

Pre-CERCLA Screening Checklist/Decision Form

This form is used in conjunction with a site map, EPA EJScreen Report, and any additional information required by the EPA Region to document completion of a Pre-CERCLA Screening (PCS). The form includes a decision on whether a site should be added to the Superfund program's active site inventory for further investigation. This checklist replaces Attachment A in the December 2016 PCS Guidance document and supersedes previous versions of the PCS checklist. A current version of the PCS checklist and additional information is available at: <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/pre-cercla-screening>. This form is best used in Adobe Reader or Acrobat Pro to access all the user features and functionality. Tip: Use CTRL-Z to sequentially undo entry/entries made on the form.

Region: 5 State/Territory: IN Tribe: _____ INR000020743
Please add additional tribes below EPA ID No. (If Available)

Site Name: Gary Machine Company

Other Site Name(s): _____

Site Location: 901 Alabama Street

_____ (Street)
1 Gary IN LAKE 46403
Congressional (City) (State/Terr.) (County) (Zip+4) (No Zip Available)
District

If no street address is available: _____
(Township-Range) (Quarter-Quarter, Quarter, Section)

Site Contact Info/Mailing Address: Environmental Cleansing Corporation

CERCLA 105d Petition for Preliminary Assessment? <u>No</u>	If Yes, Petition Date(mm/dd/yyyy): _____
Site Type: <u>Manufacturing/Processing/Maintenance</u>	Ownership Type: <u>Private</u>
Site Sub-Type: <u>Metal fabrication/finishing/coating & allied ind</u>	If "Other" Site Sub-Type selected, enter sub-type name below _____

Use the following section to select up to two government entities with known current or prior involvement at the site and write in specific program and site ID information if available (e.g., Municipal/Local Government: Brownfields, State: VCP, RCRA; EPA: RCRA).

Government Cleanup Program Involvement: <u>State</u>	Special Program(Optional): <u>Voluntary Remediation Program</u>	Program Site ID#: <u>VRP#6000406</u>
---	--	---

Government Cleanup Program Involvement: <u>(Make selection)</u>	Special Program(Optional): _____	Program Site ID#: _____
--	-------------------------------------	----------------------------

Please use the [Site Description Section](#) on page 2 to identify other government cleanup programs with current or prior involvement at this site, based on readily available information

Federal Facility? <u>No</u>	Please complete if site is a Federal Facility:
Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS)? <u>No</u>	Federal Parent Agency: <u>(Make selection)</u>
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP)? <u>No</u>	Federal Agency Owner (Federal Bureau/Division) if Applicable: _____

Native American Interest? No If Yes, list Tribe: (Make selection)

Additional Tribe(s): (Make selection) Additional Tribe(s): _____

Site Description

Use this section to briefly describe site background and conditions if known or (easily) available, such as: operational history; physical setting and land use; site surface description, soils, geology and hydrogeology; source and waste characteristics; hazardous substances/contaminants of concern; historical releases, previous investigations and cleanup activities; previous regulatory actions, including permitting and enforcement actions; institutional controls; community interest and/or environmental justice considerations. Longer entries will overflow to page 5 of this form. Additional pages can be manually attached as necessary.

The Site is a former manufacturing facility consisting of a main plant building of approximately three hundred thousand (300,000) square feet with four (4) smaller outbuildings that span across approximately forty (40) acres abutting emergent wetlands to the south and west, with a railroad and residential neighborhood beyond to the west, and another active metal works manufacturer facility to the immediate north.

The Site is only accessible from an entrance at the dead-end intersection of Alabama Street and East 7th Avenue, Gary, Indiana. IDEM successfully contacted the current property owner, in June 2025, to establish an access agreement (an Illinois-based demolition company that is using the Site for staging of construction debris) and reconnoitered the Site in August 2025.

Geospatial Information

State/Territory: IN Latitude: +41.59645°N Longitude: -87.314683°W
 Decimal Degree North (e.g., 38.859156) Decimal Degree West (e.g., 77.036783)

Provide 4 significant digits at a minimum, more if your collection method generates them.

Except for certain territories in the Pacific Ocean, all sites in U.S. states and territories are located within the northern and western hemispheres and will have a positive latitude sign and negative longitude sign. Coordinate signs displayed after entering coordinate values above are based on the State/Territory entry on page 1.

