

**ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR (EI) RCRIS CODE (CA725)**

**Current Human Exposures Under Control**

Facility Name: PERMAPOST  
Facility Address: 25600 SW. Tualatin Valley Highway, Hillsboro, OR 97123  
Facility EPA ID #: ORD 009041187

1. Has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to soil, groundwater, surface water/sediments, and air, 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 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 "Current Human Exposures Under Control" EI**

A positive "Current Human Exposures Under Control" EI determination ("YE" status code) indicates that there are no "unacceptable" human exposures to "contamination" (i.e., contaminants in concentrations in excess of appropriate risk-based levels) that can be reasonably expected under current land- and groundwater-use conditions (for all "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 "Current Human Exposures Under Control" EI are for reasonably expected human exposures under current land- and groundwater-use conditions ONLY, and do not consider potential future land- or groundwater-use conditions or ecological receptors. The RCRA Corrective Action program's overall mission to protect human health and the environment requires that Final remedies address these issues (i.e., potential future human exposure scenarios, future land and groundwater uses, and ecological receptors).

**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).

**Current Human Exposures Under Control**  
**Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS Code (CA725)**  
**Page 2**

2. Are groundwater, soil, surface water, sediments, or air **media** known or reasonably suspected to be **“contaminated”**<sup>1</sup> above appropriately protective risk-based “levels” (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, guidance, or criteria) from releases subject to RCRA Corrective Action (from SWMUs, RUs or AOCs)?

**“Contaminated” Media      Yes      No      ?      Rationale / Key Contaminants**

Groundwater	✓			Pentachlorophenol, tetrachlorophenol, As, Cr, petroleum hydrocarbons
Air (indoors)			✓	Unknown
Soil (surface, e.g., <2 ft)	✓			Pentachlorophenol, tetrachlorophenol, As, petroleum hydrocarbons
Surface Water		✓		Sampling and modeling show no significant surf. Water contamination
Sediment			✓	Unknown.
Soil (subsurface e.g., >2 ft)	✓			Pentachlorophenol, tetrachlorophenol, As,
Air (outdoors)			✓	Unknown.

**If no** (for all media) - skip to #6, and enter “YE,” status code after providing or citing appropriate “levels,” and referencing sufficient supporting documentation demonstrating that these “levels” are not exceeded.

**If yes** (for any media) - continue after identifying key contaminants in each “contaminated” medium, citing appropriate “levels” (or provide an explanation for the determination that the medium could pose an unacceptable risk), and referencing supporting documentation.

**If unknown** (for any media) - skip to #6 and enter “IN” status code.

**Rationale and Reference(s):**

Permapost is a wood treating facility which has operated since 1961. Permapost is a permitted on-site treatment, storage, and disposal facility. Pesticide formulations used in the pressure-treating include: ammoniacal copper-zinc arsenate (ACZA), pentachlorophenol (in a petroleum naphtha carrier), copper naphthenate, copper-8-quinolinolate, and zinc naphthenate. Miscellaneous maintenance and fabrication operations associated with the pressure treating process are also conducted at the facility. The site had three unlined lagoons. From 1961 to 1984, all process wastewater, sludge, fuel oil, excess treating solution, cleaning solutions, and rainfall were collected in a 150,000-gallon lagoon in the northwest corner of the site. The liquid waste in the lagoon was treated by recycling and by evaporation using overhead sprayers. A second, 100,000-gallon lagoon was constructed in 1976, to contain excess water from the primary lagoon and store runoff; it was referred to as the recirculation impoundment. The third lagoon was constructed in 1980 to handle excess waste from the recirculation impoundment. On 6/10/80, Ecology and Environment performed a hazardous waste site evaluation; the primary disposal lagoon was close to overflowing and its evaporation rate was insufficient to prevent such overflows. On 8/31/82, DEQ sampled soil from the northern boundary drainage ditch and from a point halfway between the site and Rock Creek; arsenic levels were 1540 and 437 mg/kg, respectively. In 10/82, Permapost installed an upgradient and four downgradient monitoring wells along the west property line. On 6/12/83, arsenic and pentachlorophenol were detected in downgradient wells. On 5/6/84, Sweet, Edwards and Associates conducted extensive groundwater, surface water and soil sampling; additional monitoring wells were installed. Pentachlorophenol, tetrachlorophenol isomers, and arsenic were detected in groundwater. Greater than 75 mg/kg total metals were found in shallow soil samples adjacent to the sludge impoundment. On 9/10/84, an off-site monitoring well was installed. Pentachlorophenol and 2,3,4,6-tetrachlorophenol were detected. Contaminated soil was removed after 1984. The lagoons were filled and paved, and are now regulated as closed RCRA landfills. The contaminant plume can be measured in hundreds of feet. Results from January 2000 groundwater sampling showed maximum concentrations of tetrachlorophenol at 1.6 mg/L, pentachlorophenol at 24 mg/L, and arsenic at 0.07 mg/L.

