

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

-----  
EPA PROPOSED REMEDY AT NO:  
THE AMETEK U.S. GAUGE  
DIVISION FACILITY

-----  
Thursday December 8, 2011  
-----

Hearing taken at the Indian Valley  
Public Library, 100 E. Church Avenue, Telford  
Pennsylvania on the above date commencing at  
6:30 p.m. by Susan P. Allen, Registered  
Professional Reporter

\* \* \*

BLUM-MOORE REPORTING SERVICES, INC.  
350 SOUTH MAIN STREET, SUITE 203  
DOYLESTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA 18901  
(215) 345-7966

PAUL J. GOTTHOLD  
CHIEF, PA OPERATIONS  
WASTE AND CHEMICAL MANAGEMENT DIVISION  
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
REGION III  
1650 Arch Street  
WCMD 3WC 22  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103  
215-814-3410

ALSO PRESENT:

KHAI M. DAO, EPA REGION III

JOEL HENNESSY, EPA  
CATHERYN BLANKENBILLER, EPA

## I N D E X

PAGE

INTRODUCTION:	4
PRESENTATION: (not reported)	7
QUESTIONS:	9

## E X H I B I T S

EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
(No exhibits marked)		

1           MR. GOTTHOLD: My name is Paul  
2           Gotthold. I work for the  
3           Environmental Protection Agency out of  
4           our Region III office in Philadelphia.  
5           The program that I work in is called  
6           the RECRA program. It's basically the  
7           hazard waste management program.  
8           There's two main parts to that. I  
9           guess we'll let these guys sign in.

10                  There's two main parts to  
11           that. One is the management of  
12           hazardous waste throughout the country  
13           as it's generated. Somebody makes  
14           hazardous waste now there's a process  
15           in place for them to properly dispose  
16           of that material.

17                  The other part of this program  
18           is a clean up program. We go back to  
19           facilities, like the Ametek facility,  
20           where there was manufacturing  
21           operations that happened back in the  
22           day that left some legacy of  
23           contamination at the site. We are  
24           going around, in our case in  
25           Pennsylvania, and cleaning these

1 places up one at a time.

2 We have 363 of these sites in  
3 Pennsylvania where probably 130 of  
4 them have been completely cleaned up.  
5 Several more are like this one where  
6 we are in the process of finalizing  
7 the clean up plans.

8 With me tonight is Mr. Khai  
9 Dao. He is the senior project manager  
10 in our group, he's the project manager  
11 responsible for Ametek. We also have  
12 Mr. Joel Hennessy, our senior  
13 geologist, who is a fun guy to talk to  
14 on long road trips, especially when  
15 there are rocks around. He's awesome.  
16 And we have a project manager in  
17 training back here, Catheryn  
18 Blankenbiller to help us with the  
19 presentation, and help in getting the  
20 records organized.

21 This particular site, the  
22 Ametek site in Sellersville, we have  
23 been working on for quite sometime.  
24 We are really at the point where we  
25 are ready to tell everyone what our

1 final remedy is going to be out there.

2 This right now is the comment  
3 period for this remedy decision. It  
4 was the first public notice in August,  
5 And the comment period for anyone who  
6 is interested to ask a question or  
7 provide a comment to us. As of right  
8 now, it's going to close on December  
9 15. So the process is we will gather  
10 those comments together. And we'll  
11 provide a written response to each  
12 comment. And everyone who comments  
13 will get a copy of the whole final  
14 decision, which would include comments  
15 and all responses to those things.

16 We consider all the comments  
17 very carefully. It's what we have to  
18 do under our rules. And it is  
19 possible that one of the comments  
20 would cause us to change the remedy.  
21 If we do that, we'll let everyone know  
22 and we'll have another discussion  
23 about that.

24 What we would like to do  
25 today, we have a stenographer, Ms. Sue

1 Allen is back here who is going to be  
2 recording tonight's proceedings. What  
3 we'll do is Khai has a short 20  
4 minutes or so presentation explaining  
5 some of the technical aspects and the  
6 geographic aspects of what it is that  
7 we are dealing with. Feel free to ask  
8 clarifying questions during that. We  
9 would ask that you identify yourselves  
10 so that Sue can get your name down,  
11 and we can get the questions and  
12 respond again in writing after the  
13 meeting.

