

**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:** SMR Technologies - B/E Aerospace  
**Facility Address:** Route 39, Fenwick, WV  
**Facility EPA ID #:** WVD 98 055 5395

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 Units (RU), and Areas of Concern (AOC)), been **considered** in this EI determination?

X  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).

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control**  
**Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)**

Page 2

2. Is **groundwater** known or reasonably suspected to be **“contaminated”**<sup>1</sup> above appropriately protective “levels” (i.e., 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?

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):

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control  
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)**

Page 3

One release occurred at the site on May 13, 1986. One fifty-five gallon drum of waste was spilled on a parking lot ramp. The waste was cleaning liquid consisting of toluene (37.1%), MEK (14.7%), elastic polymer (35.1%), naphtha/rubber solvent (6.7%), hexane (2.8%), ethanol (1.8%), and 1,1,1-trichloroethane (1.8%). Absorbent booms were placed to contain the spill and twelve drums of sorbent material and soil were removed and contained for proper disposal. Soil and surface water samples were taken after cleanup. WVDEP was present during these activities and approved the work.

Two recent rounds of groundwater samples have been taken (December, 1998 and January, 2000) from wells installed during the real estate transaction between SMR and B/E. No detections were found that would indicate a groundwater impact remained from the 1986 spill. However, a few detections were found above either MCLs or tapwater RBCs. In 1/2000 at MW-2 (considered an upgradient well) lead was 60ppb (action level = 15 ppb). In the same well in 1998, benzene was found at 300 ppb (MCL=5ppb). In MW-3, 4, 6, and 7, chloroform was found at 19, 20, 8, and 35 ppb respectively, above the tapwater RBC of 0.15 ppb. In MW-7, benzo(a)pyrene was detected at 8 ppb, above the MCL of 0.2 ppb. A summary of detections above the screening values and subsequent results are as follows:

<u>Benzene</u>	<u>12/98</u>	<u>1/00</u>	<u>5/00</u>	<u>MCL/RBC</u>
MW-2	300 ppb	ND	—	5 ppb
<u>Benzo(a)pyrene</u>				
MW-7	ND	8 ppb	ND	0.2 ppb
<u>Chloroform</u>				
MW-3	19 ppb	ND	—	0.15 ppb
MW-4	20 ppb	ND	—	0.15 ppb
MW-6	8 ppb	ND	—	0.15 ppb
MW-7	35 ppb	ND	—	0.15 ppb
<u>Lead</u>				
MW-2	6 ppb	60 ppb	—	15 ppb
<u>Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate</u>				
MW-7	60 ppb	ND	ND	4.8 ppb

As shown by the three rounds of groundwater samples, the concentrations appear to have decreased (with the

Footnotes:

<sup>1</sup>“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).

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control**  
**Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)**

Page 4

3. Has the **migration** of contaminated groundwater **stabilized** (such that contaminated groundwater is expected to remain within “existing area of contaminated groundwater”<sup>2</sup> as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination)?

  X   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”<sup>2</sup>).

       If no (contaminated groundwater is observed or expected to migrate beyond the designated locations defining the “existing area of groundwater contamination”<sup>2</sup>) - 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):

As shown in Question 2, there are a limited number of detections in groundwater found above either the MCL or tap water RBCs. In all cases except lead, the results were below screening levels in the most recent round of samples. For lead, the only result above the 15 ppb action level occurs in MW-2, which is at the upgradient property boundary. Sampling results from wells downgradient to that area have lead levels below MCLs or RBCs.

The sporadic number of detections appear to be limited in extent.

<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.

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control  
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)**

Page 5

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):

The most recent rounds of groundwater samples show that wells closest to the surface water bodies adjacent to the site have levels below MCLs/RBCs. MW-2 is the only well with the most recent data showing a detection of lead above the 15 ppb action level and downgradient wells show levels below MCLs/RBCs. Therefore, the limited detections in groundwater at the site do not appear to discharge into the surface water bodies.

For more information, please see the Phase II Environmental Assessment dated 12/98.

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control  
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)**

Page 6

5. Is the **discharge** of “contaminated” groundwater into surface water likely to be “**insignificant**” (i.e., the maximum concentration<sup>3</sup> 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 concentration<sup>3</sup> 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 concentration<sup>3</sup> 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 concentrations<sup>3</sup> 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.

Rationale and Reference(s):

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

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control**  
**Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)**

Page 7

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<sup>4</sup>)?

\_\_\_\_\_ 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,<sup>5</sup> 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.

Rationale and Reference(s):

<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.

<sup>5</sup> 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.

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control**  
**Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)**

Page 8

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.

Rationale and Reference(s):

As part of the follow-up activities for this site, additional groundwater sampling will be required to confirm the detected constituents have not changed or increased, and to confirm the absence of the analytes found in some monitoring rounds, but not in others. The details of the additional groundwater sampling will be negotiated with the facility.

This EI determination will be updated should additional data be found that significantly changes the decision at this site.



**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control  
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)**

Page 9

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).

  X   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 **SMR Technologies - B/E Aerospace** facility, EPA ID # WVD980555395, located at Fenwick, West Virginia. 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 groundwater is observed or expected.

       IN - More information is needed to make a determination.

Completed by    (signature) \_\_\_\_\_ Date   3/21/01    
                  (print)        Jennifer L. Shoemaker  
                  (title)        Remedial Project Manager

Supervisor     (signature) \_\_\_\_\_ Date   4/10/01    
                  (print)        Robert E. Greaves  
                  (title)        Chief, RCRA General Operations Branch  
                  (EPA Region or State)    EPA

Locations where References may be found:

U.S. EPA Region III  
1650 Arch Street  
11<sup>th</sup> floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Contact telephone and e-mail numbers

(name)              Jennifer L. Shoemaker    
(phone #)          (215) 814-2772    
(e-mail)           shoemaker.jennifer@epa.gov