Point Description: Select the option below that best represents the site point for future reference and to distinguish it from any nearby sites. See 2016 PCS Guidance for more information on selections.

- Geocoded (address-matched) Site Address
 Site Entrance (approximate center of curb-cut)
 Approximate Center of Site
 Other Distinguishing Site Feature (briefly describe):

Point Collection Method: Check the method used to collect the coordinates above and enter the date of collection.

- Online Map Interpolation
 GPS (handheld, smartphone, other device or technology with accuracy range < 25 meters)
 GPS Other (accuracy range is ≥ 25 meters or unspecified)
 Address Matching: Urban
 Address Matching: Rural
 Other Method (briefly describe below):

Collection Date (mm/dd/yyyy): 09/11/2025

POINT-SELECTION CONSIDERATIONS

- Often the best point is a feature associated with the environmental release or that identifies the site visually.
- Use the curb cut of the entrance to the site if there is a clear primary entrance and it is a good identifier for the overall location.
- The approximate center of the site (a guess at the centroid) is useful for large-area sites or where there are no appropriate distinguishing features.
- Use the geocoded address if that is the only or best option available, but if possible use something more representative for sites larger than 50 acres.

Environmental Justice Considerations

Enter the following information from EPA's [EJScreen](#) and the Council of Environmental Quality's [CEJST online](#) tools using the instructions provided below. Default EJScreen selections of "80th" percentile, "Drop a Pin" and "1" mile buffer can be changed as necessary. Use the Site Description section on page 2 to describe additional EJ information related to the site as necessary.

EPA EJScreen Number of Indexes at or above the 80th percentile
(select percentile)

EJ INDEXES: National _____ State _____
(enter numbers here)

SUPPLEMENTAL INDEXES: National _____ State _____
(enter numbers here)

CEQ* [Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool](#) (CEJST) Census Tract Disadvantaged?

(Y/N) _____

* Council on Environmental Quality, Executive Office of the President

Options for Geography/ Running a Report: Drop a Pin (select buffer) Buffer (miles): 1

Use the following steps to collect EJScreen index and CEJST designation data:

For EJScreen Index numbers, navigate to EPA EJScreen and:

- Type the address or coordinates in the upper right corner search bar (next to the magnifying glass);
- Click the Reports tab in the upper left corner tool widget (sheet of paper with the bottom corner bent);
- Select "Drop a Pin" (you may choose another geography as needed, e.g., select County if you are unsure of the site location);
- Click the "+" over the site location;
- Use the default buffer distance of 1-mile (modify distance as appropriate);
- Select EJScreen Community Report; and
- Review the report that opens to obtain National and State numbers for EJ INDEXES and for SUPPLEMENTAL INDEXES and enter into the appropriate Index categories above.

For CEJST, navigate to Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool and:

- Type the address, city, state or ZIP for the site in the upper left corner search bar (next to the magnifying glass);
- Click on the location of the site on the map; and
- The Disadvantaged Community designation (Yes or No) will display to the right of map. Select Yes or No accordingly in CEJST drop down box above.

Complete this checklist to help determine if a site should be added to the Superfund Active site inventory. See Section 3.6 of the PCS guidance for additional information.

	Yes	No	Unknown
1. An initial search for the site in EPA's Superfund active, archive and non-site inventories should be performed prior to starting a PCS. Is this a new site that does not already exist in these site inventories?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Is there evidence of an actual release or a potential to release?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Are there possible targets that could be impacted by a release of contamination at the site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Is there documentation indicating that a target has been exposed to a hazardous substance released from the site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Is the release of a naturally occurring substance in its unaltered form, or is it altered solely through naturally occurring processes or phenomena, from a location where it is naturally found?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Is the release from products which are part of the structure of, and result in exposure within, residential buildings or business or community structures?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. If there has been a release into a public or private drinking water supply, is it due to deterioration of the system through ordinary use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Are the hazardous substances possibly released at the site, or is the release itself, excluded from being addressed under CERCLA?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Is the site being addressed under RCRA corrective action or by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Is another federal, state, tribe, or local government environmental cleanup program other than site assessment actively involved with the site (e.g., state voluntary cleanup program)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Is there sufficient documentation or evidence that demonstrates there is no likelihood of a significant release that could cause adverse environmental or human health impacts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Are there other site-specific situations or factors that warrant further CERCLA remedial/integrated assessment or response?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- Preparer's Recommendation: Add site to the Superfund active site inventory
 Do not add site to the Superfund active site inventory.