14 Then after Khai's presentation  
15 we'll open it up to the floor.  
16 Whoever has got any comments,  
17 questions, concerns, feel free to fire  
18 away. Especially geology ones. Like  
19 I said, he's real smart. So that's  
20 why we always bring him. Okay, Khai.

21 -----

22 (Presentation by Khai Dao 6:37 - 7:00 p.m. not  
23 reported.)

24 -----

25 MR. GOTTHOLD: Okay. That's

1           what's going on. It's been, I would  
2           say that Khai has been working on this  
3           project for a long time. I would also  
4           like to add that Ametek has done  
5           everything that we have asked them to  
6           do. It hasn't been a difficult  
7           relationship with them. They  
8           understand their responsibilities and  
9           have been carrying them out as we move  
10          through this.

11                        As you can imagine these  
12          investigations are pretty expensive.  
13          And they're usually iterative. We end  
14          up going back to the field again and  
15          again. We do some investigation. We  
16          find another question, we go back and  
17          answer it. That process is finished.  
18          We think we know enough about the site  
19          now to propose this remedy.

20                        With that we will open it up  
21          to the floor. If anybody has got any  
22          questions, we will be happy to answer  
23          them. I would ask so that we can make  
24          sure that you get a response to your  
25          question that you identify yourself so

1           that we can write the response and get  
2           you a copy of it. And if there's no  
3           questions.

4                   GREG BULFARO: I have a quick  
5           questions. My name is Greg. You said TCE  
6           in the shallow aquifer was 40 parts per  
7           billion? That's what Khai had said.

8                   KHAI DAO: With that  
9           particular well.

10                   GREG BULFARO: Do you know  
11          what the levels are for the onsite?

12                   KHAI DAO: The onsite as I  
13          mentioned especially in the source area  
14          are very high. They're in the range,  
15          especially in the former dry lagoons, as  
16          high as maybe 150,000 parts per billion.  
17          But, again, at the source it's very high.  
18          As you move away from the source the level  
19          is reduced drastically.

20                   GREG BULFARO: Cross sections.  
21          Cross section B shows that the highest  
22          level contamination goes from the dry  
23          lagoon to monitoring well 19S, which is  
24          directly underneath the residential  
25          subdivision right next to Ametek. What

1 were the readings for monitoring well 19S.

2 KHAI DAO: Nineteen S and also  
3 19B, which are next to the wells right  
4 there, levels have been below MPLs for  
5 quite a few years.

6 GREG BULFARO: The graphs that  
7 show what these monitoring wells, how deep  
8 they go down to monitor, they designate  
9 that they're bypassing the unit one  
10 contamination and drawing water from unit  
11 two where the contamination is nowhere  
12 near as strong as unit one.

13 KHAI DAO: Can you clarify  
14 that statement again?

15 GREG BULFARO: The wells that  
16 are drawing from the shallow aquifer to  
17 monitor well 19S draw from unit two as  
18 opposed to unit one; is that accurate or  
19 not?

20 KHAI DAO: Well, when we  
21 sample the wells, we look at the data.  
22 The data shows us the level of MPLs.  
23 Those are off site.

24 So your question was  
25 monitoring well 19S. You're saying about

1 unit one which is the data zone and unit  
2 two. The cross section, I'm not -- you  
3 reference the cross section as part of the  
4 statement base that we provided to you.  
5 That was the one you're looking at, cross  
6 section?

7 GREG BULFARO: No, I believe  
8 it was in the final report from 2011.

9 KHAI DAO: You were saying  
10 that 19S is drawing water?

11 GREG BULFARO: It draws from  
12 unit two.

13 KHAI DAO: Is that a different  
14 layer of soil.

15 MR. GOTTHOLD: It might be  
16 easier to have the diagram in front of  
17 us we can respond to that in our  
18 response to comments. So the question  
19 is, are the monitoring wells  
20 monitoring the correct units as laid  
21 out in the final report? Particularly  
22 the 19S?

