Five-Year Review Report
Pasley Solvents and Chemical Site
Town of Hempstead
Nassau County, New York

Prepared by
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

August 2004

Five-Year Review Summary Form

SITE IDENTIFICATION

Site name *(from WasteLAN)*: Pasley Solvents and Chemicals Site

EPA ID *(from WasteLAN)*: NYD991292004

Region: 2 | **State:** NY | **City/County:** Uniondale/Nassau

SITE STATUS

NPL status: ■ Final ☐ Deleted ☐ Other (specify) _____

Remediation status (choose all that apply): ☐ Under Construction ■ Constructed ■ Operating

Multiple OUs?* ☐ YES ■ NO | **Construction completion date:** September 1999

Are portions of this site in use or suitable for reuse? ■ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

REVIEW STATUS

Lead agency: ■ EPA ☐ State ☐ Tribe ☐ Other Federal Agency _____

Author name: Sherrel D. Henry

Author title: Remedial Project Manager | **Author affiliation:** EPA

Review period:**09/1999 to 03/2004

Date(s) of site inspection: 01/15/2004

Type of review:

■ Post-SARA ☐ Pre-SARA ☐ NPL-Removal only
☐ Non-NPL Remedial Action Site ☐ NPL State/Tribe-lead
☐ Regional Discretion ☐ Statutory

Review number: ■ 1 (first) ☐ 2 (second) ☐ 3 (third) ☐ Other (specify) _____

Triggering action:

☐ Actual RA Onsite Construction at OU #1 ☐ Actual RA Start at OU#____
■ Construction Completion ☐ Previous Five-Year Review Report
☐ Other (specify) _____

Triggering action date *(from WasteLAN)*: 09/30/1999

Does the report include recommendation(s) and follow-up action(s)? ☐ yes ■ no
Is human exposure under control? ■ yes ☐ no ☐ not yet determined
Is contaminated groundwater under control? ■ yes ☐ no ☐ not yet determined
Is the remedy protective of the environment? ■ yes ☐ no ☐ not yet determined
Acres in use or suitable for reuse: 1acre ☐ restricted ■ unrestricted

** [Review period should correspond to the actual start and end dates of the Five-Year Review in WasteLAN.]

I. Introduction

This five-year review was conducted by Sherrel D. Henry, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Remedial Project Manager (RPM). This review was conducted in accordance with the Comprehensive Five-Year Review Guidance, OSWER Directive 9355.7-03B-P (June 2001). The purpose of a five-year review is to assure that implemented remedies protect public health and the environment and that they function as intended by the site decision documents. This document will become part of the site file.

II. Site Chronology

Table 1, below, summarizes site-related events from discovery to present.

Table 1: Chronology of Site Events	
Event	**Date**
Site Placed on National Priorities List (NPL)	1986
Administrative Order on Consent with PRPs for RI/FS	1988
EPA Initiates Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS)	1990
RI/FS Completed	1992
Record of Decision (ROD) Issued by EPA	1992
Air Sparging/Soil Vapor Extraction Pilot Test Performed by PRP	1993
Air Sparging/Soil Vapor Extraction Pilot Test Study Report Approved by EPA	1994
ROD Amendment Issued by EPA	1995
Consent Decree between EPA and PRPs for Remedial Design/Remedial Action (RD/RA) Entered with Court	1996
RD Completed/RA Started	1997
RA Completed	1997
Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Started	1997
Preliminary Close-Out Report Issued	1999
Operation and Maintenance (O&M) completed	2003
Post-Remediation Monitoring Phase Started	2003
Deletion from NPL	2004*

* projected

III. Background

Physical Characteristics

The Pasley Solvents and Chemicals Site (Site) property measures 75' by 275' with a fenced boundary on the north, east and south sides and is located just west of 585 Commercial Avenue, Town of Hempstead, Nassau County, New York. The Site lies between the borders of the political subdivisions of the Village of Garden City and Uniondale, in the Town of Hempstead (see Figure 1). A building and loading platform form the western boundary of the Site. The ground is covered by gravel and blue stone with some sparse vegetation.

