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: DuPont Performance Coatings, Inc
Facility Address: 7961 Winchester Road, Front Royal, Virginia 22630
FACILITY EPA ID #: VAD 980 554 539

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?

   __√__ 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" 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. Is **groundwater** known or reasonably suspected to be **"contaminated"**[1] 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):

Site Background

The site is located in Warren County, Virginia, just north of Front Royal as illustrated on Figure 1. It covers approximately 195 acres and is situated at the northeast corner of the intersection of U.S. Route 340/522 and Route 658. The nearest residence to the facility is approximately 1,000 feet from the manufacturing area to the northeast (60 feet from the property line).

Since June 1981, the Front Royal plant has manufactured resin polymers finishes and paint related products for the automotive original equipment and after market. Prior to plant construction in 1981, the site was used for agricultural purposes.

The facility currently employs approximately 400 individuals and operates a 24 hour per day 7 day per week. The facility layout includes an office area, two story manufacturing area, and a packaging/warehouse location. Areas around tanks and manufacturing units are typically concrete and asphalt. The active portion is completely surrounded by a 7-foot high chain link fence. Access to the site both vehicular and pedestrian is controlled through a single entrance. Security personnel on a 24-hour basis man this entrance. Security guards make frequent tours of the site perimeter to detect unauthorized entry.

The facility was constructed in a manner that did not place any product lines underground. The facility was built with each building having containment measures, including trench drains. An on-site spill basin allows for the detention of liquids for testing prior to on-site surface discharge. Stormwater is surface discharged on-site through a gate-controlled outfall. The entire facility is built on a grade that provides for secondary containment with a clay lined earthen dam.

Eleven solid waste management units (SWMUs) and two areas of concern (AOCs) were identified in the RCRA Site Visit Report[2]. Releases have been documented at the two AOCs. However, remediation at each area included the excavation and off-site disposal of potentially impacted soil. Confirmatory soil samples did not indicate any constituents above screening criteria (EPA, 2009. Regional Screening Levels for Chemical Contaminants at Superfund Sites. May 20.).

---

[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).
[2] Tetra Tech, 2006. Draft Final RCRA Site Visit Report. December.

Groundwater Conditions

Groundwater is not a media of concern at the site. The depth to the groundwater is more than 50 feet below grade. The facility currently maintains 5 vapor wells surrounding the fuel oil tank. The wells are 50 feet in depth and penetrate into bedrock. The water table was not encountered during drilling. No sampling data was provided for the wells. However, facility representatives have indicated that no vapors have ever been detected in these wells. In addition, there are no documented releases that have occurred that could have impacted groundwater conditions at the facility. Groundwater is not currently used as a potable or irrigation water supply at the facility. The plant utilizes local municipal potable water.

3. Has the **migration** of contaminated groundwater **stabilized** (such that contaminated groundwater is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated groundwater"[3] 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):

[3] "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.

Rationale and Reference(s):

5. Is the **discharge** of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water likely to be **"insignificant"** (i.e., the maximum concentration[4] 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[3] 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[3] 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[3] 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):

[4] 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[5])?

_____ 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,[6] 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):

---

[5] 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.

[6] 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.

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).

__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 **DuPont Performance Coatings, EPA ID# VAD980554539,** located at **7961 Winchester Road, Front Royal, VA 22630**. 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		Erich Weissbart	Date	9/15/09
	(Print)	Erich Weissbart		
	(Title)	Environmental Engineer Senior		

Supervisor		Jutta Schneider	Date	9/16/09
	(Print)	Jutta Schneider		
	(Title)	Groundwater Team Leader, Office of Remediation Programs		
	(EPA Region or State)	VADEQ		

Locations where References may be found:

Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
629 East Main Street
Richmond, VA 23219

Contact telephone and e-mail numbers:

(Name)	Erich Weissbart
(Phone #)	(804)-698-4393
(e-mail)	Erich.Weissbart@deq.virginia.gov



CORPORATE REMEDIATION GROUP

An Alliance between
DuPont and URS Diamond - North Carolina

6324 Fairview Road
Charlotte, NC 28210

Title: Topographic Site Location Map
E.I. CA 725
DuPont Performance Coatings, Inc.
Front Royal, Virginia

Created: C. Oneal	DuPont Project Number: 4478
Date: 06/13/09	URSD Project Number: 16984825
Revision:	Figure Number: 1
File Name: G:\Front_Royal\GIS\Projects\FR_site_layout_Landscape06_09.mxd	