23 GREG BULFARO: Yes.

24 MR. GOTTHOLD: Okay. We'll  
25 look at that.

1 GREG BULFARO: Okay.

2 META MITCHNER: Meta Mitchner.

3 My question is how many gallons a day are  
4 you treating during the pump and treat?

5 KHAI DAO: Right now we are  
6 pumping, I guess about 69 gallons per  
7 minute. In terms of calculations I need  
8 to calculate to determine the gallons per  
9 day. Right now the pumping rate is 69  
10 gallons per minute.

11 META MITCHNER: Then what  
12 about the Perkasio Borough well that went  
13 back on?

14 KHAI DAO: The Perkasio  
15 Borough well is pumping around 220 gallons  
16 per minute. But it's also pumping from a  
17 deeper aquifer. It's pumping, I think,  
18 right now at a depth of 220 feet. So it's  
19 in the deep aquifer. Whereas  
20 contamination, the majority of the  
21 contamination is in the shallow aquifer.

22 Depth to ground water in the  
23 shallow aquifer is anywhere between 85  
24 feet to about 140 feet. In terms of the  
25 deep aquifer it's about 210 to maybe 285.

1 So there's two different zones of aquifer.

2 META MITCHNER: One more  
3 thing. Did they do raw water sampling of  
4 well 10 before they put it back on line?

5 KHAI DAO: They just put it  
6 back on line. I just found out a couple  
7 of days ago they just put it back on line  
8 a month ago. I believe they do normally  
9 test for raw data, raw samples prior to  
10 going to the treatment of VOCs. Then they  
11 also treat at the end of it to make sure  
12 that the levels meet the regulatory  
13 requirements.

14 But normally in the past, I'll  
15 just go back to the question. Like I  
16 said, normally in the past levels were  
17 anywhere between the teens, ten to 20  
18 parts per billion.

19 JOEL HENNESSY: Prior to  
20 treatment.

21 KHAI DAO: Yes.

22 BOB RUDICK: Bob Rudick. Now  
23 that Perkasio has well number ten back on  
24 line, it seemed like the numbers were  
25 dropping lower off site, is there the

1 potential that the VOCs or TCEs, whatever  
2 you're monitoring in that area, that might  
3 start spreading further because they are  
4 now pumping that well?

5 KHAH DAO: They may. We have  
6 monitoring wells off site to evaluate the  
7 ground water elevation and to determine  
8 whether it's moving towards that well.  
9 But to tell you the truth, I really don't  
10 think so.

11 The reason why is this, that  
12 in the -- maybe I can go back into the one  
13 of the slides here. Well number ten here  
14 is pumping a deep aquifer. This right  
15 here is in the lower in the shallow  
16 aquifer. At least in this area it's  
17 really tight in the shallow aquifer. So  
18 it doesn't migrate. Whatever is pumping  
19 out of number ten is not really affecting  
20 here in the shallow aquifer. So the  
21 shallow aquifer is fine.

22 When you look at the deep  
23 aquifer you can tell that there is that  
24 spot right there that's elevated. The  
25 reason it's elevated we figured out over

1 time is there was a damaged well in the  
2 deep aquifer that over time this well  
3 started to deteriorate. What was  
4 contamination in the shallow aquifer  
5 migrated down to the deep aquifer.

6 The level in the deep aquifer  
7 is substantially lower than the shallow  
8 aquifer. I believe at the highest point  
9 it's about 160 parts per billion. Since  
10 we recognize there's the damaged well, we  
11 deactivated, decommissioned that well. We  
12 drew in a new well with better casing. So  
13 now there's no source, the continuous  
14 source has gone to the deep aquifer. The  
15 levels have gone down substantially since  
16 we replaced the damaged deep aquifer well  
17 with the new well.

18 So even though they're  
19 residual VOCs in the deep aquifer well in  
20 that area it's going down and is nothing  
21 like it was in the past.

22 So it's still pumping at well  
23 number ten. It may have an effect there,  
24 but the level is so low I don't think it  
25 will affect PBA ten drastically. Two, we

1 have a system at PBA ten just in case the  
2 levels are high we will clean up, the VOCs  
3 will be cleaned up in ground water.