**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 appropriately protective risk-based “levels” (for the media, that identify risks within the acceptable risk range).

<sup>2</sup>. Recent evidence (from the Colorado Dept. of Public Health and Environment, and others) suggest that unacceptable indoor air concentrations are more common in structures above groundwater with volatile contaminants than previously believed. This is a rapidly developing field and reviewers are encouraged to look to the latest guidance for the appropriate methods and scale of demonstration necessary to be reasonably certain that indoor air (in structures located above (and adjacent to) groundwater with volatile contaminants) does not present unacceptable risks.

**Current Human Exposures Under Control**  
**Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS Code (CA725)**  
**Page 3**

- Are there **complete pathways** between “contamination” and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under the current (land- and groundwater-use) conditions?

**Summary Exposure Pathway Evaluation Table**

Potential **Human Receptors** (Under Current Conditions)

“Contaminated” Media	Residents	Workers	Day-Care	Construction	Trespassers	Recreation	Food 3
Groundwater							
Air (indoors)							
Soil (surface, e.g., <2 ft)							
Surface Water							
Sediment							
Soil (subsurface e.g., >2 ft)							
Air (outdoors)							

**Instructions for Summary Exposure Pathway Evaluation Table:**

- Strike-out specific Media including Human Receptors’ spaces for Media which are not “contaminated”) as identified in #2 above.
- Enter “yes” or “no” for potential “completeness” under each “Contaminated” Media -- Human Receptor combination (Pathway).

**Note:** In order to focus the evaluation to the most probable combinations some potential “Contaminated” Media - Human Receptor combinations (Pathways) do not have check spaces (“\_\_\_”). While these combinations may not be probable in most situations they may be possible in some settings and should be added as necessary.

- If no** (pathways are not complete for any contaminated media-receptor combination) - skip to #6, and enter “YE” status code, after explaining and/or referencing condition(s) in-place, whether natural or man-made, preventing a complete exposure pathway from each contaminated medium (e.g., use optional Pathway Evaluation Work Sheet to analyze major pathways).
- If yes** (pathways are complete for any “Contaminated” Media - Human Receptor combination) - continue after providing supporting explanation.
- If unknown** (for any “Contaminated” Media - Human Receptor combination) - skip to #6 and enter “IN” status code

**Rationale and Reference(s):** Additional information obtained in 2002 indicated pentachlorophenol contamination located offsite and southwest of the facility. The conceptual site model was revised to incorporate potential exposure of off-site residents in this area. A report entitled “Fate and Transport and Locality Status” was submitted on July 17, 2002. This report identified 6 potential residential wells in the area and follow-up information indicated potentially complete exposure pathways for only two of the wells. In response to a survey on use, the well owners indicated the wells were not used for drinking and may occasionally be used for irrigation. On August 23, 2002, a “Workplan for Expanded Human Health Risk Assessment” was submitted. A determination of complete exposure pathways and an assessment of potential risks to human receptors is ongoing.

**Footnotes:**

<sup>3</sup>. *Indirect Pathway/Receptor (e.g., vegetables, fruits, crops, meat and dairy products, fish, shellfish, etc.)*

**Current Human Exposures Under Control**  
**Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS Code (CA725)**  
**Page 4**

---

4. Can the **exposures** from any of the complete pathways identified in #3 be reasonably expected to be **“significant”**<sup>4</sup> (i.e., potentially “unacceptable” because exposures can be reasonably expected to be: (1) greater in magnitude (intensity, frequency and/or duration) than assumed in the derivation of the acceptable “levels” (used to identify the “contamination”); or (2) the combination of exposure magnitude (perhaps even though low) and contaminant concentrations (which may be substantially above the acceptable “levels”) could result in greater than acceptable risks)?

