DOCUMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR DETERMINATION

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

Facility Name:

Beazer East, Inc. (formerly Koppers Company, Inc.)

Facility Address:

15 Plum Street, Verona, PA 15147

Facility EPA ID#:

PAD980554950

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?		
	\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.	Is groundwater known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated"; 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.	
	\boxtimes	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):

In 1996, Beazer East, Inc. filed a Notice of Intent to Remediate (NIR) under the Pennsylvania's Land Recycling Program (Act 2 Program) to investigate and remediate the Site to site-specific standards for nonresidential reuse of the property. As part of the investigation Beazer conducted a Phase I Environment Site Assessment that included a record review and site reconnaissance to evaluate the history and the conditions of the Site. The Phase I preliminary environmental assessment did not identify any past operations at the site that would have significantly impacted the environment or pose a human health exposure risks. Subsequently, Beazer conducted a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment that consisted of groundwater, soils, and sediment sampling to determine and confirm the environmental impact of past operations at the Site. In 1997, PADEP approved the Final Report and issued the Facility a release of liability under the PADEP Act 2 Land Recyling Program.

The groundwater investigation targeted volatile organic compounds (VOCs), semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs), heavy metals and total cyanide. Several groundwater monitoring wells were installed upgradient and downgradient of the Facility. Groundwater was encountered in the shallow aquifer approximately 9 feet below ground surface (bgs). The groundwater flow is to the north-northwest and discharges to Plum Creek located adjacent to the Facility. Groundwater is not the source of water supply in the area. Oakmont Water Authority supplies public water to the Facility and the surrounding areas draw its water from the nearby Allegheny River.

No VOCs, SVOCs or total cyanide were detected in groundwater. The majority of the heavy metals of concern detected in groundwater were below EPA's Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs). However, for some heavy metals (e.g., As, Pb, Se, Sb, Tl), the detection limits used to evaluate groundwater quality were above the MCLs. Although these specific five metals were non-detects in groundwater, the results are not necessarily representative of the groundwater quality at the Facility. The former monitor wells are no longer available for re-sampling. Therefore, to determine if past operations at the Facility could have impacted groundwater relative to the five aforementioned heavy metals, a file review of historic activities at the Facility was conducted. In addition, the subsurface soil samples collected at the Facility along with sediment samples in Plum Creek were evaluated to deduce the groundwater quality at the site for the five aforementioned heavy metals.

The subsurface soil results for the aforementioned heavy metals did not exceed the PADEP Statewide Health residential soil standards nor the PADEP soil-to-groundwater standards. Similarly, the sediment results did not exceed either of the PADEP standards. The results confirm that As, Pb, Se, Sb, and Tl concentrations in subsurface soils and sediment are minimal and do not adversely impact groundwater quality at the Facility. In addition, a file review of historic operations at the Facility did not indicate any reported releases or past practices at the Facility that could have warranted an impact to groundwater. Despite the higher detection limits used to evaluate some of the heavy metals, EPA determined that there are no reasons to suspect that the aforementioned heavy metals have adversely impacted groundwater quality at the Facility. Therefore, EPA concludes that groundwater quality at the Facility is not a concern relative to present and past activities conducted at the Site.

(El Inspection Report 2012, 1996 Final Report, Site Characterization, Cleanup Plan and Remediation, 1996 Phase I Environmental Assessment Report, 1989 Final RCRA Facility Assessment Report)

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.	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)?		
		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):

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 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.	
		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.	
Ratio	nale and	Reference(s):	

5.	concent grounds or envir	e discharge of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water likely to be "insignificant" (i.e., the maximum centration of each contaminant discharging into surface water is less than 10 times their appropriate undwater "level," and there are no other conditions (e.g., the nature, and number, of discharging contaminants, invironmental setting), which significantly increase the potential for unacceptable impacts to surface water, ments, 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 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 concentrations 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 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):		

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

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 ₄)?		
		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-assessment ₅ , 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.	
Datio	nala and l	Deference(s):	

Rationale and Reference(s):

- 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 test 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.	
Datia	nale and I	2 of orange (a)	

Rationale and Reference(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 Beazer East, Inc. (formerly Koppers Company, Inc.) facility, EPA ID # PAD980554950, located at 15 Plum Street, Verona, Pennsylvania 15147.		
		NO - Unacceptable migration of contaminated groundwater is observed or expected.		
		IN - More information is needed to make a determination.		
	Completed by Supervisor	(signature) Chear Company Comp		
Locatio	ons where Referen	ces may be found:		
	US EPA Region Waste & Chemi- 1650 Arch Stree Philadelphia, PA	cals Management Division		
Contac	t telephone and e-	mail numbers M. Dao		
	(name) Khai	IVI. D'AO		

(phone #) (215) 814-5467 (e-mail) dao.khai@epa.gov