4 MR. LARSON: The name is  
5 Larson. Two questions. First of all, are  
6 your extraction wells pumping at maximum?

7 KHAI DAO: No, they're not. I  
8 think maximum is potentially 100 to 110.  
9 And also our rate of maximum capacity will  
10 be based on restriction on the Delaware  
11 River Basin Commission. I have a value  
12 somewhere, but right now I think I'll  
13 estimate maximum pumping rate will  
14 probably be 100, 110.

15 MR. LARSON: It would be a  
16 shame to let the geologist go home without  
17 one question. Apart from bad wells those  
18 two aquifers aren't all that far apart,  
19 apart from bad wells what are the  
20 connections between them?

21 JOEL HENNESSY: Well, you can  
22 have fractures across, you know, more  
23 confining units. You know, certainly, and  
24 it -- but it was interesting in that  
25 southern area as we were going through all

1 these iterations of investigation that we  
2 really were focusing on one well, I  
3 believe it was well 5D, that seemed to be  
4 anomalously high relative to other deep  
5 wells in that southern end. So we  
6 hypothesized that there might be something  
7 wrong with that well casing. So we did  
8 that and abandoned that and replaced a new  
9 well. From the time the new well went in  
10 the concentrations in the deep aquifer  
11 began to decline.

12 So I think there might still  
13 be some minor fracturing that is creating  
14 a connection. But this open hole  
15 connection is gone.

16 KHAI DAO: We have done  
17 several pumping tests in that area too.  
18 It seems like there's really no  
19 communication in the southern area. But  
20 conversely in the northern area, as you  
21 can see, there is some contamination in  
22 the deep aquifer and would seem to be much  
23 better communication in that area.

24 TOM HUFNAGEL: Tom Hufnagel.  
25 With all the amount of rain we have been

1 having is that starting to chase the TEC  
2 down the hill into the other aquifers or  
3 can it be controlled?

4 KHAI DAO: You mean  
5 infiltration from the rain?

6 TOM HUFNAGEL: Yes.

7 KHAI DAO: It's under control  
8 now. I think when you look at our  
9 recovery wells here there's communication  
10 in the northern area between the lower  
11 aquifer and the deep aquifer. Our  
12 recovery wells cover both aquifers. And  
13 we have control based on our pump and  
14 treat where we have draw down in these  
15 wells that we are drawn in the  
16 contamination to the recovery wells.

17 We also have affect in the  
18 southern area too. In the southern area  
19 the communication between the lower  
20 shallow deep aquifer is really slim. So  
21 we still have control of that. In terms  
22 of migration down there --

23 MR. GOTTHOLD: Khai, I think  
24 one of the important things is at the very  
25 beginning when DEP was involved, they

1 removed the source, they dug them up and  
2 took the sources off. From the standpoint  
3 of infiltration from the surface going  
4 through waste and dragging that in there  
5 that contamination has been taken off site  
6 and disposed of.

7 GREG BULFARO: I guess part of  
8 my confusion initially was a lot of the  
9 reports states that ground water migration  
10 is northeast. Most of the reports  
11 actually confirm that. And the cross  
12 sections that I was talking about also  
13 confirm that. How did none of the  
14 contamination then not flow northeast and  
15 flow southwest?

16 KHAI DAO: It's not southwest,  
17 it's northwest based on --

18 GREG BULFARO: It flowed from  
19 the property south in a west, southwestern  
20 direction.

21 KHAI DAO: You mean toward  
22 this end?

23 GREG BULFARO: Where it's  
24 under those homes.

25 MR. GOTTHOLD: Down here,

1 Khai, on the off site part of the plume  
2 right now.

3 MR. HENNESSY; To the left.

4 KHAI DAO: That area. One  
5 theory is that in the past it did have a  
6 plant well here. Plant number one had a  
7 production well. So in the past it might  
8 have been the fact that it was drawing the  
9 plume towards that area. But since they  
10 closed, shut down that well there may have  
11 been residual contaminant and now we are  
12 gradually removing that towards our  
13 recovery well.

