

**Risk Assessment Guidance
for Superfund:
Volume I —
Human Health Evaluation
Manual
(Part C, Risk Evaluation of
Remedial Alternatives)**

Interim

**Office of Emergency and Remedial Response
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC 20460**

NOTICE

The policies set out in this document are intended solely as guidance; they are not final U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) actions. These policies are not intended, nor can they be relied upon, to create any rights enforceable by any party in litigation with the United States. EPA officials may decide to follow the guidance provided in this document, or to act at variance with the guidance, based on an analysis of specific site circumstances. The Agency also reserves the right to change this guidance at any time without public notice.

This guidance is based on policies in the Final Rule of the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP), which was published on March 8, 1990 (55 *Federal Register* 8666). The NCP should be considered the authoritative source.

CONTENTS

	Page
NOTICE	ii
EXHIBITS	v
DEFINITIONS	vi
ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATIONS	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	xi
PREFACE	xii
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 SCOPE AND OVERVIEW OF PART C	1
1.1.1 Scope	1
1.1.2 Overview	3
1.2 RELEVANT STATUTES, REGULATIONS, AND GUIDANCE	6
1.2.1 CERCLA/SARA	6
1.2.2 NCP	6
1.2.3 Other Relevant Guidance	7
1.3 LEVEL OF EFFORT	7
1.4 IMPORTANCE OF RISK COMMUNICATION	7
1.5 MANAGEMENT AND DOCUMENTATION	8
1.6 ORGANIZATION OF THE DOCUMENT	8
2.0 RISK EVALUATION DURING THE FEASIBILITY STUDY	11
2.1 RISK EVALUATION DURING DEVELOPMENT AND SCREENING OF ALTERNATIVES	11
2.1.1 Consideration of Long-term Human Health Risks	11
2.1.2 Consideration of Short-term Human Health Risks	11
2.2 RISK EVALUATION DURING DETAILED ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES	12
2.2.1 Evaluation of Long-term Human Health Risks for Detailed Analysis	14
2.2.2 Evaluation of Short-term Human Health Risks for Detailed Analysis	15
2.3 CASE STUDIES	20
3.0 RISK EVALUATION AFTER THE FEASIBILITY STUDY	25
3.1 RISK EVALUATION FOR THE PROPOSED PLAN	25

CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
3.2 DOCUMENTATION OF RISKS IN THE ROD	25
3.3 RISK EVALUATION DURING REMEDIAL DESIGN/REMEDIAL ACTION	25
3.3.1 Risk Evaluation During Remedial Design	26
3.3.2 Monitoring Short-term Health Risks During Implementation	26
3.3.3 Assessing Attainment of Selected Remediation Levels During Implementation	26
3.3.4 Evaluation of Residual Risk	26
3.4 RISK EVALUATION DURING FIVE-YEAR REVIEWS	27
3.4.1 Purpose of Five-year Reviews	27
3.4.2 Sites That Receive Five-year Reviews	27
3.4.3 Risk-related Activities During Five-year Reviews	28
REFERENCES	29
APPENDIX A SELECTED REMEDIATION TECHNOLOGIES AND ASSOCIATED POTENTIAL RELEASES	31
APPENDIX B QUANTIFYING POTENTIAL RELEASES FROM SELECTED REMEDIAL TECHNOLOGIES	43
B.1 SOILS HANDLING TECHNOLOGIES	43
B.2 THERMAL DESTRUCTION TECHNOLOGIES	43
B.3 SOLIDIFICATION/STABILIZATION TREATMENT TECHNOLOGIES	44
B.4 REFERENCES FOR DETERMINING RELEASES RESULTING FROM REMEDIAL ACTIVITIES	45
B.4.1 Various Remedial Activities	45
B.4.2 Soils Handling	45
B.4.3 Thermal Destruction	46
B.4.4 Stabilization/Solidification	47
APPENDIX C SHORT-TERM TOXICITY VALUES	49
C.1 BACKGROUND ON EXPOSURE DURATION	49
C.2 EXISTING SHORT-TERM TOXICITY VALUES	50
C.2.1 Toxicity Values for Assessing Risk of Noncarcinogenic Effects for Short-term Exposure	50
C.2.2 Specific Carcinogenic Risk Values for Short-term Exposures	54
APPENDIX D RADIATION REMEDIATION TECHNOLOGIES	57