Geology/Hydrogeology

There are two distinct formations in the Pasley study area, the Upper Glacial aquifer and the Magothy aquifer. The unconsolidated sand and gravel sediments encountered to a depth of 60 feet belong to the Upper Pleistocene undifferentiated glacial outwash deposits or Upper Glacial aquifer. The Magothy formation consists of fine sand often containing thin, discontinuous layers of silt and clay. The thickness of the Magothy aquifer is estimated at 400 to 500 feet in the Pasley study area. The Upper Glacial aquifer overlies the Magothy aquifer and the two may act as distinct aquifers, or as one, depending upon the degree of hydraulic connection between the two. The groundwater in these aquifers flows in a southwesterly to south southwesterly direction depending upon depth.

Land and Resource Use

The immediate area has light industrial and commercial properties; residential communities are located within 1/4 mile of the Site. The predominant land use in the vicinity is industrial with the nearest off-site building adjacent to the Site. It is estimated that 75 homes are located within a 1/4 mile radius of the Site and 1,800 homes within one mile of the Site. The only source of drinking water for residences in the Town of Hempstead is ground water. All public water supply wells in the Site area draw water from the deeper aquifer, the Magothy Aquifer. Four public water supply wells that serves the residents near the site are located within approximately two miles of the Site.

History of Contamination

From 1969 until 1982, the Site was occupied by the Pasley Solvents and Chemicals Company (Pasley) and was used as a chemical distribution facility. Activities at the Site included delivery and storage of chemicals in tanks on-site, and transfer of the chemicals to 55-gallon drums for delivery to customers. Used chemicals and empty drums were reportedly returned to the Site by some customers. These chemicals included a wide range of aromatics and halogenated aliphatic hydrocarbons, solvents, ketones and alcohols. The Site was owned by Commander Oil Corporation (Commander). The Site was purchase by Plato Holdings LLC. on August 21,2003. Prior to 1969, the Site was occupied by Commander for distribution of fuel oils.

In 1980, Pasley applied for a NYSDEC permit to store and remove chemicals. The Nassau County Department of Health (NCDOH) collected soil samples from the Site. Sample analysis indicated that the soils were contaminated with volatile organic compounds (VOCs).

Initial Response

In 1980, NCDOH referred the Site to NYSDEC and both agencies recommended that Pasley submit a plan for a remedial investigation and cleanup. In 1981, Lakeland Engineering performed a limited well drilling and groundwater sampling program. Five on-property and one off-property monitoring wells were installed and groundwater samples were collected by Lakeland and NYSDOH. Contaminants were detected above State drinking water standards. Based on the results of this investigation, the Site was place on the National Priorities List (NPL) in June 1986.

Basis for Taking Action

In 1988, a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) was initiated to determine the nature and extent of site contamination and to evaluate alternatives for the mitigation of unacceptable risks associated with the contamination. The analytical data generated during the RI showed extensive and significant organic and inorganic soil and groundwater contamination on-site. In addition, EPA performed a risk assessment that determined that actual or threatened releases of hazardous substances from the Site, if not addressed, could present an unacceptable threat to public health, welfare, or the environment.

Enforcement Activities

The performance of the RI/FS by Commander was accomplished through an Administrative Order on Consent, issued by EPA on August 19, 1988. EPA issued a Record of Decision (ROD) in April 1992, which selected remediation of the ground water by extraction, treatment and recharge of the treated ground water to the aquifer. Soil Vapor Extraction was selected to treat contaminated soils. Once the ROD was issued, notice letters and a draft Consent Decree were sent to Commander and Pasley for implementation of the remedy selected in the ROD. These parties declined to perform the selected remedial action. EPA then obligated Superfund monies for performance of the Remedial Design by Ebasco Services Inc., an EPA contractor.

Subsequently, Commander notified EPA that it believed that the innovative technology, Air Sparging, would be an effective means of remediating the ground water at approximately half the cost of the selected remedy. EPA evaluated all available information on the air sparging technology and gave approval for Commander to submit a work plan to conduct a pilot study to evaluate the effectiveness of air sparging at the site. The results of the pilot study, which was documented in the Air Sparging/Soil Vapor Extraction Pilot Test Study Report, demonstrated that air sparging would be an effective means of remediating the ground water at the Site.

A ROD Amendment was subsequently issued in May 1995 which identified the remedial actions that would be undertaken to mitigate risks to human health and the environment as a result of site

contamination. The major difference between the ROD and the ROD Amendment was the method selected to remediate the ground water. The 1995 ROD Amendment selected remediation of the ground water by air sparging. An agreement was reached with Commander to perform the actions identified in the ROD Amendment and was memorialized in a Consent Decree for remedial design/remedial action (RD/RA) entered by the court on January 26, 1996. The components of the ROD Amendment are summarized below.

