detected above the MCL ( $80 \mu\text{g/L}$ ) in GTA-MW-2 at a concentration of  $380 \mu\text{g/L}$ . Tetrachloroethene (PCE) was detected above the MCL ( $5 \mu\text{g/L}$ ) in GTA-MW-2 ( $720 \text{ug/l}$ ) and GTA-MW-3 ( $12 \text{ug/l}$ ). Trichloroethene (TCE) was detected in GTA-MW-2 ( $170 \text{ug/l}$ ), above the MCL ( $5 \mu\text{g/L}$ ).

### **3.1.3 Soil Gas Samples for VOC Analyses**

The results of the soil gas sampling were compared to MDE Tier 1 and Tier 2 soil gas screening values, which are based on EPA soil gas SLs. As long as indoor air contaminant concentrations are below acceptable risk thresholds, soil gas concentrations that are below the Tier 1 soil gas screening values generally do not require any additional monitoring or assessment when source conditions are known and appear to be stable. When soil gas concentrations are between the Tier 1 and Tier 2 values, and indoor air risk is acceptable, additional long-term soil gas monitoring or source reduction is generally necessary. When target soil gas concentrations exceed the Tier 2 values, remedial measures are generally necessary at a site. In all instances, site-specific factors will be considered in establishing remedial goals and selecting monitoring frequencies.

Soil gas samples were collected throughout the Facility for VOCs in December 2006, August 2007, September 2008, December 2009 and July 2010.

At the Parcel, at ESG-18, benzene was detected at 160 micrograms per cubic meter ( $\text{ug/m}^3$ ) above the Tier 1 limit of  $72 \text{ug/m}^3$ ; chloroform was detected at  $48 \text{ug/m}^3$ , above the Tier 1 limit of  $24 \text{ug/m}^3$ ; 1,1,2 trichloroethane was detected at  $39 \text{ug/m}^3$ , above the Tier 2 limit of  $21 \text{ug/m}^3$ ; and trichloroethene was detected at  $250 \text{ug/m}^3$ , above the Tier 2 limit of  $210 \text{ug/m}^3$ . At ESG-6, acrolein was detected at  $5.3 \text{ug/m}^3$ , above the Tier 1 limit of  $.42 \text{ug/m}^3$ .

#### ***Soil Gas Sampling in 2017***

Soil gas sampling and analysis was conducted at the Facility in 2017 that involved the installation of four soil gas sampling points (GTA-SV-4, 6, 7, and 8) to evaluate overall soil gas conditions at the Parcel.

At GTA-SV-4, carbon tetrachloride was detected at  $301 \text{ug/m}^3$ , above the Tier 2 limit of  $47 \text{ug/m}^3$ ; chloroform was detected at  $320 \text{ug/m}^3$ , above the Tier 2 limit of  $120 \text{ug/m}^3$ ; and

Statement of Basis

tetrachloroethene was detected at 1,600 ug/m<sup>3</sup>, above the Tier 1 limit of 840 ug/m<sup>3</sup>.

At GTA-SV-6, trichloroethene was detected at 70 ug/m<sup>3</sup>, above the Tier 1 limit of 42 ug/m<sup>3</sup>.

### **3.1.4 PCB Concrete Sampling in 2018**

From March 2018 to June 2018, initial sampling of concrete was conducted as part of a suitability evaluation for on-site concrete disposal. This sampling identified PCB impacts in two areas on the Parcel: (1) an enclosed transformer room within the northeastern portion of the former warehouse building; and (2) a portion of a concrete floor slab, adjacent to a former transformer pad, in the west-central portion of the color mixing building. The transformers were removed sometime in the past, but it is not known when.

In September 2018, GTA conducted perimeter sampling of the two known PCB-impacted areas identified during the initial assessment. Sampling activities conducted confirmed the PCB-impacted area in the warehouse building is contained within a formerly enclosed, 1,000 ft<sup>2</sup> room. For expediency and efficiency in the field, this entire room was identified as impacted by PCBs. Perimeter sampling outside of this 1,000 ft<sup>2</sup> area did not identify impacts greater than 1.0 mg/kg of PCBs. Within the color mixing building, additional perimeter sampling of the known PCB-impacted area resulted in expanding the PCB-impacted area to 470 ft<sup>2</sup>.

In November 2018, PCB-contaminated soil and concrete were delineated in these areas identified above and placed in roll-off dumpsters for off-site disposal. From November 8, 2018 to January 2, 2019, GTA personnel ensured the removal, transport, and proper disposal of PCB-impacted concrete and soil. Approximately 161,000 kilograms or 178 tons of material were disposed of at an off-site disposal facility.