EXHIBITS

Exhibit		Page
1-1	RELATIONSHIP OF HUMAN HEALTH EVALUATION TO THE CERCLA PROCESS	2
1-2	SUMMARY OF RISK EVALUATIONS OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES	4
1-3	RISK EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES IN THE CERCLA PROCESS	5
2-1	ILLUSTRATION OF AN EXPOSURE PATHWAY FOR A REMEDIAL ACTION	17
2-2	ILLUSTRATION OF CUMULATIVE EXPOSURES FROM MULTIPLE RELEASES	18
A-1	REMEDIATION TECHNOLOGY DESCRIPTIONS	32
A-2	REMEDIATION TECHNOLOGIES AND SOME POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT RELEASES	37
D-1	POTENTIAL RELEASES OF RADIOACTIVITY ASSOCIATED WITH RADIATION REMEDIATION TECHNOLOGIES	58
D-2	DEGREE OF POTENTIAL SHORT- AND LONG-TERM RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH RADIATION REMEDIATION TECHNOLOGIES	62

DEFINITIONS

Term	Definition
Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs)	"Applicable" requirements are those clean-up standards, standards of control, and other substantive environmental protection requirements, criteria, or limitations promulgated under federal or state law that specifically address a hazardous substance, pollutant, contaminant, remedial action, location, or other circumstance at a Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) site. "Relevant and appropriate" requirements are those clean-up standards which, while not "applicable" at a CERCLA site, address problems or situations sufficiently similar to those encountered at the CERCLA site that their use is well-suited to the particular site. ARARs can be action-specific, location-specific, or chemical-specific.
Exposure Pathway	The course a chemical or physical agent takes from a source to an exposed organism. An exposure pathway describes a unique mechanism by which an individual or population is exposed to chemicals or physical agents at or originating from a site. Each exposure pathway includes a source or release from a source, an exposure point, and an exposure route. If the exposure point differs from the source, a transport/exposure medium (e.g., air) or media (in cases of intermedia transfer) also would be indicated.
Exposure Point	A location of potential contact between an organism and a chemical or physical agent.
Exposure Route	The way a chemical or physical agent comes in contact with an organism (i.e., by ingestion, inhalation, dermal contact).
Final Remediation Levels	Chemical-specific clean-up levels that are documented in the Record of Decision (ROD). They may differ from preliminary remediation goals (PRGs) because of modifications resulting from consideration of various uncertainties, technical and exposure factors, and all nine selection-of-remedy criteria outlined in the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP).
Long-term Risks	Risks that remain after remedy implementation is complete (i.e., residual risks).
Preliminary Remediation Goals (PRGs)	Initial clean-up goals that (1) are protective of human health and the environment and (2) comply with ARARs. They are developed early in the process based on readily available information and are modified to reflect results of the baseline risk assessment. They also are used during analysis of remedial alternatives in the remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS).

DEFINITIONS (Continued)

Term	Definition
Remedial Alternative	An action considered in the feasibility study intended to reduce or eliminate significant risks to human health and/or the environment at a site. A range of remedial alternatives are considered in detail by the FS while the selection of a specific remedial alternative over others is documented in the ROD.
Remedial Action	The selected alternative that is documented in the ROD.
Risk-based Concentrations	Concentration levels for individual chemicals that correspond to a specific cancer risk level (e.g., 10^{-6} , 10^{-4}) or hazard quotient (HQ) or hazard index (HI) (e.g., less than or equal to 1). They are generally selected as preliminary or final remediation goals when ARARs are not available.
Short-term Risks	Risks that occur during implementation of a remedial alternative. Some "short-term" risks can occur over a period of many years (e.g., risk associated with air stripper emissions).

ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATIONS

Acronym/ Abbreviation	Definition
ACGIH	American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists
AIC	Acute Inhalation Criteria
APCD	Air Pollution Control Device
ARARs	Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements
ATSDR	Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry
CEGL	Continuous Exposure Guidance Level
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
ECAO	Environmental Criteria and Assessment Office
EEGL	Emergency Exposure Guidance Level
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
HEAST	Health Effects Assessment Summary Tables
HHEM	Human Health Evaluation Manual
HI	Hazard Index
HQ	Hazard Quotient
IDLH	Immediately Dangerous to Life and Health
IRIS	Integrated Risk Information System
LOAEL	Lowest-observed-adverse-effect-level
MCL	Maximum Contaminant Level
MRL	Minimal Risk Level
NCP	National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan
NIOSH	National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health
NOAEL	No-observed-adverse-effect-level
NRC	National Research Council

ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATIONS (Continued)

Acronym/ Abbreviation	Definition
ORD	Office of Research and Development
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
PEL	Permissible Exposure Level
POTW	Publicly Owned Treatment Works
PPE	Personal Protective Equipment
PRG	Preliminary Remediation Goal
QA/QC	Quality Assurance/Quality Control
RAGS	Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
REL	Recommended Exposure Level
RfC	Reference Concentration
RfD	Reference Dose
RI/FS	Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study
RME	Reasonable Maximum Exposure
ROD	Record of Decision
RPM	Remedial Project Manager
RQ	Reportable Quantity
RREL	Risk Reduction Engineering Laboratory
SARA	Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act
SPEGL	Short-term Public Emergency Guidance Level
TLV-C	Threshold Limit Values - Ceiling
TLV-STEL	Threshold Limit Values - Short-term Exposure Limit
TLV-TWA	Threshold Limit Values - Time-weighted Average
TSC	Superfund Health Risk Technical Support Center

ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATIONS (Continued)

Acronym/ Abbreviation	Definition
TSCA	Toxic Substances Control Act
VOCs	Volatile Organic Compounds

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This manual was developed by the Toxics Integration Branch (TIB) of EPA's Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, Hazardous Site Evaluation Division. A large number of EPA regional and headquarters managers and technical staff (see below) provided valuable input regarding the organization, content, and policy implications of the manual throughout its development.

ICF Incorporated provided technical assistance to EPA in the development of this manual, under Contract Nos. 68-01-7389, 68-W8-0098, and 68-03-3452. S. Cohen and Associates (SC&A) provided assistance in the development of Appendix D, under EPA Contract No. 68-D9-0170.

WORKGROUP

EPA HEADQUARTERS

Office of Emergency and Remedial Response:	Rhea Cohen, David Cooper, Steve Golian, Jennifer Sutter, Ed Hanlon, James Konz, Tracy Loy, Bruce Means
Office of Radiation Programs:	Bob Dyer
Office of General Counsel:	Larry Starfield
Office of Policy, Planning, and Evaluation:	Pepi Lecayo
Office of Waste Programs Enforcement:	Steve Ells
Office of Health and Environmental Assessment:	Kevin Garrahan

EPA REGIONAL OFFICES

Region 1:	Ann-Marie Burke, Jeri Weiss
Region 5:	Alison Hiltner, Jae Lee, Andrew Podowski
Region 6:	Jon Rauscher
Region 10:	Judi Schwarz, Carol Sweeney

OTHER EPA OFFICES

Risk Reduction Engineering Laboratory:	Pat Laforvara
Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards:	Fred Hauchman
Office of Health and Environmental Assessment:	Pei-Fung Hurst

STATE AGENCIES

Michigan Department of Natural Resources:	Chris Flaga
New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection:	Linda Cullen

PREFACE

Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund: Volume I — Human Health Evaluation Manual (RAGS/HHEM) Part C is one of a three-part series. Part A addresses the baseline risk assessment; Part B addresses the development of risk-based preliminary remediation goals. Part C provides guidance on the human health risk evaluations of remedial alternatives that are conducted during the feasibility study, during selection and documentation of a remedy, and during and after remedy implementation. Part C provides general guidance to assist in site-specific risk evaluations and to maintain flexibility in the analysis and decision-making process. This guidance does not discuss the evaluation of ecological effects that takes place during remedy selection and implementation, nor does it discuss the risk management decisions that are necessary at a CERCLA site (e.g., selection of final remediation goals). The potential users of Part C are persons involved in the remedy selection and implementation process, including risk assessors, risk assessment reviewers, remedial project managers, and other decision-makers.