IV. Remedial Actions

Remedy Selection

Based on the findings of the RI/FS, EPA signed a ROD in April 1992. A ROD Amendment was subsequently issued in May 1995, selecting the following remedy:

- Remediation of the ground water by Air Sparging (AS) in the contaminated saturated zone underlying the Property;
- Remediation of the on-property unsaturated zone soils and collection of AS vapors by Soil Vapor Extraction (SVE);
- Interception and remediation of the off-property groundwater plume by AS accompanied by SVE in the area of the Cluster Park;
- Implementation of a long-term ground water monitoring program to track the migration and concentrations of the contaminants of concern; and
- Implementation of a remediation system monitoring program that includes vapor monitoring, ground-water monitoring and soil sampling.

Remedy Implementation

Pre-design activities commenced shortly after the effective date of the Consent Decree. The Final Design Report was approved by EPA in April 1997. Conestoga - Rovers & Associates (CRA) (formerly known as TreaTek-CRA Company) was selected by the Commander to design, construct, and operate the remedial system.

Following approval of the Remedial Action Work Plan on June 10, 1997, construction of the remedy started on June 26, 1997 and was completed on October 21, 1997.

The remediation system consisted of two SVE/AS systems: one on the Site property; and one off the property in Cluster Park. The system worked by introducing air into the aquifer to volatilize organic compounds and capturing the organic vapors. The vapors from the on-property system were treated with granular activated carbon, prior to discharge. Rotary-vane AS compressors and rotary-lobe SVE

blowers, housed in the on-property treatment building, were used to "push" and "pull" the air and soil vapor from both systems.

Under normal conditions the on-property and off-property SVE/AS systems were automatic and did not require continuous attention. The SVE and AS wells (except the off-property SVE wells) were connected to headers with automatic valves. Under normal operating conditions, the headers would operate alternately between idle and active service. Timers, programmed into the programmable logic controller (PLC), activated the automatic valves in a pre-determined sequence to pulse the wells. The PLC had auto-dial capability to notify the operator of a malfunction. In the event of a system malfunction, the PLC would fax an alarm report to the operator at the CRA Services office and/or at his home.

Major components of the constructed remedy include:

On-property

- 19 AS Wells, 2-inch PVC, screened 50-52-feet below ground surface (bgs)
- Eight shallow SVE wells, 2 inch PVC, screened 5-10 feet bgs
- Eight deep SVE wells, 4 inch PVC, screened 15-20 feet bgs
- 5 Monitoring well clusters
- Buried piping to each AS/SVE well
- 24 x 24-ft Treatment Building
- AS and SVE blowers, piping and controls
- Granular activated carbon (GAC) vapor treatment system
- Condensate collection and GAC treatment system
- Re-infiltration gallery
- Off-property AS and SVE blowers, piping, controls

Off-property

- 15 AS Wells, 2-inch PVC, screened 50-52 feet bgs
- 5 SVE wells, 2 inch PVC, screened 15-20 feet bgs
- 6 Monitoring-well clusters
- Buried piping to each AS/SVE well
- Buried distribution vault and controls

The Interim Remedial Action Report, which documented the activities undertaken to design, construct, and start the AS/SVE system was submitted in July 1998.

Operation and Maintenance

The Operation, Maintenance and Monitoring (O & M) Manual was approved by EPA in November 1997. In accordance with the Consent Decree and the O&M Manual, the O&M period was to be

performed for a minimum of five years to be followed by a Post Remediation Monitoring period. O&M activities were initiated in November 1997. The operation, maintenance, monitoring, and reporting requirements are summarized in Table 2, below.

Activities	November 1997- October 2000	November 2000-March 2003
Site visit and System Monitoring	Weekly	Monthly
Reporting to EPA	Monthly	Quarterly
Groundwater Sampling	Quarterly	Semiannually

There are four on-site ground water monitoring wells that were monitored over the 5-year period. A total of 19 rounds of groundwater samples was taken during that period. Samples were analyzed for the Site Index Compounds (SICs). The SICs are 1,1-Dichloroethene, 1,1-Dichloroethane, Trans-1,2-Dichloroethene, Chloroform, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane, Toluene, Chlorobenzene, Ethylbenzene, and Xylenes. After the first two years of treatment, three of the ground water monitoring wells had SICs concentrations that were reduced to nondetectable levels. The fourth well, MW-2S, located in the southwesterly corner, required five years and implementation of contingency measures before the SICs (specifically xylene) were below the cleanup levels. Contingency measures included shutting off the east side air sparging wells and diverting air to the area around, MW-2S. In addition, inorganic nutrients in the form of a commercial garden fertilizer (Miracid 30:10:10) was added to the west side well in an attempt to accelerate biological activity for further chemical reduction, and two more AS wells were installed in the area .