PCS Summary and Decision Rationale

Use this section to summarize PCS findings and support the decision to add or not add the site to the Superfund active site inventory for further investigation. Information does not need to be specific but, where known, can include key factors such as source and waste characteristics (e.g., drums, contaminated soil); evidence of release or potential release; threatened targets (e.g., drinking water wells); key sampling results (if available); CERCLA eligibility; involvement of other cleanup programs; and other supporting factors. Longer entries will display on page 6 of this form. Additional pages can be manually attached as necessary.

While most hazardous materials (e.g., ACM, PCBs, etc.) were removed from the Site during remediation activities conducted during the period between 1990 and 1992, when the GUEA applied to VRP and submitted a work plan with their completion report simultaneously, no further groundwater release scenario was considered or pursued as contamination was below Tier-II VRP remediation criteria. The Site is currently full of piles of waste, with strong chemical odors throughout the Site. The facility buildings might at some point need demolished due to compromised structural integrity from several decades of neglect. Furthermore the wetlands adjacent to the property to the east.

Checklist preparer:

Name/Title: John P. Hockemeyer, environmental scientist Date: 09/25/2025
 Organization: Indiana Department of Environmental Management Phone: (317) 232-5675
 Street: 100 N Senate Ave Email: JHockeme@idem.in.gov
 City: Indianapolis State: IN County: LAKE Zip+4: 46204 2273

(The following section is to be completed by EPA)

EPA Regional Review and Pre-CERCLA Screening Decision

Add site to the Superfund active site Inventory for completion of:

- Preliminary Assessment (PA)
- Abbreviated PA
- Integrated Removal Assessment and PA

Please note: Throughout this form, an incorrectly checked box can be unchecked by using "CTRL+Z" ("undo").

Do not add site to the Superfund active site inventory. Site is:

- Not a valid site or incident
- Being/ will be addressed under another program (select one):
 - State (non-RCRA Cleanup Program)
 - Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
 - Tribal Cleanup Program
 - Municipal/ Local Government Cleanup Program
 - EPA Removal
 - Other Federal Cleanup Program
 - RCRA
 - Other (Please specify):

Optional: Print name of EPA Assessor making this decision: Albert Rios, Site Assessment Manager

EPA Regional Approval:
(Enter Date and then click the right-hand box to initiate digital signature stamp)

Date (enter first):
01/05/2026



Digitally signed by ALBERT RIOS
Date: 2026.01.05 09:15:48 -06'00'

Site Description

(All text as entered on page 2)

The Site is a former manufacturing facility consisting of a main plant building of approximately three hundred thousand (300,000) square feet with four (4) smaller outbuildings that span across approximately forty (40) acres abutting emergent wetlands to the south and west, with a railroad and residential neighborhood beyond to the west, and another active metal works manufacturer facility to the immediate north.

The Site is only accessible from an entrance at the dead-end intersection of Alabama Street and East 7th Avenue, Gary, Indiana. IDEM successfully contacted the current property owner, in June 2025, to establish an access agreement (an Illinois-based demolition company that is using the Site for staging of construction debris) and reconnoitered the Site in August 2025.

A large excavator is parked, accompanied by concrete barriers to block this entrance, ostensibly to minimize trespassing and dumping. There are trash piles and detritus scattered everywhere, which includes solid wastes such as old furniture, clothing, and cans full of unknown materials whose original use may have related to construction (e.g., shellac, etc.). There are several large metal parts, vehicle parts, and trailers that appear to be construction equipment, such as a crane extension booms, that are likely unusable given their extensive oxidization. There are two large piles of mixed debris on the parcel, one consisting mostly of sand-like fill materials approximately fifteen (15) feet high on the northwest corner of the main plant near the entrance, and the other in the southwest corner of main plant consisting of rebar concrete chunks and plumbing componentry that reach approximately fifteen (15) feet high in places, so immense that the southern and western areas of the parcel are inaccessible entirely on foot. The eastern and northern areas around the largest main plant building are entirely overgrown, even in concreted areas that indicate persistent standing water and development of fissures through years of disuse. These demolition materials appear to have been placed somewhere within the last five (5) years since the current owner took over the property around 2020.