**If no** (exposures can not be reasonably expected to be significant (i.e., potentially “unacceptable”) for any complete exposure pathway) - skip to #6 and enter “YE” status code after explaining and/or referencing documentation justifying why the exposures (from each of the complete pathways) to “contamination” (identified in #3) are not expected to be “significant.”

**If yes** (exposures could be reasonably expected to be “significant” (i.e., potentially “unacceptable”) for any complete exposure pathway) - continue after providing a description (of each potentially “unacceptable” exposure pathway) and explaining and/or referencing documentation justifying why the exposures (from each of the remaining complete pathways) to “contamination” (identified in #3) are not expected to be “significant.”

**If unknown** (for any complete pathway) - skip to #6 and enter “IN” status code

**Rationale and Reference(s):**

---

---

---

**Footnotes:**

<sup>4</sup> *If there is any question on whether the identified exposures are “significant” (i.e., potentially “unacceptable”) consult a human health Risk Assessment specialist with appropriate education, training and experience.*

**Current Human Exposures Under Control**  
**Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS Code (CA725)**  
**Page 5**

---

5. Can the “significant” **exposures** (identified in #4) be shown to be within **acceptable** limits?
- If yes** (all “significant” exposures have been shown to be within acceptable limits) - continue and enter “YE” after summarizing and referencing documentation justifying why all “significant” exposures to “contamination” are within acceptable limits (e.g., a site-specific Human Health Risk Assessment).
  - If no** (there are current exposures that can be reasonably expected to be “unacceptable”)- continue and enter “NO” status code after providing a description of each potentially “unacceptable” exposure.
  - If unknown** (for any potentially “unacceptable” exposure) - continue and enter “IN” status code

**Rationale and Reference(s):**

---

---

---

**Current Human Exposures Under Control**  
**Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS Code (CA725)**  
**Page 6**

---

6. Check the appropriate RCRIS status codes for the Current Human Exposures Under Control EI event code (CA725), and obtain Supervisor (or appropriate Manager) signature and date on the EI determination below (and attach appropriate supporting documentation as well as a map of the facility):

- YE - Yes**, "Current Human Exposures Under Control" has been verified. Based on a review of the information contained in this EI Determination, "Current Human Exposures" are expected to be "Under Control" at the **PERMAPOST** facility, EPA ID #**ORD 009041187**, located at **25600 SW. Tualatin Valley Highway, Hillsboro, OR 97123** under current and reasonably expected conditions. This determination will be re-evaluated when the Agency/State becomes aware of significant changes at the facility.
- NO** - "Current Human Exposures" are NOT "Under Control."
- IN** - More information is needed to make a determination.

**Completed By:**

_____	_____ 8/04 _____
(Signature)	(Date)
<u>Barb Puchy</u>	<u>Hazardous Waste Specialist</u>
(Print Name)	(Title)

**Supervisor:**

_____	_____
(Signature)	(Date)
<u>Andree Pollock</u>	<u>Manager, Hazardous Waste Compliance</u>
(Print Name)	(Title)

Oregon Department of Environmental Quality  
(EPA Region or State)

**Locations where References may be found:**

DEQ - Northwest Region, 2020 SW.4th Avenue, PtlD.97201 P

**Contact telephone and E-mail numbers:**

<u>Bill Robertson, NWR</u>	<u>(503) 229-6843</u>	<u>robertson.bill@deq.state.or.us</u>
(Name)	(Phone Number)	(E-Mail)

**FINAL NOTE: THE HUMAN EXPOSURES EI IS A QUALITATIVE SCREENING OF EXPOSURES AND THE DETERMINATIONS WITHIN THIS DOCUMENT SHOULD NOT BE USED AS THE SOLE BASIS FOR RESTRICTING THE SCOPE OF MORE DETAILED (E.G., SITE-SPECIFIC) ASSESSMENTS OF RISK.**



**ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR (EI) RCRIS CODE (CA750)**

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control**

Facility Name: PERMAPOST  
Facility Address: 25600 SW. Tualatin Valley Highway, Hillsboro, OR 97123  
Facility EPA ID #: ORD 009041187

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).