The SVE/AS system was shut-down in October 2002 to test for any rebound of contamination in the ground water. Two additional rounds of samples were collected which showed no rebound of SICs in the ground water.

Seven off-site wells, located approximately 400 feet down gradient from the Site, were monitored over the same period. Four of these wells are placed upgradient of the SVE/AS off-site sparge curtain with the other three wells located downgradient of the sparge curtain. In the four upgradient wells the level of SICs were elevated during the first three years of O & M. These elevated SICs levels were reduced once the levels of the on-site contamination were reduced by the on-site treatment efforts. The three wells located downgradient of the sparge curtain did not detect SICs in 18 out of the 19 rounds of monitoring over the five-year period.

On-site soil validation sampling was done in two phases. The first phase was conducted in July 2000 to assess remedial progress. A total of 12 soil boring were advanced and tested for SICs. The results showed that, with the exception of an area near MW-2S, all soil samples met the cleanup standards. The second phase of the soil sampling was conducted in April 2003. This effort was a targeted sampling effort focusing in the area near MW-2S. The results showed SICs below the cleanup target, which is consistent with the monitoring results for the groundwater in MW-2S.

Commander recently submitted the Notice of Completion and Final O&M Report. The report indicated that Site Index Compounds have met the cleanup standards as specified in Record of Decision. Accordingly, EPA determined that the Operation and Maintenance was complete, and the Site could progress to the Post-Remediation Monitoring (PRM) phase. EPA authorized the Settling Work Defendant to demobilize and remove all treatment equipment from the Site. A Post-remediation monitoring Plan was submitted and was approved by EPA in January 2004. During the PRM phase, sampling will be conducted semiannually for two years (2004-2006). A total of five groundwater monitoring wells will be sampled, one upgradient, one on-site and three downgradient. At the end of the 2-year period, EPA and the state will review the sampling results to determine if sampling can be terminated.

Institutional Controls

It was the intent of the ROD and ROD Amendment to remediate the soil so that the Site could be used without restriction. Therefore, no institutional controls were required for the Site. Site ownership has recently changed which will allow for reuse. A warehouse facility is planned for the Site.

V. Five-Year Review Process

Administrative Components

Sherrel Henry, EPA Remedial Project Manager (RPM), conducted the five-year review. This is a PRP-lead Site. Site records and reports and the PRP's O&M contractor, have provided the information necessary for this review.

Community Involvement

The EPA Community Relations Coordinator for the Site, Cecilia Echols, published a notice in Newsday, a local newspaper, indicating that the five-year review has been completed, the implemented remedy for the Site remains protective of public health and the environment, and the five-year review will be available in the local site repository for any interested members of the public to view. The notice included the RPM's address and telephone number for questions related to the five-year review process or the Site. If significant comments are received, concerning the protectiveness determination made in this report, EPA may reevaluate that determination and prepare an addendum to this report that addresses the issue.

Document Review

The following documents, data, and information were reviewed in completing the five-year review:

- Record of Decision, EPA, April 24, 1992;
- Record of Decision Amendment, EPA, May 22, 1995;
- Administrative Order on Consent, Index No. II CERCLA-80212, August 19, 1988;

- Consent Decree, Docket No. CV-95-4489, entered in U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York on January 26, 1996;
- Superfund Preliminary Closeout Report, Pasley Solvents and Chemicals Site, September 1999;
- EPA WasteLAN database;
- Notice of Completion Final O&M Report, August 2003; and
- EPA Comprehensive Five-Year Review Guidance, June 2001.

Site Inspection

Sherrel Henry, RPM, conducted a site inspection on January 16, 2004. Tony Ying, representing Commander, from CRA was also present at the Site inspection. During the site inspection, the RPM did not observe any problems with the Site.

Monitoring and Data Review

A review of the data collected over the five-year period of O&M indicates that Site Index Compounds have met the cleanup standards for both groundwater and soil as specified in the Record of Decision, Amended ROD and the Consent Decree. During the operation of the AS/SVE system, the vapor from each of sixteen on-property and five off-property extraction wells were monitored on a monthly basis. Air discharge, prior to carbon treatment, from the SVE system was monitored on a monthly basis in order to demonstrate the effectiveness of the SVE system to remove VOCs from soil. The nine ground water monitoring wells were monitored quarterly for the first three years then semi-annually for the remaining two years.

