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: **The Rochester Group (Tyco Electronics)**
Facility Address: **751 Old Brandy Road, Culpeper, VA 22701**
Facility EPA ID #: **VAD 059 174 367**

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

Rochester began manufacturing operations in Culpeper in 1941. Operations included the production of steel wire rope used in commercial ships, military ships, and other industrial/construction applications. In 1978, Rochester began manufacturing electro-mechanical cables and added the production of fiber optic cable in the 1980s. In 1996, Rochester divested the steel wire rope business and, therefore, no longer manufactures this product at this facility. Prior to 2002, the facility also operated a Paten Line that involved heat treatment of steel and used the application of molten zinc for anodization purposes. A bright wire process that involved the application of a zinc phosphate coating to prevent rust was also conducted at the facility as part of the Paten Line. The facility terminated all Paten Line Operations and removed all equipment associated with the Paten Line Process between January and February 2007.

As part of the former Paten Line Process, coal chips from the lead quenching process were occasionally scraped off the top of the lead quench bath and collected in a dumpster and disposed in an area known as the Former Coal–Lead Hazardous Waste Pile (SWMU No. 1). Small amounts of zinc slag or dross from the zinc coating of wire was also placed in the same bin with the coal-lead waste. The lead quench unit was replaced with a fluidized sand bed in the late 1980s.

The facility currently draws steel rods into wire and consumes approximately 70 percent of the steel wire it produces into its own manufactured products. The manufacturing process includes, but is not limited to, wire drawing using a sodium carbonate lubricant, extrusion (plastic), copper wire stranding, cabling, armoring, and some braiding. The facility also manufactures umbilicals that incorporate steel twisted around electro-mechanical and fiber optic cables for use in the operation of various robotic vehicles. The lubing material used in the wire drawing process consists of 8120 oil that contains a non-hazardous paraffinic base. The facility uses six wire-drawing machines that draw steel rods into wire of various gauges based on customer specifications.

A cable coating operation (with asphalt) is a part of the specialty cable manufacturing process at the facility. Manufacturing of stranded wire cables includes the application of blocking compounds to fill the hollow spaces or voids between the wires. In the past, blocking compounds were lead-based and created a D008 (lead) hazardous waste. The facility no longer uses lead blocking compounds; epoxy-based blocking compounds are currently used.

Wastewaters (rinse waters) generated from the bright wire and Paten Line Processes were at one time significant and were piped to the Rochester facility's on-site industrial WWTP (SWMU No. 2) for pre-treatment prior to discharge to the Town of Culpeper's Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW) system. The industrial wastewaters were discharged to the POTW system under a Virginia Pollution Discharge Elimination System (VPDES) Industrial Pretreatment Permit issued by

the Town of Culpeper. The on-site WWTP is no longer in use. The Rochester facility currently discharges industrial wastewaters consisting of water from extruders, a test tank, and sanitary wastewater to the Culpeper POTW.

Additional documents can be found in the Final RCRA Site Visit Report, dated May 6, 2009.

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).

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

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):

Several releases with the potential to impact groundwater have occurred at the site. These releases include leaking Underground Storage Tanks (USTs), a diesel spill, and the historic presence of an impoundment for coal-lead hazardous waste at the site. These releases have been addressed to the satisfaction of the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VDEQ). Sampling conducted in May, 2010 indicated the soil surrounding the former in-ground open-top concrete pickle liquor vault contained lead below non-residential Risk Based Concentration (RBC) values, with two samples slightly above residential RBC values. There have been no reported or documented spills or releases from the vault, which is in relatively good condition with no areas of significant deterioration. All other tanks formerly used to store the spent pickle liquor have been removed from the Facility. It should be noted that groundwater was not encountered in any of the excavations, and is estimated to be approximately 35 to 50 feet below ground surface (bgs). Installation of groundwater monitoring wells has not been required as part of prior remediation activities. However, a monitoring well does exist on the property. This monitoring well is operated by the Quarles Fuel Supply Company, an oil distribution company that was formerly located near the northeastern corner of the Rochester site. The Rochester facility is not provided with sampling results from the monitoring well. Given the site topography and the relative elevations of the Rochester manufacturing areas, it is unlikely that any potential or actual groundwater contamination from the Quarles Fuel Supply Company facility would have an impact on groundwater underlying the manufacturing area.

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).

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

3. Has the **migration** of contaminated groundwater **stabilized** (such that contaminated groundwater is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated groundwater"[2] 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.

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

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):

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

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

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

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

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 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[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.

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.

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

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):

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

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 Rochester Group (Tyco Electronics), EPA ID # VAD 059 174 367, located at 751 Old Brandy Road, Culpeper, Virginia 22701. 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) -s- Date _____
(print) Karrie Crumlish
(title)

Supervisor (signature) -s- Date 8/16/2011
(print) Luis Pizarro
(title)
(EPA Region or State)

Locations where References may be found:

US EPA Region III
Land & Chemicals Management Division
1650 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Contact telephone and e-mail numbers
(name) Luis Pizarro
(phone #) 215-814-3444
(e-mail) pizarro.luis@epa.gov