14 MR. GOTTHOLD: Joel, did you  
15 want to say something about how it  
16 seems that a lot of times the pumping  
17 centers in that area tend to --

18 MR. HENNESSY: Yes. One of  
19 the things when you first go into an  
20 area is you're thinking about where  
21 does ground water flow regionally.  
22 Your first thought is well, it's going  
23 to flow to the stream.

24 When we started looking at  
25 this area we found out that it's not

1 flowing to the stream, it's flowing to  
2 the nearest pumping wells. Because  
3 there's a lot of pumping wells.

4 There's municipal drinking water wells  
5 and you've got the onsite production  
6 wells there.

7 So we determined that because  
8 we put a staff gauge on Perkiomen  
9 Creek and found that the water level  
10 in the Perkiomen Creek was higher than  
11 the water level in the adjacent  
12 monitoring wells. And so it's  
13 actually at that location is losing  
14 stream. Why is it losing? It's  
15 losing because the pumping from the  
16 production wells on site.

17 There's a long history of  
18 pumping in different locations. And  
19 so things have moved around. I think  
20 a lot of what we see is the residual  
21 effects. You know, PBA ten was off,  
22 was pumping for a long time. It had  
23 some TCEs when it was off for a while.  
24 I think that's helped us to contain  
25 this within the site.

1                   KHAI DAO: Any other  
2                   questions?

3                   MARIE ROCHAL: I have a  
4                   question. My name is Marie Rochal. And  
5                   my question has to do with plant one, and  
6                   the fact that you only have that one side  
7                   on plant one. There was no other source  
8                   of contamination during the production  
9                   years from plant one.

10                  KHAI DAO: Not that we know  
11                  of. Our investigation stems from plant  
12                  two, the former lagoons. But didn't have  
13                  any information that would warrant that  
14                  any contamination came out of plant one.

15                  It was a much smaller  
16                  facility. It didn't produce as much as  
17                  plant two. That's the reason why they  
18                  closed up plant one and moved the  
19                  processing to plant two. We don't have  
20                  any information. We assume that it's  
21                  fine. There's no contamination down there  
22                  on that plant.

23                  But our focus on this  
24                  investigation was on plant two.

25                  MARIE ROCHAL: Because of the

1 lagoons?

2 KHAI DAO: Yes.

3 MARIE ROCHAL: But it's an  
4 assumption as far as plant one is  
5 concerned, it's not from testing?

6 KHAI DAO: Yes. We don't have  
7 anything that warrants us to go out there  
8 and test plant two right now. Based on  
9 records or information in the past there's  
10 nothing that says that there was a release  
11 that we need to go out there and see.

12 MARIE ROCHAL: Was it a  
13 different part of the process in making  
14 the gauges that...

15 KHAI DAO: I think it may  
16 have. I'm not quite sure. I know that  
17 there was tubing in the plant, they had  
18 machining of metal components probably  
19 degreasing. But I don't know the  
20 specifics.

21 MARIE ROCHAL: So there are no  
22 plans to do any testing in the plant one  
23 site?

24 KHAI DAO: Not at this time.  
25 Because, again, there's nothing that

1 warranted. Normally we go out and take  
2 action if there's a former release. We go  
3 out there, evaluate and see has the  
4 release gone beyond site, or has it posed  
5 a risk.

6 And at the same time when we  
7 ultimately close out different units we do  
8 some sampling to make sure that unit is  
9 clean.

10 As regards to the former  
11 lagoons we realized that migration of  
12 contaminant has gone down to ground water.  
13 But in regards to plant one there's really  
14 nothing there that would warrant us.

15 MR. GOTTHOLD: In an indirect  
16 way, the pattern that we found over the  
17 multiple years of investigation, and  
18 multiple stage of investigation on plant  
19 two, never led us to think that there was  
20 an unknown source at the plant one  
21 property.

22 I mean, the stuff that we have  
23 seen in the ground water is consistent  
24 with the waste management practices that  
25 happened at plant two and the scale of

1 practices that happened at plant two.  
2 There was no information we gathered in  
3 any of those investigations that would  
4 have suggested a problem at plant one.