### **3.1.5 Petroleum-Contaminated Soil Removal**

In December 2018 and January 2019, two areas of petroleum-impacted soil were discovered in sewer and storm drain utility runs located on the southeastern portion of the Parcel. The petroleum-impacted soil was observed approximately 1 foot bgs and consisted of gray clays and silts that exhibited a petroleum odor. Elevated Photo Ionization Detector (PID) readings were not observed. However, this material was observed in the general vicinity of the former forklift building, where stained concrete and a 500-gallon gasoline underground storage tank (UST) were previously removed from the Parcel. Stained soil and petroleum odors were not observed below 5 feet from grade, where native clays were encountered. The approximate area of excavated petroleum-impacted soil that was removed was about 50 feet long, 10 feet wide, and 5 feet deep. The petroleum-impacted soil was staged on and covered with plastic adjacent to the excavation, pending future off-site disposal. No liquids were encountered in the excavation.



In March 2018, an area of petroleum-impacted soil was discovered in a water line utility run located on the southeastern portion of the Parcel, contiguous to the impacts identified in December 2018 and in January 2019. The petroleum-impacted soil was observed approximately 1 foot below existing grades. The soil observations and PID readings were generally consistent to the area of adjacent impacts. Stained soil and petroleum odors were not observed below 3 feet from grade, where native clays were encountered. The area of excavated petroleum-impacted soil that was removed measured approximately 40 feet long, 4 feet wide, and 3 feet deep.

In May and June 2019, petroleum-impacted materials were encountered during footing excavations on the western side of the proposed Building 500 (Petroleum-Impacted Removal Area B). An approximately 75-foot section of petroleum-impacted soil was discovered in May 2019. In June 2019, two approximately 25-foot sections of petroleum-impacted soil were discovered north and south of the original 75-foot section. This material was found approximately 3 feet below existing grades and consisted of an approximately 1½-foot layer of stone, brick, and concrete mixed with soil (petroleum-impacted material). Clays were observed above and below this material, and the clays did not display indications of staining or unusual odors. The petroleum-impacted material exhibited petroleum odors, and PID readings were between 30-60 ppm. No liquids were observed in the excavation. Petroleum-impacted soils were not observed west of the excavation during prior utility installation activities, nor were they observed further east during the installation of interior column footings.

On February 6, 2019 and from March 18, 2019 to March 25, 2019, petroleum impacted soils from the Petroleum-Impacted Removal Area excavations were transported for off-site disposal. Soils transported off-site on February 6, 2019 also included the soils removed from the UST #8 excavation, which is located on the adjacent parcel. A total of 343.7 tons of petroleum-impacted soil from the UST #8 and Petroleum-Impacted Soil Removal Areas A and B was transported for off-site disposal.

### **3.1.6 Human Health Risk Assessment and Evaluation of Exposure Pathways**

#### ***Human Health Risk Assessment Dated May 23, 2013***

A Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) was performed under the assumption the entire Facility would be redeveloped for non-residential use. The results of the HHRA indicate that there is no unacceptable risk to current or future adolescents or adult trespassers or visitors at any of the undeveloped areas of the Facility. Further, there was no unacceptable risk identified for current or future off-site residents or industrial workers. The HHRA identified a potential for unacceptable risk to the following human health receptors under current or future industrial use conditions of the Facility:

- Presuming future redevelopment of the Facility property, exposure of future building occupants to soil gas via vapor intrusion could result in unacceptable risk to human health;

Statement of Basis

- Groundwater beneath the Facility contains VOCs and metals at concentrations above the EPA tapwater SLs and above MCLs, which could pose an unacceptable risk to human health receptors at the Facility if used for potable or non-potable purposes. Currently, there are no groundwater supply wells on the Facility; and
- Exposure to deep on-site groundwater for non-potable purposes could result in an elevated carcinogenic and noncarcinogenic risk for industrial workers.

The HHRA also concluded that if the Facility is to be redeveloped either as industrial or residential, controls would be required to eliminate the unacceptable risks identified above. The proposed remedy as described in the SB includes these controls (See Section 5).

### **3.2 Environmental Indicators**

Under the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), EPA has set national goals to address RCRA corrective action facilities. Under GPRA, EPA evaluates two key environmental clean-up indicators for each facility: (1) Current Human Exposures Under Control, which the Facility met on September 3, 2013; and (2) Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control, which the Facility has not yet met. There is currently insufficient data to address the groundwater indicator, which will be addressed in the future.

