

SUPERFUND FIVE-YEAR REVIEW SITE SURVEY		
<b>Site Name:</b> Garland Creosoting Superfund Site		<b>EPA ID No.:</b> TXD007330053
<b>Location:</b> Longview, Gregg County, Texas		<b>Date:</b> 3/22/2019
<b>Contact Made By:</b>		
<b>Name:</b> Philip Allen	<b>Title:</b> Remedial Project Manager	<b>Organization:</b> U.S. EPA
<b>Telephone No.:</b> (214) 665-8516 <b>E-Mail:</b> <a href="mailto:allen.philip@epa.gov">allen.philip@epa.gov</a>	<b>Street Address:</b> 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 <b>City, State, Zip:</b> Dallas, Texas 75202	
<b>Name:</b> April Ballweg	<b>Title:</b> Project Manager	<b>Organization:</b> EA Engineering, Science, and Technology, Inc., PBC
<b>Telephone No.:</b> (972) 315-3922 <b>E-Mail:</b> [REDACTED]	<b>Street Address:</b> 405 S. Highway 121 Bypass, Building C, Suite 100 <b>City, State, Zip:</b> Lewisville, Texas 75067	
<b>Individual Contacted:</b>		
<b>Name:</b> Denice "Dee" McCalley	<b>Title:</b> Project Manager	<b>Organization:</b> Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ)
<b>Telephone No.:</b> 512-239-2443 <b>E-Mail Address:</b> <a href="mailto:Dee.McCalley@tceq.texas.gov">Dee.McCalley@tceq.texas.gov</a>	<b>Street Address:</b> P.O. Box 13087; MC 136 <b>City, State, Zip:</b> Austin, Texas 78711-3087	
<b>Survey Questions</b>		
<p><i>The purpose of the five-year review is to evaluate the implementation and performance of the remedy, and to confirm that human health and the environment continue to be protected by the remedial actions that have been performed at the site. This interview is being conducted as a part of the second five-year review for the Garland Creosoting Superfund Site. The scope of the review is from November 2014 to present.</i></p> <p>1. What is your overall impression of the work conducted at the site during this review period?</p> <p>The site has undergone optimization activities by EPA per the recommendations in the September 2016 Optimization Report which has advanced the Superfund process and knowledge of the site groundwater contamination. Multiple wells were installed since the previous 5 Year Review to further delineate the TCE plume, although the monitoring well best positioned to determine Dense Non-Aqueous Phase Liquid (DNAPL) delineation has yet to be installed due to access issues. The Ground Water Treatment Plant (GWTP) has been well maintained and on-going maintenance has been performed. Per EPA's reports, no leachate has been found in the Leak Detection System which indicates the containment cell is performing as designed. The new perimeter fence line which does not have creek crossings has performed well with minor repairs needed when trees fall.</p>		

SUPERFUND FIVE-YEAR REVIEW SITE SURVEY	
<b>Site Name:</b> Garland Creosoting Superfund Site	<b>EPA ID No.:</b> TXD007330053
<b>Location:</b> Longview, Gregg County, Texas	<b>Date:</b>
<p align="center"><b>Survey Questions (Continued)</b></p> <p>2. From your perspective, what effect have site operations had on the surrounding community?</p> <p>The Five-Year site visit did not include visitations with neighboring businesses, however, the businesses do not seem to be impacted adversely by site activities. A new business has established operations to the North and appears to be running smoothly. Most of the property owners to the south are informed of the on-goings at the site. It is unknown if the owner of the site where the new monitoring well is to be installed is knowledgeable of site operations, but EPA has indicated they are making efforts to reach out to the owner.</p> <p>3. Have there been routine communications or activities (site visits, inspections, reporting activities, etc.) conducted by your office regarding the site? If so, please describe the purpose and results.</p> <p>TCEQ conducts quarterly inspections and is informed about site activities. TCEQ also receives Semi-Annual reports and site related reports such as the 2016 Optimization Report from the EPA contractor.</p> <p>4. Are you aware of any events, incidents, or activities that have occurred at the site, such as dumping, vandalism, or anything that required emergency response from local authorities? If so, please provide details.</p> <p>No.</p> <p>5. Have there been any complaints, violations, or other incidents related to the site that required a response by your office? If so, please summarize the events and results.</p> <p>At the 5 Yr Review site visit it was noted that absorbent booms were installed in the unnamed tributary south of the site. A follow-up phone call to Westlake Chemical's safety manager established that they (Westlake Chemical) installed the booms to address a NAPL leak from contaminated groundwater at their site and this is being addressed through the TCEQ Petroleum Storage Tank (PST) Program.</p> <p>6. Are you aware of any problems or difficulties encountered which have impacted progress or resulted in a change in operations and maintenance procedures? Please describe any changes and impacts.</p> <p>No.</p> <p>7. Have there been any changes in the wastewater treatment plant discharge limits?</p> <p>Not that I am aware of.</p>	

SUPERFUND FIVE-YEAR REVIEW SITE SURVEY	
<b>Site Name:</b> Garland Creosoting Superfund Site	<b>EPA ID No.:</b> TXD007330053
<b>Location:</b> Longview, Gregg County, Texas	<b>Date:</b>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Survey Questions (Continued)</b></p> <p>8. Have there been any changes in state environmental standards which may call into question the current protectiveness or effectiveness of the remedial action?</p> <p>Not that I am aware of.</p> <p>9. Do you know of opportunities to optimize the operation, maintenance, or sampling efforts at the site, and have such changes been adopted?</p> <p>The new fence installed after the previous 5 Yr Review has been helpful in preventing fence damage due to stormwater. EPA's contractor did a study evaluating alternative DNAPL technologies and found that the existing GWTP is still the most effective method to remove DNAPL.</p> <p>10. Do you feel well-informed about the site's activities and progress?</p> <p>EPA's Contractor is very proactive and proficient at maintaining the site and keeping TCEQ informed of progress.</p> <p>11. Do you have any comments, suggestions, or recommendations regarding the site?</p> <p>As mentioned in the previous 5 Yr Review Survey, further delineation is necessary to define the TCE, Vinyl Chloride (VC) and DNAPL plume boundaries. The current plume boundaries appear to extend beyond the Technical Impracticability Zone (TIZ) necessitating further investigation by the EPA to extend the TIZ boundaries. Furthermore, if Chemicals Of Concern (COCs) are detected above their respective Remedial Action Objectives (RAOs) in the new offsite well, an Institutional Control document will be necessary on that property. The latest Semiannual Sampling Report (December 2018) states that the TCE plume likely originated offsite although the origination is not yet determined. The most recent TCE concentration of 435 µg/L along the northern property boundary exceeds the RAO of 5 µg/L warranting further investigation of this area to determine whether this COC is sourced offsite or related to Garland Creosoting operations.</p>	