5 MARIE ROCHAL: But plant one  
6 was the main plant for years before plant  
7 two.

8 MR. GOTTHOLD: I think as Khai  
9 said it was a matter of scale. There was  
10 not waste management, units, ponds and  
11 those kinds of things at plant one  
12 situation nor was it at the same scale of  
13 it.

14 So, you know, we are confident  
15 that this is the problem here when you  
16 look at all the data in the record.

17 MR. ?: Did you find any  
18 mercury in any of the water?

19 KHAI DAO: No, we did not.

20 MR. ?: Because at the dump  
21 site at the north end of town --

22 KHAI DAO: You're talking  
23 about the 12th Street landfill? That's  
24 outside of the scope, but we did look into  
25 it. I think it didn't close out under DEP

1 or process to close out.

2 MR. GOTTHOLD: There are  
3 probably four investigations still going  
4 on on the other side of the Creek. We did  
5 one that we are finished with that was  
6 okay to -- a place called Bell Mawr up  
7 there. That one, we closed that. We did  
8 that, EPA did that. But we have been  
9 working with the DEP office in Norristown  
10 to sort of get our arms around the whole  
11 situation.

12 There's a lot of sources very  
13 similar to these sources, these chemicals  
14 up on the other side of the Creek. DEP I  
15 just talked to the project manager today,  
16 they're mobilizing to go out probably  
17 within the next three weeks and do some  
18 residential sampling up there. They will  
19 gather companies together and have  
20 meetings, and tell them the bad news about  
21 how much they're going to contribute to  
22 the investigation that they're doing up  
23 that way. The dumps that they talk about  
24 is one that the DEP has got. They got a  
25 project manager on it right now.

1           I think there was some removal  
2 there. There was some interaction that  
3 was taken there, but, you know, part of it  
4 is that we were looking at this data and  
5 we said we kept finding TCE in places we  
6 didn't expect it.

7           Rather than say it's all got  
8 to be coming from Ametek, we started to  
9 broaden it a little bit and started seeing  
10 it in other places. That's when we  
11 realized that there were places northwest  
12 across the Creek that had the same  
13 problem.

14           So there was sort of probably  
15 six or seven different places up there  
16 that are being looked at right now. Some  
17 by us, some by our Superfund program out  
18 of Philadelphia. And also in cooperation  
19 with the Norristown office of the DEP.

20           So those things have really  
21 finally come together, and the broad  
22 scheme is just to figure it all out and  
23 clean it all up.

24           KHAI DAO: Any more questions?

25           If not then I thank you for coming out

1           tonight. You have my information on  
2           the fact sheets, my contact numbers.  
3           So after this meeting if you have any  
4           questions or concerns that you later  
5           propose down the road, feel free to  
6           contact me and I'll try to help out  
7           and respond as best I can.

8                     Thank you.

9                     MR. GOTTHOLD: If you guys  
10           would be so kind as to put an e-mail  
11           address or mailing address on the  
12           sign-in sheet over there, we'll make  
13           sure you get copies of the final  
14           decision and response and all that  
15           stuff. If you have any questions as  
16           Khai said, just give us a shout.  
17           We'll take comments that we'll  
18           officially respond to up until  
19           December 15. They can be phone calls,  
20           they can be e-mail, they can be a  
21           letter, any way you want to do it.

22                     And if you have another  
23           question, and just want to talk about  
24           anything, including if you want any of  
25           the other things that are going on we

1 are kind of plugged into that. We are  
2 actually going to try to plug into  
3 Perkasio Borough too and we hoped to  
4 do that before that pump went back on.  
5 So feel free to call us and we'll get  
6 all the information to let you know  
7 what's going on. Okay.

8 -----

9 (Hearing concluded at 7:22 p.m.)

10 -----

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I hereby certify that  
the hearing is a true record of  
the presentation given and  
questions by the audience.

-----  
Susan P. Allen, RPR, CRI

(The foregoing certification of this  
transcript does not apply to any  
reproduction of the same by any means,  
unless under the direct control and/or  
supervision of the certifying shorthand  
reporter.)