Strong chemical odors were discerned during the entire visit, though its sundry nature and possible source(s) of emission were undeterminable. There are areas of stained surficial soils relating to oily substances being dumped out around the facility, and the outbuildings to the southern and northern directions relative to the main plant are dilapidated to the point that vegetation, including small trees, have taken over these structures and are entirely inaccessible. The wetlands beyond the facility have encroached both up to and through the chain-link fencing along the perimeter of the parcel. Despite being low-lying, the Site is not itself within a flood zone, there are flood zones to the north along the Grand Calumet River and to the south for the Little Calumet River. General groundwater flow is northward towards the Grand Calumet River and Lake Michigan beyond. There are approximately ten (10) single-story apartment buildings and about thirty (30) residences due north towards the river and lake, but the majority of the residential neighborhood extends further west and northwest of the Site. Groundwater flow might be influenced by the Grand Calumet, which originally flowed west to east emptying into Lake Michigan near the Indiana Dunes National Seashore, but due to pollution and other reasons, its flow was reversed through engineering applications, and thus its influence on local groundwater flow is unknown without data.

Aside from safety hazards relating to falling or overhead injury, the facility itself exhibits evidence of vagrancy and graffiti vandalism, though it is difficult to access given the vegetation overgrowth.

There are estimably several tons of tires and clothing piled inside the main plant building, and the roof is visibly disintegrating, thus time spent within the structure were quite limited.

Several on-site surficial soil screenings were conducted where possible using x-ray fluorescence (XRF) portable analyzer to determine presence of heavy metals. See appended screening data in Attachment A – Figure 4 for more information.

The facility itself operated between 1912 and 1988 as the Gary division of Pittsburgh Screw and Bolt Corporation, manufacturing screws, nuts, and bolts through processes such as metal cutting, cleaning, heat treatment, and galvanization. Once shut down in the mid-1980s, it was purchased in 1990 and renamed Gary Machine Company before being shut down permanently in 1992. This period of operation primarily consisted of capital asset liquidation, not manufacturing. It was later purchased out of tax auction by Gary Urban Enterprise Association (GUEA), a now defunct and criminally liable 501(c)(3) organization that purportedly existed to improve commerce and redevelopment in an ailing Gary, Indiana.

Along with more than six hundred properties, the Site was purchased using Indiana tax-derived grant funds made available through the Enterprise Zone Program created by Indiana legislation. The director of the program used the facility to collect clothing donations with the notion to collect and process textiles before shipment to less-developed countries for undefined bulk textile reuse manufacturing (e.g., insulation fibers, etc.), though before that project ever came to fruition, the organization was disbanded and its leadership indicted on federal charges of fraud and embezzlement.

The well that provided water supply to the facility was not abandoned because the GUEA maintained that it held value and could be used by a future owner. GUEA performed some remedial activity under Indiana Voluntary Remediation Program (VRP) that consisted of Phase I and Phase II investigations that included sampling of various media to evaluate potential risks to on-site exposure scenarios. Some removal of hazardous compounds and materials occurred between closure of the facility in 1992 and its application to VRP in 2000. The project was completed in 1999 and documented in a combined remediation closure report and draft remediation work plan.