## Section 4: Corrective Action Objectives

---

EPA's Corrective Action Objectives for the proposed remedy at the Parcel are the following:

### **1. Soils**

EPA has determined that hazardous constituents currently remain in Parcel soils above acceptable risk levels protective of human health and the environment for residential use (i.e., SLs for residential soils). Therefore, EPA's proposed Corrective Action Objective for Parcel soils is to control exposure to the hazardous constituents remaining in surface soils by requiring compliance with and maintenance of engineering controls and land use restrictions to allow for residential use of the Parcel. This objective will facilitate the redevelopment of the Facility in a way that protects human health and the environment and allows for residential use, while incorporating controls to protect workers during construction.

### **2. Groundwater**

EPA's proposed Corrective Action Objective for groundwater at the Parcel is to prevent exposure to potential hazardous constituents in groundwater in the interim through use restrictions while Facility-wide groundwater continues to be evaluated under the Corrective Action Program.

## Section 5: Proposed Remedy

---

### 1. Introduction

Because some contaminants remain in the soil and groundwater at the Parcel at levels which exceed acceptable levels for residential use, EPA's proposed remedy requires engineering controls and compliance with and maintenance of soil and groundwater use restrictions.

EPA proposes implementing the land and groundwater restrictions necessary to prevent human exposure to contaminants at the Parcel through a permit, order, or environmental covenant.

Additionally, the State of Maryland Well Construction Regulations, codified at Code of Maryland Regulations 26.03.01.05, prohibit installation of individual water systems where adequate community systems are available. Moreover, section 2.19.1 of the Plumbing and Gasfitting Code of Baltimore County states that public water supply systems are considered available if they are within 500 feet or another reasonable distance of an owner's property line. In this case, the Facility and surrounding area are already being provided with potable water from Baltimore City's public water supply system.

### 2. Soils

EPA's proposed remedy for the Parcel soils consists of engineering controls and compliance with and maintenance of land use restrictions.

The proposed remedy requires the following engineering controls for the Parcel and are described in the MDE-approved Remedial Action Plan (RAP):

- The maintenance of a permanent cover on the Parcel which was installed in December 2019 as required by the RAP and stated in the Facility's January 2020 Monthly Report; and
- The development of a Soils, Cover and Cap Management Plan (SCCMP) and a Health and Safety Plan for MDE and EPA review and approval.

The proposed remedy also requires implementation of a vapor intrusion control system, the design of which shall be approved in advance by EPA and MDE. The vapor intrusion control system shall be installed in every new structure constructed where VOC gas was detected above the contaminated groundwater plume or within a 100-foot perimeter of the contaminated groundwater plume, unless EPA and MDE approve in writing a demonstration that vapor intrusion does not pose a threat to human health and that no vapor intrusion control system is needed. Existing buildings already have vapor intrusion control systems installed.

Statement of Basis

---

Because contaminants remain in the groundwater at the Facility above levels appropriate for residential use, while Facility-wide groundwater is being investigated further, EPA is proposing to prohibit the use of groundwater to prevent human exposure to those contaminants. In the interim, EPA is proposing that groundwater use restrictions be implemented through institutional controls at the Parcel. Groundwater monitoring results and the HHRA indicate that there are currently no unacceptable risks of exposure to contaminated groundwater, except for potential direct contact by on-site construction or excavation workers. However, groundwater is deeper than any proposed construction depth; therefore, groundwater contact by construction or excavation workers does not present an unacceptable risk. In the unlikely event groundwater is encountered during construction, protection of workers will be addressed by an EPA and MDE-approved Health and Safety Plan.

### **3. Institutional Controls**

EPA's proposed remedy also includes the following land and groundwater use restrictions and notifications to protect human health and the integrity of the proposed remedy:

1. Groundwater at the Parcel shall not be used for any purpose other than the operation, maintenance, and monitoring activities currently being conducted at the Facility and activities required by EPA and MDE, unless it is demonstrated to EPA and MDE that such use will not pose a threat to human health or the environment or adversely affect or interfere with the final remedy, and the current Parcel owner obtains prior written approval from EPA and MDE for such use.
2. The Parcel shall not be used for unrestricted residential use (Maryland Tier 1A) or as an unrestricted public recreational area (Maryland Level 1 and 2) unless it is demonstrated to EPA and MDE that such use does not pose a threat to human health and EPA and MDE prior provides written approval for such use.
3. No new wells shall be installed on the Parcel unless it is demonstrated to EPA and MDE that such wells are necessary to implement the final remedy for the Facility, and the current Parcel owner obtains prior written approval from EPA and MDE to install such wells.
4. All new structures on the Parcel shall be protected by a vapor intrusion control system, the design of which shall be approved in advance in writing by EPA and MDE. The current Parcel owner shall maintain the integrity of the vapor barrier installed in current structures, and conduct inspections, maintenance and repairs as needed.
5. Compliance with the EPA and MDE-approved SCCMP. The SCCMP will require the current Parcel owner to maintain the integrity of all caps and covers on the Parcel by conducting regular periodic inspections (no less frequently than once per year),

making timely repairs if needed, and maintaining a record of such inspection and maintenance. The SCCMP will also establish the documentation, reporting, and notification methods that will be used to implement, monitor compliance, and ensure the SCCMP remains in place and effective.