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control**  
**Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS Code (CA750)**  
**Page 2**

---

2. Is **groundwater** known or reasonably suspected to be “**contaminated**”<sup>1</sup> 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):**

This site has a significant plume of groundwater contamination that requires continuous treatment to prevent off-site impacts to local groundwater resources and to surface water in nearby Rock Creek. Results from the January 28, 2000, semi-annual groundwater sampling show excesses of pentachlorophenol (ranging from non-detect (ND) to 24 mg/L), tetrachlorophenol (ranging from ND to 1.6 mg/L), and arsenic (ranging ND to 0.07 mg/L). Known or suspected hazardous substances which have been detected in soil and groundwater are presented in sections 1.3.6 and 1.4.1 of the "Level I Scoping Ecological Risk Assessment Permapost Products Company, Inc.," dated May 14, 1999.

**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).

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control**  
**Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS Code (CA750)**  
**Page 3**

---

3. Has the **migration** of contaminated groundwater **stabilized** (such that contaminated groundwater is expected to remain within “existing area of contaminated groundwater”<sup>2</sup> 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 Reference(s):**

Groundwater is moving in a northwesterly direction and has the potential to discharge to the offsite marshy area. Migration of groundwater also has the potential to discharge to the Valley Memorial Park Cemetery Lake. The extent and magnitude of the groundwater contamination has been assessed using a fate and transport model as part of a human health risk assessment. Additional sampling and computer modeling from 2003 and 2004 shows that the contaminated groundwater plume is stable. Modeling indicates that contamination will not reach the marshy area and contaminated groundwater does not cause significant contamination in Cemetery Lake.

**Footnotes:**

<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.

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control**  
**Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS Code (CA750)**  
**Page 4**

---

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):**

Groundwater samples indicate low concentrations of contaminants in proximity to Cemetery Lake. However, surface water samples from the Lake and modeling of groundwater discharge to surface water do not indicate any surface water contamination above risk-based concentrations.

---

---

---

---

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control**  
**Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS Code (CA750)**  
**Page 5**

---

5. Is the **discharge** of “contaminated” groundwater into surface water likely to be “**insignificant**” (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 ecosystems 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 ecosystem.

**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 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<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):**

Groundwater samples indicate low concentrations of contaminants in proximity to Cemetery Lake. However, surface water samples from the Lake and modeling of groundwater discharge to surface water do not indicate any surface water contamination above risk-based concentrations

---

---

---

**Footnotes:**

<sup>3</sup> 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)  
Page 6**

---

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 ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented<sup>4</sup>)?

**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,<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 ecosystems, 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 ecosystems.

**If unknown** - skip to 8 and enter “IN” status code.

**Rationale and Reference(s):**

---

---

---

---

**Footnotes:**

<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>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 ecosystems.

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control**  
**Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS Code (CA750)**  
**Page 7**

---

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):**

The groundwater pump and treatment system has been operating since March 1991.  
Groundwater monitoring will continue as \_\_\_\_\_ required by the Post-Closure permit.

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control  
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS Code (CA750)  
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 **PERMAPOST** facility, EPA ID #**ORD 009041187**, located at **25600 SW. Tualatin Valley Highway, Hillsboro, OR 97123** under current and reasonably expected conditions. 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)  
  
Barb Puchy  
(Print Name)

8/04 \_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)  
  
Hazardous Waste Specialist  
(Title)

**Supervisor:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature)  
  
Andree Pollock  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)  
  
Manager, Hazardous Waste Manager  
\_\_\_\_\_

Oregon Department of Environmental Quality  
(EPA Region or State)

**Locations where References may be found:**

DEQ - Northwest Region, 2020 SW.4th Avenue, Ptlid.97201

**Contact telephone and E-mail numbers:**

Bill Robertson, NWR  
(Name)

(503) 229-6843  
(Phone Number)

robertson.bill@deq.state.or.us  
(E-Mail)