After approximately two years of operation, the on-property monitoring wells showed reduction in the concentration of Site Index Compounds. The results of ground water sampling indicate that ground water from monitoring well, MW- 9701 was reduced from a total VOC concentration of 4,112 ppb of SICs in September 1997 to nondetectable levels for the last eight quarters. The total concentration from MW-9704R was also reduced from 7,496 ppb of SICs to nondetectable levels for the last eight quarters. MW-9705 has reduced the total VOC concentration of 644 ppb of SICs to nondetectable levels for the last twelve quarters. Monitoring well, MW-2S was reduced from a total SIC VOC of 6,914 ppb to 4 ppb.

The off-property sparge curtain has worked as designed over the five-year operational period. The curtain has successfully contained and treated SICs. Analytical results from all three monitoring wells downgradient of the sparge curtain, have had concentrations of SICs at nondetectable levels or below Maximum Contaminant Levels for twelve straight quarters.

VI. Technical Assessment

Question A: Is the remedy functioning as intended by the decision documents?

Yes. The primary objectives of the 1992 ROD, as modified by the 1995 ROD Amendment, are to address the source of contamination at the Site, the contamination in the surface soils, and ground water contamination attributable to the Site. By treating the VOC contaminated soils and ground water by means of air sparging/SVE, the principal threat posed by the Site was addressed. This was verified by sampling results obtained for both the soil and ground water that indicate that all Site Index Compounds have met the cleanup standards as specified in Record of Decision, the Amended ROD and the Consent Decree.

Question B: Are the exposure assumptions, toxicity data, cleanup levels, and remedial action objectives used at the time of the remedy still valid?

There have been no changes in the physical conditions of the site that would affect the protectiveness of the remedy. The land use for the Site is expected to remain industrial over the next five years, the period of time considered in this review. The land use considerations and potential exposure pathways considered in the baseline human health risk assessment are still valid. However, since the ROD was signed, several toxicity values have been revised. Comparison of screening level PRGs (values based on a risk of 1 x 10E-6 and a noncancer HI of 0.1) for residential and industrial landuses (see Tables 3 and 4) indicate that the risk-based remediation goals are consistent with those presented in the ROD based on direct contact (i.e., ingestion and dermal contact with contaminated soils). This comparison found that the remediation goals remain protective.

The evaluation of groundwater focused on two primary exposure pathways, direction ingestion (as a potable water source) and the possibility of vapor intrusion if buildings were to be constructed over the plume. The evaluation of the direct contact pathway showed that all nearby residents are receiving public water, and since there are no residential or public supply wells in the contaminated area, there is no exposure. Therefore, the remedy is protective for this potential exposure pathway. The groundwater remediation goals selected in the original ROD were the MCLs and remain protective.

Soil vapor intrusion was evaluated based on the conservative (health protective) assumption that residences are located above the maximum detected concentrations and utilized the health-based screening criteria provided in the Draft Guidance for Evaluating the Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air Pathway from Groundwater and Soils. This guidance provides calculations of concentrations in groundwater associated with indoor air concentrations at acceptable levels of cancer risk and non-cancer hazards. This review looked at groundwater data collected from the past 5 years, and included data from sampling events for eight quarters of reported monitoring. Detection limits from the August 2003 Notice of Completion, Final O & M Report was used for the analyses. As shown in Table 5, the reported detection limits for the contaminants of concern for the March 6, 2003 sampling event indicate that no contaminants exceeded their screening criteria at the most protective screening level of 10^{-6} or a noncancer hazard of 0.1.

Table 3. Comparison of PRGs to New PRGs Calculated Using Current Toxicity Values Based on Residential Clean-up Goals for Direct Contact (i.e., ingestion and dermal contact).

Contaminant of Concern	Soil Cleanup Objective From 1995 ROD	Current Residential PRGs 10E-6	Current Residential PRGs HI = 0.1
1,1-Dichloroethane	0.4	N/A	52
1,1-Dichloroethene	0.2	N/A	12
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	0.3	N/A	6.9
chloroform	0.3	N/A	0.36
1,1,1-trichloroethene	0.8	N/A	NA
toluene	1.5	N/A	66
chlorobenzene	1.7	N/A	15
ethylbenzene	5.5	8.9	190

Table 4. Comparison of PRGs to New PRGs Calculated Using Current Toxicity Values Based on Industrial Clean-up Goals for Direct Contact (i.e., ingestion and dermal contact).

