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:	Paxar Corporation
	Facility Address:	317 South Thomas Avenue, Sayre, Pennsylvania
	Facility EPA ID #:	PAD 080 879 588
1.	groundwater me	relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to he dia, subject to RCRA Corrective Action (e.g., from Solid Waste Management Units ated Units (RU), and Areas of Concern (AOC)), been considered in this EI determination?
	X	If yes - check here and continue with #2 below.
	9.	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 nonhuman (ecological) receptors is intended to be developed in the future.

Definition of "Current Human Exposures Under Controls" EI

A positive "Current Human Exposures Under Control" EI determination ("YE" status code) indicates that there are no "unacceptable" human exposures to "contamination" (i.e., contaminants in concentrations in excess of appropriate risk-based levels) that can be reasonably expected under current land- and groundwater-use conditions (for all "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 groundwater 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.	Is groundwater known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (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
	X	referencing supporting documentation to demonstrate that groundwater is not "contaminated."
		If unknown (for any media) - skip to #8 and enter "IN" status code.
Ration	ale and Reference(s):

See next page for response to Rationale and Reference(s).

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).

Response to Question 2, Migration of Contaminated Groundwater under Control

Rationale and Reference(s):

The site does not contain any groundwater monitoring wells; therefore, no groundwater monitoring has taken place. According to PADEP and USEPA files, no releases to groundwater (or soil) appear to have occurred at this facility.

A sectional UST was formerly located on the southwestern side of the building/Area G. This storage tank was divided into three compartments and had a total capacity of 10,000 gallons. This UST contained methyl ethyl ketone (MEK), toluene, and isopropyl alcohol (IPA). In August 1994, the UST was removed (Brooks Petroleum Contracting Company, September 7, 1994). According to the *Underground Storage Tank Closure Report Form* completed at the time of removal and the samples collected, all soil appeared to be uncontaminated and was used as backfill. Soil samples collected at the time of removal showed low levels of MTBE present in the soil. Following removal, the area was capped.

Based on the lack of history of releases, and the fact that most of the site is paved and covered with a building, it does not appear that soil or groundwater contamination exists.

The Paxar South Thomas Avenue facility had a history of VOC emissions exceeding PADER regulations dating back to the early 1980s. The sources of these emissions were the facility's two retrogravure printing presses and the "A and B fabric coating lines" (PADER, October 18, 1983). The facility attempted to mitigate VOC emissions through numerous operational changes but were not successful. In September 1995, Paxar informed PADEP that all ink manufacturing processes at the South Thomas Avenue facility ceased and were relocated to a new manufacturing facility in Rock Hill, South Carolina (Paxar, September 10, 1995). As a result, the retrogravure printing presses and the "A and B fabric coating lines" were no longer to be used in the facility's operations.

to remain within	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)?	
<u> </u>	If yes - continue, after presenting or referencing the physical evidence (e.g., groundwater sampling/measurement/migration barrierdata) and rationale why contaminated groundwater is expected to remain within the (horizontal or vertical) dimensions of the "existing area of groundwater contamination"	
	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	s):	

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.

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

4.	Does "contaminated" groundwater discharge into surface water bodies?	
		If yes - continue after identifying potentially affected surface water bodies.
	5 g	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.
Ration	nale and Reference	's):

5.	maximum conce appropriate grou discharging cont	of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water likely to be "insignificant" (i.e., the ntration of each contaminant discharging into surface water is less than 10 times their ndwater "level," and there are no other conditions (e.g., the nature, and number, of aminants, or environmental setting), which significantly increase the potential for pacts to surface water, sediments, or eco-systems at these concentrations)?
٠		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 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
	s	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 of <u>each</u> 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 greater than 100 times their appropriate "level(s)," and if 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):

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

Can the discharge of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water be shown to be "currently 6. 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?)? 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-assessment⁵ 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 interimassessment (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 formaking the EI determination. If no - (the discharge of "contaminated" groundwater can not be shown to be "currently acceptable") - skip to #8 and enter a "NO" status, after documenting the currently unacceptable impacts to the surface water body, sediments, and/or eco-systems...

Rationale and Reference(s):

If unknown - skip to 8 and enter "IN" status code.

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 Reference(s):

8.	(event code CA750),	and obtain Supervisor (or appropriate Manager) signature and date on the EI determination riate supporting documentation as well as a map of the facility).
	YE	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 Paxar Corporation facility, EPA ID # PAD 080 879 588, located at 317 South Thomas Avenue, Sayre, PA. 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 reevaluated 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) Late 11/4/11 (print) Joseph Figured
		(title) Permits Section
	Supervisor:	(signature) Date 11-3-11 (print) Paul Gotthold
		(title) Assoc. Director, PA Remed., LCD
		(EPA Region or State) EPA Region 3
		(Biritagion of State) Biritagion 5
	Locations where	References may be found
	which ca	ence documents are appended to the Environmental Indicator Final Report, n be found at the PADEP North Central Records Office (in Williamsport) or Region III Records Office (in Philadelphia).
	Contact telephon	e and e-mail numbers:
	(name)	Joseph Figured
) (570) 327-3730

Jfigured@state.pa.us

Facility Name: Paxar Corporation EPA ID #: PAD 080 879 588

Location: 317 South Thomas Avenue, Sayre, PA

MIGRATION OF CONTAMINATED GROUNDWATER UNDER CONTROL (CA 750)