6. All earthmoving activities on the Parcel, including excavation, grading, and/or utility construction, shall be conducted in compliance with an EPA and MDE-approved SCCMP to ensure that the activity will not pose a threat to human health and the environment or adversely affect or interfere with the covered areas.
7. On an annual basis and whenever requested by EPA or MDE, the current Parcel owner shall submit to MDE and EPA a written certification stating whether the owner is maintaining and complying with all groundwater and land use restrictions.
8. The Parcel shall not be used in a way that will adversely affect or interfere with the integrity and protectiveness of the final remedy.

The Parcel owner shall also allow EPA, MDE, and/or their authorized agents and representatives, access to the Parcel to inspect and evaluate the continued effectiveness of the final remedy, and if necessary, to conduct additional remediation to ensure the protection of human health and the environment based upon the final remedy selected by EPA in the FDRTC.

In addition, the Parcel owner shall provide EPA with a coordinate survey as well as a metes and bounds survey of the Parcel boundaries. Mapping the extent of the above use restrictions will allow for presentation in a publicly accessible mapping program such as Google Earth or Google Maps.

## Section 6: Evaluation of Proposed Remedy

---

This section describes the criteria EPA used to evaluate the proposed remedy consistent with EPA guidance. The evaluation criteria are applied in two phases. In the first phase, EPA evaluates the proposed remedy against three threshold criteria as general goals. In the second phase, if the proposed remedy meets the threshold criteria, EPA then evaluates seven balancing criteria.

Threshold Criteria	Evaluation
1) Protect human health and the environment	<p>EPA’s proposed remedy for the Parcel protects human health and the environment by eliminating, reducing, or controlling potential unacceptable risk through the implementation and maintenance of use restrictions and engineering controls for contaminated soil and groundwater above acceptable residential use levels.</p> <p>All current structures on the Parcel have a vapor barrier, which will be maintained by the current Parcel owner. If new buildings are constructed, vapor intrusion control systems, the design of which shall require prior written approval from EPA and MDE, will be installed.</p> <p>Also, a cap of either concrete, asphalt, or clean soils, depending on the location, was installed in December 2019 over the Parcel to prevent human and environmental exposure to the hazardous wastes and hazardous constituents remaining in the soil and landfill.</p> <p>All earthmoving activities, including excavation, drilling and construction activities in those areas of the Parcel where any contaminants remain in soils above EPA's SLs for residential use or in groundwater above MCLs/tapwater SLs shall be conducted in accordance with an EPA and MDE-approved SCCMP. The SCCMP will also include procedures to maintain the cap and cover over contaminated soils. Any earthmoving activities will be conducted in accordance with an EPA and MDE-approved Health and Safety Plan.</p> <p>Therefore, EPA has determined that the proposed remedy satisfies this criterion.</p>
2) Achieve	EPA’s proposed remedy achieves media cleanup objectives based on

Statement of Basis

---

<p>media cleanup objectives</p>	<p>assumptions regarding current and reasonably anticipated land and water resource use(s). The proposed remedy in this SB is based on an anticipated residential land use.</p> <p>All earthmoving activities, including excavation, drilling and construction activities, in the areas at the Parcel where any contaminants remain in soils above SLs for residential use or in groundwater above MCLs/tapwater SLs, shall be conducted in accordance with an EPA and MDE-approved SCCMP. The SCCMP will also include procedures to maintain the cap and cover over contaminated soils. Any earthmoving activities will be conducted in accordance with an EPA and MDE-approved Health and Safety Plan.</p> <p>Therefore, EPA has determined that the proposed remedy satisfies this criterion.</p>
<p>3) Remediating the Source of Releases</p>	<p>In all proposed remedies, EPA seeks to eliminate or further reduce releases of hazardous wastes and hazardous constituents that may pose a threat to human health and the environment and this proposed remedy meets this objective.</p> <p>The sources of petroleum and PCB releases have been removed from the soil at the Parcel, thereby eliminating, to the extent practicable, further releases of hazardous constituents from on-site soils as well as groundwater.</p> <p>All earthmoving activities, including excavation, drilling and construction activities, in the areas at the Parcel where any contaminants remain in soils above SLs for residential use or in groundwater above MCLs/tapwater SLs, shall be conducted in accordance with an EPA and MDE-approved SCCMP and Health and Safety Plan.</p> <p>All current structures on the Parcel have a vapor barrier, which will be maintained by the current Parcel owner. If new buildings are constructed, vapor intrusion control systems, the design of which shall require prior written approve of EPA and MDE, will be installed.</p> <p>Therefore, EPA has determined that the proposed remedy satisfies this criterion.</p>