This manual is being distributed as an interim document to allow for a period of field testing and review. RAGS/HHEM will be revised in the future, and Parts A, B, and C will be incorporated into a single final guidance document. Additional information for specific subject areas is being developed for inclusion in a later revision. These areas include:

- development of short-term inhalation toxicity values;
- short-term worker health and safety issues; and
- determination of attainment of final remediation goals.

Comments addressing usefulness, changes, and additional areas where guidance is needed should be sent to:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Toxics Integration Branch (OS-230)
Office of Emergency and Remedial Response
401 M Street, SW
Washington, DC 20460

Telephone: 202-260-9486
FAX: 202-260-6852

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This guidance has been developed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to assist remedial project managers (RPMs), risk assessors, site engineers, and others in using risk information at Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) sites to both evaluate remedial alternatives during the feasibility study (FS) and to evaluate the human health risk associated with the selected remedial alternative during and after its implementation. Part C provides general guidance to assist in site-specific risk evaluations and to maintain flexibility in the decision-making process.

Risk assessment is one of many tools that RPMs use in selecting the best remedy for a site. Other important tools (not addressed in this guidance) involve the assessments of technical feasibility, applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs), cost, and implementability.

This guidance is the third part (Part C) in the series *Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund: Volume I — Human Health Evaluation Manual (RAGS/HHEM)*. Part A of this guidance (EPA 1989g) describes how to conduct a site-specific baseline risk assessment; the information in Part A is necessary background for Part C. Part B (EPA 1991c) provides guidance for calculating risk-based concentrations that may be used, along with ARARs and other information, to develop preliminary remediation goals (PRGs) during project scoping. PRGs (and final remediation levels set in the Record of Decision [ROD]) can be used throughout the analyses in Part C to assist in evaluating the human health risks of remedial alternatives. Exhibit 1-1 illustrates the major correspondence of RAGS/HHEM activities with the steps in the CERCLA remedial process.

The steps for conducting a risk evaluation of remedial alternatives are discussed in general terms in Chapters 2 and 3; more detailed guidance for conducting short-term evaluations is provided in Appendices A through D. (See the box in the next column for a description of how the terms short-

SHORT-TERM RISK VS. LONG-TERM RISK

For the purposes of this guidance, short-term risks are those that occur during implementation of a remedial alternative. Some "short-term" risks can occur over a period of many years (e.g., risk associated with air stripper emissions). In contrast, long-term risks are those that remain after remedy implementation is complete (i.e., residual risks).

term risk and long-term risk differ in this guidance.) The remainder of this chapter:

- presents the scope and an overview of Part C;
- discusses the statutes, regulations, and guidance relevant to the evaluation of remedial alternatives;
- describes appropriate levels of effort for risk evaluations of remedial alternatives;
- discusses the importance of risk communication;
- addresses the role of the RPM and the need for documentation; and
- presents the organization of the remainder of this document.


1.1 SCOPE AND OVERVIEW OF PART C

1.1.1 SCOPE

As discussed in Section 1.2 below, some of the nine criteria that are described in the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP) and that are used to evaluate remedial alternatives during the remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS), involve a direct use of risk-related information. Several aspects of these criteria (e.g., short-term risks to workers and

EXHIBIT 1-1

RELATIONSHIP OF HUMAN HEALTH EVALUATION TO THE CERCLA PROCESS



surrounding community, long-term effectiveness) are discussed in detail in this guidance. Other criteria that do not directly involve health risk (e.g., implementability, cost) — with the exception of community acceptance — are mentioned briefly but are not discussed in detail.

Remedial alternatives, in addition to being evaluated for the degree to which they protect human health, are evaluated for their potential to protect ecological receptors. RAGS/HHEM Part C does not address ecological risk assessment (see the next box). However, ecological guidance specific to evaluating remedial alternatives in the CERCLA program will be developed following finalization of Agency guidance on ecological risk assessment.

