#### 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 Environmental Services

Facility Address: 1750 Morgantown Industrial Park, Morgantown, WV 26501

Facility EPA ID #: WVD 981 107 600

1.	ground	Has <b>all</b> 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 <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**

The American Environmental Services (AES) facility is located at 1750 Morgantown Industrial Park, Morganton, WV, 26501. The site is located in the Morgantown Industrial Park, southwest of the city of Morgantown, and west of the Monongahela River in Building 170. AES is a chemical waste handler with headquarters in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and additional facilities in Calvert City, Kentucky, and Offices in Pensacola, Florida; Atlanta, Georgia; Charlotte, North Carolina; and Dayton, Ohio.

The Morgantown Industrial Park was constructed in the early 1940s by the US Government for the production of ammonia to support munitions manufacturing. Prior to construction, land use was a mix of wooded and open land.

There are scattered residences and development to the north, east, and south of the Morgantown Industrial Park. The closest residence is less than 1 mile from the facility, and is located across (east) of the Monongahela River.

AES has occupied the facility since September 1999, when it assumed operations and ownership of the permitted facility from Regeneration Technology, Inc. AES purchased the facility and building from the Morgantown Industrial Park (MIP) in March 2000. The Morgantown, WV facility is licensed as a Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facility (TSDF) and Large Quantity Generator (LQG) of hazardous waste through April 2012.

The facility covers approximately 0.75 acres, comprised of Building 170 and surrounding area in the MIP. The facility building is three-stories in height with approximately 17,000 square feet of space.

AES operates as a transfer facility for RCRA hazardous and non-hazardous wastes. Operations include storage, repacking/consolidating compatible waste streams, and transportation of wastes to off-site disposal facilities. The facility generates small amounts of contaminated personal protective equipment (PPE) during repacking/consolidation activities. Operations are segregated into functional areas designated as the Central Storage Area (Area A), Lower Storage Area (Area C), Loading Dock Area (Area B), Yard Area, Department of Transportation (DOT) 10-day Trailer Staging Area, Boiler Room, and Offices. The facility has not received any shipments of waste since March 27, 2009.

The facility is permitted to accept a wide-variety of hazardous wastes including but not limited to contaminated soil, sludge, wastewaters, filter media, paint related wastes, sand blast materials, lamps, batteries, off-specification products, spent solvents, and oils. The facility is currently permitted to store a maximum of 50,000 gallons of waste at any given time.

AES manages hazardous wastes containing greater than 500 ppm volatile organics by weight and typically utilizes Level I containers (120, 85 or 55-gallon drums and smaller containers) to manage these hazardous waste streams. The Level I containers meet DOT standards and utilize covers with no visible gaps. Containers of waste are kept closed and only opened to sample, add or remove waste. Recent inspections showed no concerns with this process.

Nine aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) and one underground storage tank (UST) have been identified in the files reviewed. The UST was filled with concrete and closed in April 1987 under approval of WVDNR. Of the ASTs identified, eight were located in the Tank Farm Area; while the ninth was located inside the building, next to the boiler. The ASTs have been removed.

As of 2000, there were 6 ASTs on-site; three tanks were used for the treatment and storage of collected storm water and three non-RCRA tanks were used for bulking of non-hazardous liquids such as oils and contaminated wastewaters. These tanks have been removed.

The facility is currently inactive; an AES employee periodically visits the site for maintenance purposes.

#### **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.

#### <u>Definition of "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" EI</u>

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.	2. Is <b>groundwater</b> known or reasonably suspected to be <b>"contaminated"</b> 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 refessupporting documentation.			
If no - skip to #8 and enter "YE" status code, after citing appropriate "levels," and supporting documentation to demonstrate that groundwater is not "contaminated."				
		If unknown - skip to #8 and enter "IN" status code.		
Rationale and Reference(s):				
Sanitary wastes from the facility are discharged to the MIP sewage treatment facility, which operates under an independent NPDES permit.				
There are no documented releases to the trench drain or storm sewer system. The facility (prior to AES' purchase) historically operated a Wastewater Treatment Facility under NPDES Permit.				
Current groundwater conditions are not known, however, two monitoring wells exist on the site (have not been sampled for several years. Most of the site is covered with asphalt and concrete and operations do not take place outdoors. If a release were to occur, it would most likely not reach groundwater.				

#### Footnotes:

1"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.	expecte	Has the <b>migration</b> of contaminated groundwater <b>stabilized</b> (such that contaminated groundwater is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated groundwater" <sup>2</sup> as defined by the monitoring ocations designated at the time of this determination)?				
		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"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):

<sup>&</sup>lt;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 <b>discharge</b> into <b>surface water</b> 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.		
Rationa	le and R	eference(s):		

5.	maximum concentration <sup>3</sup> of each contaminant discharging 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 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 judgment/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.		
Ration	ale and Re	eference(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.

б.	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 <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 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 <sub>5</sub> , 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 " <b>currently acceptable</b> ") - 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.		
Ratior	nale and R	eference(s):		

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.

	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.			
Rational	e and Re	eference(s):			

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 the American Environmental Services facility, EPA ID # WVD 981 107 600, located at 1750 Morgantown Industrial Park, Morgantown, WV 26501. 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) (print) (title)	-s- Denis Zielinski Senior RPM	Date _	7/29/10	
	Supervisor	(signature) (print) (title)	Luis Pizarro Associate Director EPA Region III	Date _ 	8/2/10	
Locatio	ons where Reference	ces may be found:				
	US EPA Region Land & Chemica 1650 Arch Stree Philadelphia, PA	als Division t				
Contac	t telephone and e-1 (name) Denis (phone #) 215-	s M. Zielinski				
		nski.denis@epa.go	V			