Statement of Basis



## Section 6: Evaluation of Proposed Remedy (continued)

Balancing Criteria	Evaluation
4) Long-term effectiveness	The proposed remedy is long-term effective because groundwater and land use restrictions will be implemented, and the soil cover will be maintained to prevent exposure to contaminated soils and groundwater remaining at the Parcel and may present unacceptable risk.
5) Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume of the Hazardous Constituents	Reduction of toxicity, mobility, and volume of contaminated soils was achieved by excavation, removal, and disposal of contaminated soils.
6) Short-term effectiveness	EPA anticipates that the land and groundwater use restrictions will be fully implemented shortly after the issuance of the FDRTC. EPA's proposed remedy takes into consideration future activities, such as construction or excavation that would pose short-term risks to workers, residents, and the environment, by requiring the EPA and MDE-approved SCCMP and Health and Safety Plan.
7) Implementability	EPA's proposed remedy is readily implementable. EPA proposes to implement the use restrictions through a mechanism that will inform future owners and occupants of these restrictions, such as an environmental covenant, permit, or order.
8) Cost	EPA's proposed remedy is cost effective. The costs associated with this proposed remedy are minimal as vapor intrusion controls are the costliest aspect of the proposed remedy. These vapor intrusion controls are already installed in existing buildings but will need to be installed and approved by EPA and MDE in any new buildings.
9) Community Acceptance	EPA will evaluate community acceptance of the proposed remedy during the public comment period, which will be described in the FDRTC.
10) State/Support Agency Acceptance	MDE has reviewed and concurred with the proposed remedy for the Parcel.

Overall, based on the evaluation criteria, EPA has determined the proposed remedy meets the threshold criteria and provides the best balance of tradeoffs with respect to the evaluation criteria.

Statement of Basis

## Section 7: Financial Assurance

---

EPA has evaluated whether financial assurance is necessary for EPA's proposed remedy at the Facility. Given that the physical elements of the remedy have been constructed and that the costs of implementing institutional controls at the Facility will be minimal, EPA is not proposing a financial assurance requirement for this proposed remedy.

## Section 8: Public Participation

---

Interested persons are invited to comment on EPA's proposed remedy. The public comment period will last thirty (30) calendar days from the date that notice is published in a local newspaper. Comments may be submitted by mail, fax, or electronic mail to Mr. Leonard Hotham at the contact information listed below.

A public meeting will be held upon request. Requests for a public meeting should be submitted to Mr. Leonard Hotham in writing at the contact information listed below. A meeting will not be scheduled unless one is requested.

The AR contains all the information considered by EPA for the proposed remedy at this Parcel. The AR is available at the following location:

U.S. EPA Region III  
1650 Arch Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Contact: Mr. Leonard Hotham (3LD10)  
Phone: (215) 814-5778  
Fax: (215) 814 - 3113  
Email: [hotham.leonard@epa.gov](mailto:hotham.leonard@epa.gov)

### **Attachments:**

Figure 1: Map of Facility

Figure 2: Soil Sampling Results Map

Table 1: Soil Sample Results

Date: 4/29/20



---

John A. Armstead, Director  
Land, Chemicals and Redevelopment Division  
US EPA, Region III

Statement of Basis

---

## Section 9: Index to Administrative Record

---

Site Characterization and Risk Assessment Report for 5601 Eastern Ave Baltimore Maryland, Environmental Resources Management dated September 9, 2011

Report of Preliminary Geotechnical Exploration Former Pemco Facility 5601 Eastern Ave. Baltimore MD, Geo-Technology Associates Inc., June 9, 2015

Remediation Action Plan, Geo-Technology Associates Inc. dated April 18, 2016

Site Update Response Yard 56, Geo-Technology Associates Inc., April 23, 2018

Groundwater Evaluation Summary Yard 56, 5601 Eastern Ave., May 15, 2018

Underground Storage Tank Closure Report Yard 56, Geo-Technology Associates Inc., March 6, 2020

March and April 2018 Response Action Plan (RAP) Progress Report, Geo-Technology Associates Inc.

**Attachments**