EVALUATING ECOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES

Remedial actions, by their nature, can alter or destroy aquatic and terrestrial habitat. This potential for destruction or alteration of habitat and subsequent consequences must be evaluated so that it can be considered during the selection of a remedial alternative and during its implementation.

This document does not address the evaluation of ecological risks. Future guidance for ecological evaluations is planned, however. At present, ecological evaluations should be based on the best professional judgment of experienced ecologists and/or aquatic or environmental toxicologists.

The guidance in this document applies to sites contaminated with non-radioactive hazardous substances and those contaminated with radionuclides. Appendix D provides additional guidance specific to radionuclide sites.

Note that this guidance is limited to the use of risk assessment in evaluating remedial alternatives. Part C does not provide guidance on the risk management decisions that must be made when evaluating alternatives and selecting a remedy (e.g., balancing of the nine NCP criteria, selection of final remediation goals and levels) or engineering judgments that affect the evaluation of alternatives (e.g., determining whether an alternative is likely to achieve remediation goals). These issues are

addressed in other guidance or in guidance that currently is being developed.

1.1.2 OVERVIEW

The process of evaluating remedial alternatives begins in the development and screening stage of the FS and extends into the detailed analysis stage. The major goal for the risk evaluation during these steps is to provide decision-makers with specific information that they may need in choosing among alternatives. Additional risk evaluations may need to be conducted during the proposed plan, during the design and implementation of the remedy, and after the remedy is complete (e.g., during "five-year reviews"). These activities are discussed below and throughout this guidance.

Exhibit 1-2 summarizes the levels of effort and purposes of the risk evaluations of remedial alternatives, while Exhibit 1-3 illustrates when these activities take place within the context of the CERCLA remedial process.

Identification and Screening of Technologies and Alternatives. During this stage, a range of remedial alternatives is identified, if necessary, and each alternative is evaluated with respect to effectiveness, implementability, and cost. This process may consist of two steps: (1) identification and screening of technologies and (2) development and screening of alternatives. These steps are often combined into a single step (as reflected in this guidance). Those alternatives that are clearly unfavorable relative to other alternatives in terms of effectiveness (e.g., very high perceived risk) or implementability, or that are grossly excessive in cost are dropped from consideration after this screening. Part of the evaluation of effectiveness involves human health risk (e.g., risks to the community and remediation workers), and Chapter 2 of this document provides guidance on evaluating these factors. RAGS/HHEM Part C does not discuss evaluating factors such as implementability and cost.

Detailed Analysis of Alternatives. During the detailed analysis stage, alternatives are evaluated according to each of the nine NCP evaluation criteria, and then are compared to each other. Both long-term effectiveness (i.e., residual risk) and short-term effectiveness (i.e., risk to the community and remediation workers during remedy implementation) are evaluated during the detailed analysis. Chapter 2 and Appendices A

EXHIBIT 1-2

SUMMARY OF RISK EVALUATIONS OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES

STAGE	LEVEL OF EFFORT ^a		PRIMARY PURPOSE OF RISK EVALUATION ^b	
	Short-term Risk ^c	Long-term Risk	Short-term Risk ^c	Long-term Risk
Screening of Alternatives (Section 2.1)	Qualitative	Qualitative	Identify (and eliminate from consideration) alternatives with clearly unacceptable short-term risks.	Identify (and eliminate from consideration) alternatives with clearly unacceptable long-term risks.
Detailed Analysis of Alternatives (Section 2.2)	Qualitative or Quantitative ^d	Qualitative or Quantitative ^d	Evaluate short-term risks of each alternative to community and on-site remediation workers during implementation so that these risks can be compared among alternatives.	Evaluate long-term (residual) risk of each alternative and its ability to provide continued protection over time so that these risks can be compared among alternatives.
Proposed Plan (Section 3.1)	Qualitative or Quantitative ^d	Qualitative or Quantitative ^d	Refine previous analyses, as needed, based on newly developed information.	Refine previous analyses, as needed, based on newly developed information.
Record of Decision (Section 3.2)	Qualitative or Quantitative ^d	Qualitative or Quantitative ^d	Document short-term risks that may occur during remedy implementation.	Document risks that may remain after completion of remedy and determine need for five-year reviews.
Remedial Design (Section 3.3)	Qualitative or Quantitative ^d	Qualitative or Quantitative ^d	Refine previous analyses, as needed, and identify need for engineering controls or other measures to mitigate risks.	Refine previous analyses, as needed, and identify need for engineering controls or other measures to mitigate risks.
Remedial Action (Section 3.3)	Quantitative	Quantitative	Ensure protection of workers and community by monitoring emissions or exposure concentrations, as needed.	Evaluate whether remediation levels specified in ROD have been attained and evaluate residual risk after completion of remedy to ensure protectiveness.
Five-year Review (Section 3.4)	Generally not applicable	Quantitative	Generally not applicable.	Confirm that remedy (including any engineering or institutional controls) remains operational and functional and evaluate whether clean-up standards are still protective.

