#### 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:	United States Naval Academy
Facility	Address:	181 Wainwright Road, Annapolis, Maryland 21402-5000
Facility	<b>EPA ID #:</b>	MD0 17 002 2602
1.	groundwater m	le relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to the edia, subject to RCRA Corrective Action (e.g., from Solid Waste Management Units lated Units (RU), and Areas of Concern (AOC)), been <b>considered</b> 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.
BACKG	ROUND	

#### **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., nonaqueous 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).

Page 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 referencing supporting documentation.	
X 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):	
USNA was the subject of three environmental investigations under the EPA Corrective Action Permit. The	
Verification Investigation (1992 VI), the 1996 Phase I RFI and the 2000 Phase II RFI. The VI investigated	
groundwater as related to the three SWMUs and the two AOCs (AOC 3 and AOC 4). The VI identified	
groundwater contamination through 16 onsite monitoring well network including 13 at SWMUs 6 and 8,	
and 3 at SWMU #13.	
Groundwater sampling was conducted at the facility in February 2000. This sampling was conducted as	
part of the Phase II RCRA Facility Investigation. Groundwater samples were collected from three on-site	
monitoring wells. The samples were analyzed for the following constituents: semi-volatile organic	
compounds (SVOCs), polyaromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs),	
target analyte list (TAL) metals, and cyanide. These results showed that no constituent was present in the	
groundwater at a concentration above maximum contaminant levels (MCL). One lead result in excess of	
the action level of 15 ug/L for household plumbing systems was obtained at one well.	
Previous groundwater investigations at the facility were conducted during the Verification	
Investigation (1992) and the Preliminary RFI (1996). The Verification Investigation identified	
constituents of concern above drinking water maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) including	
the following Total metals: arsenic, beryllium, cadmium, chromium, lead, and mercury. None of the	
Dissolved metals exceeded the MCL.	
Groundwater sampling conducted during the Preliminary RFI in August 1996 showed that total metals	
were elevated above the MCLs for antimony and arsenic. However, no other constituents exceeded the	
MCL. Inorganic levels in the groundwater samples from the Preliminary RFI indicate minimal impact	
from the site. Also, the presence of elevated total dissolved solids (TDS) and total suspended solids (TSS)	
may have influenced the inorganic levels in the groundwater samples. No VOCs or SVOCs have	
been identified at levels above MCLs during any groundwater sampling event.	
References Include: (1) Draft Final Solid Waste Management Unit (SWMU) 13 Phase II RCRA Facility	
Investigation United States Naval Academy Annapolis, Maryland (May 2001); (2) Preliminary RCRA	
Facility Investigation (CH2M Hill, June 1998); (3) Verification Investigation (Baker, 1994).	

#### 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).

3.	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" 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" <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 Re	ference(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.
	Rationale and Reference(s):

5.	Is the <b>discharge</b> of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water likely to be " <b>insignificant</b> " (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 <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 <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>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> As measured in groundwater prior to entry to the groundwater-surface water/sediment interaction (e.g., hyporheic) zone.

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.
agency would deem appropriate for making the Di 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.

<sup>&</sup>lt;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>&</sup>lt;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.

7.	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.		
	Rationale and Reference(s):		

Page 8

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 **United States Naval Academy** facility, EPA ID #MD0 17 002 2602, located at 181 Wainwright Road, Annapolis, Maryland 21402-5000. 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.

> > Date: 09-27-02

Date: <u>09-27-02</u>

Completed by (signature)

> Vernon Butler (print)

(title) Remedial Project Manager

**Supervisor** (signature)

> Robert E. Greaves (print)

**Chief, General Operations Branch** (title)

(EPA Region or State) EPA, Region 3

## Locations where References may be found:

EPA, Region III - 11th Floor RCRA Fileroom 1650 Arch Street Philadelphia, PA 19103-2029

#### Contact telephone and e-mail numbers:

(name) Vernon Butler

(phone number) 215-814-3425

(e-mail) butler.vernon@epa.gov