IDEM responded by requesting further groundwater contamination investigation in an area in the northwest corner of the property. This consisted of sampling shallow subsurface soils, groundwater, and surface soils for volatile organic compounds (VOCs). It was deemed sufficient and IDEM awarded a Covenant Not to Sue after GUEA recorded an environmental restrictive covenant (ERC) on the property to pursue risk-based closure using state guidance relevant to the time period (circa 2002). Despite the large area of the parcel, only four (4) monitoring wells were temporarily established during investigation that took place in the 1990s and were advanced to around ten (10) to fifteen (15) feet below ground surface (bgs). These wells were established in the corners of the property, one for each cardinal vector. The northern well near the corner where Alabama Street intersects with East 7th Avenue, the western well in the southwest corner of the Site property near the southern rail line and the elevated rail line that extends over East 7th Avenue towards the entrance, the southern well in the southernmost corner where the property abuts the emergent wetlands along the south rail line near the defunct boiler and large ASTs, and the eastern well in the far northeast corner along an old rail spur near an old, crumbling guard house. Vinyl chloride (VC) was detected in subsurface soils and groundwater during investigation preceding VRP activities, though follow-up sampling consisted of limited sampling of an area known to have had vinyl chloride released during historic operations, likely in the 1980s before the shutdown. Because the criteria used for VRP program closure goals designated the Site as being restricted to non-residential use, it was acceptable to not further investigate release of VC or other VOCs to groundwater. Furthermore, though soils were sampled for VOCs, given the nature of volatile compounds, the time elapsed from facility shutdown to investigation amounts to about fifteen (15) years. There are no records available to indicate the monitoring wells were abandoned.

On August 6th, 2025, IDEM Site Investigation staff utilized an XRF analyzer to screen surficial soils both on- and off-site, it is obvious that metal works have been operating in the vicinity due to the high concentration of some heavy metals. Namely on-site the metals of concern include Iron, Chromium, Arsenic, Nickel, Copper, Cadmium. Previously asbestos-containing materials (ACM), poly-chlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), polyaromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs), and VOCs have all been contaminants of concern for the Site. The likely mechanism of transport for off-site heavy metals is through fugitive dust escaping from emissions source(s) containing particulate matter (PM). PM can contain a variety of hazardous substances beyond just heavy metals (e.g., dioxins, inter al.) that can range in size from ten (10) micrometers to 2.5 micrometers in diameter. Wind direction is quite varied based on data available from Gary Airport, which is located approximately five (5) miles west of the Site, and often regularly changes from west to east prevalence to north to south, likely caused by weather influenced by Lake Michigan to the north. Direction also varies frequently within seasons and short of conducting statistical analysis, wind likely contributes to PM deposition in off-site surface soils. One caveat is that also within eight (8) miles, to as close as less than one (1) mile, to the residential area of concern are some of the most productive, massive steel mills in the US, and likely are additional sources contributing to PM emissions and subsequent deposition in the Site vicinity.

The Site was closed regarding VRP guidance that allows for Sites to close with contamination still present so long as its intended use remains industrial and that no groundwater is to be extracted from the property. This occurred more than a decade before vapor intrusion was considered a pathway capable of leading to health impacts of nearby residents. Moreover the facility is being encroached upon by wetlands to the south and east, that contain two (2) perennial ponds with approximately six hundred (600) meters of combined frontage for a probable point of entry (PPE) and whose wetlands are classified (though have not been surveyed directly by IDEM or others) as emergent wetlands, forested included. Although it also remains to be determined how extensively this area is used by wildlife, the potential exists for off-site migration of metals to the wetlands where its quality as habitat could be further degraded.

Given the local geology of predominately sand and gravel units and limited groundwater investigation, there is possible off-site migration of chemicals used on-site with conditions reaching concentrations that over time may have occurred in a manner conducive to formation of non-aqueous phase liquids (NAPL) that might persist in the unconsolidated and highly-transmissive aquifer. Once off-site these release-related substances can impact groundwater usability and potentially create vapor intrusion issues, though evidence for an off-site release is limited at this time and only potential in nature.

PCS Summary and Decision Rationale

(All text as entered on page 4)

While most hazardous materials (e.g., ACM, PCBs, etc.) were removed from the Site during remediation activities conducted during the period between 1990 and 1992, when the GUEA applied to VRP and submitted a work plan with their completion report simultaneously, no further groundwater release scenario was considered or pursued as contamination was below Tier-II VRP remediation criteria. The Site is currently full of piles of waste, with strong chemical odors throughout the Site. The facility buildings might at some point need demolished due to compromised structural integrity from several decades of neglect. Furthermore the wetlands adjacent to the property to the east, southeast, and south may be used as critical habitat for critical species, as well as bears classification as emergent forested wetlands, and offer vital ecoservices that might be considered for future separate investigation, as well as other facilities in the vicinity. Though there are not obvious or apparent evidentiary factors that would support unacceptable risks to human health or ecological impacts. It is recommended that no further investigative action be made at this time.