^a Level of effort (i.e., qualitative or quantitative) refers only to the level of risk evaluation that is generally expected. Levels other than those presented here, or combinations of levels, are possible. See the main text of this document for additional discussion on level of effort.


^b Purpose presented in this exhibit for each stage is only the primary purpose; other purposes may exist. See the main text of this document for additional information.

^c Short-term risk refers to risks that occur during remedy implementation.

^d Text box in Section 2.2 lists considerations for deciding whether a qualitative or quantitative risk evaluation is needed for these stages.

EXHIBIT 1-3

**RISK EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES IN THE
CERCLA PROCESS**



through D of this document provide guidance on the evaluation of the risk-related aspects of long-term effectiveness (residual risk and permanence), and short-term effectiveness. (As with the screening of alternatives, Chapter 2 generally does not discuss evaluation of the other criteria, which do not directly involve human health risk considerations.) The resulting risk information is incorporated into the overall detailed analysis process described in the *Guidance for Conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies Under CERCLA* (RI/FS Guidance; EPA 1988c).

Proposed Plan and ROD. Risk evaluations are generally conducted during the development of the proposed plan and ROD only when new information concerning risks of the remedial alternatives is generated. Chapter 3 provides guidance on the evaluation of risks for the proposed plan and ROD stage.

Remedial Design/Remedial Action (RD/RA). Risk-related evaluations may also be conducted for some sites during implementation of the selected remedy. These activities, discussed briefly in Chapter 3, include: (1) refining risk evaluations as necessary when designing the remedy; (2) monitoring potential short-term health impacts on the community and workers; (3) assessing attainment of final remediation levels selected in the ROD; and (4) evaluating residual risk.

Five-year Review. Under the NCP, five-year reviews are required for sites as long as hazardous substances remain onsite above levels that allow unlimited use and unrestricted exposure, and are also conducted as a matter of policy for long-term remedial action sites even if no hazardous substances are expected to remain after completion of the action. Chapter 3 briefly addresses the consideration of risk during five-year reviews.

1.2 RELEVANT STATUTES, REGULATIONS, AND GUIDANCE

As discussed in RAGS/HHEM Part A, there is a hierarchy of requirements and guidance in CERCLA, beginning with the laws enacted by Congress, followed by the regulations, and then the guidance developed by EPA. This section addresses this hierarchy within the context of the risk evaluation of remedial alternatives.

1.2.1 CERCLA/SARA

CERCLA, commonly called Superfund, was enacted by Congress in 1980 in response to the dangers posed by sudden or otherwise uncontrolled releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants into the environment. The Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) was enacted in 1986. (All references to CERCLA in this guidance should be interpreted as "CERCLA as amended by SARA.")

Section 121 of CERCLA requires that remedies be protective of human health and the environment, satisfy ARARs, be cost-effective, and utilize permanent solutions and alternative treatment technologies to the maximum extent practicable. Section 121(c) of CERCLA requires a periodic review of remedial actions, at least every five years after initiation, for as long as hazardous substances that may pose a threat to human health or the environment remain at the site. The information in this manual provides guidance for evaluating the protectiveness of remedial alternatives at a site in terms of the human health-related aspects of these CERCLA requirements. Some considerations include protectiveness, effectiveness in terms of risk reduction, and degree of hazard for substances remaining at the site.

