

**DOCUMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR DETERMINATION**

Interim Final 2/5/99

**RCRA Corrective Action**

**Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA725)**

**Current Human Exposures Under Control**

**Facility Name:** Alta Kitson Farm  
**Facility Address:** 7732 Henry Road, Henry, VA 24102  
**Facility EPA ID #:** VAD 000 447 623

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 are not available, skip to #6 and enter "IN" (more information needed) status code.

**BACKGROUND**

The Alta Kitson Farm site consists of a parcel of land, a house, and horse stables previously owned by Ms. Alta Kitson of Henry, VA. The farm is located along Route 605, approximately ½ mile West of the intersection of Rt. 606 and Rt. 605 in Henry, VA 24102, found in Henry County. The surrounding area is mostly rural property and farms. The Blue Ridge Talc Company's (Blue Ridge Talc) plant was the only industrial site in the area during the late 1990's.

The Alta Kitson Farm is a horse farm that was used for unpermitted disposal of hazardous paint wastes from the Blue Ridge Talc facility located in Henry, Virginia (a formerly active manufacturer of latex and solvent based paint). The site consists of two parcels, one parcel of approximately 20 acres and another parcel that is approximately 40 acres.

**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)**

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)?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>Rationale / Key Contaminants</u>
Groundwater		X		Clean closure achieved in 2002.
Air (indoors) <sup>2</sup>		X		No industrial operations site is a residence/farm.
Surface Soil (e.g., <2 ft)		X		Clean closure achieved in 2002.
Surface Water		X		Clean closure achieved in 2002.
Sediment		X		Clean closure achieved in 2002.
Subsurf. Soil (e.g., >2 ft)		X		Clean closure achieved in 2002.
Air (outdoors)		X		No industrial operations; site is a residence/farm.

- 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):

The site has been/is a farm and residence. Once SWMU existed at the site due to a one time disposal event of waste paints and thinners by the Blue Ridge Talc Company.

The drainage ditch in which the disposal occurred was excavated in accordance with an approved Closure Plan. Clean Closure was achieved in 2002.

**Current Human Exposures Under Control****Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA725)**

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)

<b><u>“Contaminated” Media</u></b>	Residents	Workers	Day-Care	Construction	Trespassers	Recreation	Food <sup>3</sup>
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:

1. Strike-out specific Media including Human Receptors’ spaces for Media, which are not “contaminated” as identified in #2 above.
2. 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):

<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)**

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):

<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)**

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)**

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 (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 Alta Kitson Farm, EPA ID # VAD 000 447 623, located at 7732 Henry Road, Henry, Virginia 24102. Specifically, this determination indicates that the migration of "contaminated" groundwater is 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 (signature) \_\_\_\_\_ Date 1/22/09  
(print) Denis Zielinski  
(title) \_\_\_\_\_

Supervisor (signature) \_\_\_\_\_ Date 1/22/09  
(print) Luis Pizarro  
(title) \_\_\_\_\_  
(EPA Region or State) \_\_\_\_\_

Locations where References may be found:

US EPA Region III  
Land & Chemicals Division  
1650 Arch Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Contact telephone and e-mail numbers

(name) Denis M. Zielinski  
(phone #) 215-814-3431  
(e-mail) zielinski.denis@epa.gov