DOCUMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR DETERMINATION

RCRA Corrective Action
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)

Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control

Facility Name:	Cedar Chemical Corporation
Facility Address:	State Highway 242, West Helena, Arkansas
Facility EPA ID #:	ARD990660649

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?

   Yes 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.

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 AMigration 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?

__Yes__ 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):
1,2-dichloroethane has been detected in off site monitoring wells in concentrations ranging from 42 ug/l to 14000 ug/l. MCL for 1,2-dichloroethane is 5 ug/l, CAS Region 6 High Screen value for tap water is 12 ug/l. Groundwater is not utilized as a source of potable water for any population. Potentially exposed population is agricultural workers during the months from June to September when irrigation is required.

References Cedar Chemical Corp - Risk Assessment 21 March 2000 ENSAFE Project#2162-012; Cedar Chemical Corp - Groundwater Monitoring Report, 21 September 2001; EPA Region 6 CAS Low-Priority Brightline Screening tables and High-Priority Screening Tables; Cedar Chemical Company Facility Investigation Report submitted by Ensafe June 28, 1996.

[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).

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)?

__Yes__ 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):

Agricultural well AGI-2 has remained uncontaminated based on analytical results from the 07/27/04 EPA sampling event. AGI-2 is located downgradient from the groundwater plume.

---

[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.

No 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: Based on depth to groundwater in the perched and alluvial aquifer (10 – 24 feet) and the depth of shallow drainage ditches in the area (5 – 6 feet), a groundwater to surface water interface should not be a concern.

The constructed wetland at the site is a bermed area constructed for use as a containment for waste water or storm water treatment. According to the history of the site was the constructed wetland was never utilized. The base of this unit is at or just below the natural land surface. Based on the depth to ground water a groundwater interface should not be a concern.

The former wastewater treatment ponds are located side gradient to the direction of groundwater flow. Contaminated groundwater discharge into the ponds should not be a concern.

Reference(s): Cedar Chemical Company Facility Investigation Report; Ensafe June 29, 1996

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 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):

---

[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 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.

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?"

Yes ___ 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): The Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) with the possible assistance of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) will continue to monitor Agricultural wells within and outside of the plume along with monitoring well elevations to track the stabilization of groundwater contamination. See Attached map of monitoring well and Ag well locations.

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 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 **Cedar Chemical Corporation** facility, **EPA ID # ARD990660649** , located in **West Helena, AR.** 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) _____ Date 5/1/07
(print) Jim Rigg
(title) Geology Supervisor

Supervisor (signature) _____ Date 5/1/07
(print) Tammie Hynum
(title) Technical Branch Manager
(EPA Region or State) Arkansas

Locations where References may be found:

Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality
8001 National Drive
Little Rock, AR.
Hazardous Waste Division and/or the Records Management Section

Contact telephone and e-mail numbers

(name) Jim Rigg
(phone #) 501-682-0832
(e-mail) rigg@adeq.state.ar.us



BOOZ | ALLEN | HAMILTON
230 Peachtree Street N.E. Suite 2100
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
(404) 659-3600 FAX (404) 589-7050

ON-SITE MONITORING WELL LOCATION MAP

Facility Name:	CEDAR CHEMICAL	Date: 08/25/03	
Facility Address:	WEST HELENA, ARKANSAS		Figure: 1
Drawn By: AER	Checked By: AS		* NOT TO SCALE


CEDAR CHEMICAL CORPORATION
BHAG-1
AGI-5
OFFMW-3
OFFMW-4
OFFMW-1
OFFMW-2
AGI-1
AGI-6
AGI-2
N
LEGEND
EXISTING MONITORING OR AGRICULTURAL WELL
BOOZ | ALLEN | HAMILTON
OFF-SITE MONITORING WELL LOCATION MAP
Facility Name: CEDAR CHEMICAL
Date: 08/25/03
Facility Address: WEST HELENA, ARKANSAS
Figure: 2
Drawn By: AER
Checked By: AS
NOT TO SCALE