Contaminant of Concern	Soil Cleanup Objective From 1995 ROD	Current Industrial PRGs 10E-6	Current Industrial PRGs HI = 0.1
1,1-Dichloroethane	0.4	N/A	170
1,1-Dichloroethene	0.2	N/A	41
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	0.3	N/A	23
chloroform	0.3	N/A	1.2
1,1,1-trichloroethene	0.8	N/A	NA
toluene	1.5	N/A	220
chlorobenzene	1.7	N/A	53
ethylbenzene	5.5	20	740

Table 5: Comparison of Maximum Detected Concentrations with Risk-based Concentrations to Evaluate the Potential for Vapor Intrusion: 60 Feet Below Upper Pleistocene Undifferentiated Glacial Outwash Deposits.

Parameter	Vapor Intrusion Screening Concentration (ppb) Cancer risk = E-06; HQ = 0.1	Maximum Detected Concentration (ug/l)	Location/Depth (Date)
1,1-Dichloroethane	220	ND (5)	MW-2S, MW-9701, MW-9704R, MW-9705 MW-9720, MW-9721, MW-9722, MW-9723, MW-9724, MW-9725, MW-4S
1,1-Dichloroethene	19	ND (5)	MW-2S, MW-9701, MW-9704R, MW-9705 MW-9720, MW-9721, MW-9722, MW-9723, MW-9724, MW-9725, MW-4S
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	26	ND (5)	MW-2S, MW-9701, MW-9704R, MW-9705 MW-9720, MW-9721, MW-9722, MW-9723, MW-9724, MW-9725, MW-4S
chloroform	8	ND (5)	MW-2S, MW-9701, MW-9704R, MW-9705 MW-9720, MW-9721, MW-9722, MW-9723, MW-9724, MW-9725, MW-4S
1,1,1-trichloroethene	NA	ND (5)	MW-2S, MW-9701, MW-9704R, MW-9705 MW-9720, MW-9721, MW-9722, MW-9723, MW-9724, MW-9725, MW-4S
toluene	15	ND (5)	MW-2S, MW-9701, MW-9704R, MW-9705 MW-9720, MW-9721, MW-9722, MW-9723, MW-9724, MW-9725, MW-4S
chlorobenzene	39	ND (5)	MW-2S, MW-9701, MW-9704R, MW-9705 MW-9720, MW-9721, MW-9722, MW-9723, MW-9724, MW-9725, MW-4S
ethylbenzene	70	ND (5)	MW-2S, MW-9701, MW-9704R, MW-9705 MW-9720, MW-9721, MW-9722, MW-9723, MW-9724, MW-9725, MW-4S
xylene (total)	2,300	ND (5)	MW-2S, MW-9701, MW-9704R, MW-9705 MW-9720, MW-9721, MW-9722, MW-9723, MW-9724, MW-9725, MW-4S

NA = No screening value is available

Data based on Notice of Completion Final O&M Report, August 5, 2003.

Question C: Has any other information come to light that could call into question the protectiveness of the remedy?

No. All data indicate that the remedy has achieved the remediation goals for the Site. Based on these monitoring data, EPA is preparing to delete the Site from the NPL.

VII. Recommendations and Follow-up Actions

There are no recommendations or followup actions associated with this review. The Site will have Post Remediation Monitoring (PRM) activities for the next two years. At the end of the 2-year period, EPA will review the sampling results to determine if sampling can be terminated or will need to continue.

VIII. Protectiveness Statement

All site remedies appear to be complete and no institutional controls are required. The Site is suitable for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure. While the Site may be used for residential purposes, the reasonably anticipated future uses are for commercial or industrial purposes. Groundwater meets water standards for site contaminants. However, it should be noted that county wide institutional controls exist in the form of permit requirements for drilling private water supply wells.

IX. Next Review

The Remedial Project Manager believes that remediation is complete and that no further five-year reviews are necessary. However, two years of PRM have been agreed to. Should monitoring continue beyond two years into calender year 2009, EPA or NYSDEC will conduct a second five-year review before July 2009.

Approved:

_____ _____

George Pavlou, Director
Emergency and Remedial Response Division

Date