1.2.2 NCP

The NCP is the main set of regulations developed by EPA to implement CERCLA. The most recent NCP was published on March 8, 1990 (55 *Federal Register* 8666-8865) and is codified at 40 *Code of Federal Regulations* (CFR) Part 300. Section 300.430(e)(1) of the NCP describes a two-stage evaluation of remedial alternatives: a screening evaluation of a range of alternatives, if necessary, followed by a detailed analysis of the most promising alternatives. The NCP also describes activities that follow selection and implementation of the selected remedial alternative.

Screening. NCP section 300.430(e)(7) indicates that, if necessary and to the extent sufficient information is available, alternatives should be screened out if determined to be ineffective, not implementable, or grossly excessive in cost. Some aspects of effectiveness involve considerations of human health risk and are discussed in this guidance.

Detailed Analysis. The NCP establishes nine criteria in section 300.430(e)(9)(iii) to use in evaluating alternatives in detail and in selecting a remedy. Parts of three of these criteria — overall protection of human health and the environment, long-term effectiveness and permanence, and short-term effectiveness — directly relate to risks and therefore are the focus of this guidance. The actual selection of a remedy for any given site ultimately is based on consideration of the nine criteria. This guidance also discusses the importance of risk communication to the community as it relates to the criterion of community acceptance.

Five-year Reviews. NCP section 300.430(f)(4)(ii) provides that if a remedial alternative is selected that results in hazardous substances (or pollutants or contaminants) remaining at the site above levels that allow for unrestricted exposure and unlimited use, such remedy should be reviewed at least every five years after initiation of the selected remedial alternative.

1.2.3 OTHER RELEVANT GUIDANCE

Three CERCLA program documents are important background for the guidance presented in this document — RAGS/HHEM Parts A and B (EPA 1989g; EPA 1991c), and the RI/FS Guidance (EPA 1988c). Parts A and B provide guidance on conducting a baseline risk assessment and on developing risk-based concentrations, respectively, that should be used in evaluating remedial alternatives. The activities conducted during a risk evaluation of remedial alternatives are somewhat similar to the activities conducted during a baseline risk assessment. (Chapter 2 discusses in more detail the similarities and differences.) The RI/FS Guidance describes the major activities and analyses that are conducted during the RI/FS. See the references at the end of this document for other relevant background guidance.

1.3 LEVEL OF EFFORT

The level of effort for risk evaluations of remedial alternatives depends primarily on the site-specific questions that must be answered in order to select and implement a remedy. In addition, site-specific factors such as the complexity of the site, the number of alternatives considered for the site, the available resources, and the amount of available data may affect the level of effort. In most cases, a qualitative rather than a detailed

quantitative evaluation of both long-term and short-term risks is all that is needed to select the most appropriate alternative. A quantitative risk evaluation of remedial alternatives will not need to be conducted for all sites. In all cases, the baseline risk assessment provides much of the risk-related information needed for the detailed analysis of alternatives, especially for those alternatives that involve limited or no action.

For many sites, the risk evaluations of remedial alternatives during the FS are conducted in a qualitative manner. That is, the risk evaluations during both the screening and detailed analysis stages for these sites will not be at all quantitative. At other sites, a more quantitative analysis of the long-term and/or short-term risks associated with the remedial alternatives may be needed during the detailed analysis. In these situations, the risk evaluation generally needs to incorporate more site-specific information.

A guiding principle is that the risk evaluation should be tailored to provide the RPM with specific information that he or she needs for supporting the selection or design of a remedy (e.g., the relative risks associated with alternatives, the alternatives that best meet the remediation goals). Because of the differences in information needs and available data for sites, in the complexity of sites, and in available methods, models, and resources for evaluation, all of the components of this guidance will not be applicable to all sites.

Chapter 2 provides some additional factors to consider when deciding on the level of effort to use for the risk evaluation of remedial alternatives.

1.4 IMPORTANCE OF RISK COMMUNICATION

As noted earlier, while overall protection of human health and the environment is one of the threshold criteria established by the NCP for use in evaluating alternatives and selecting a remedy, community acceptance of the remedy is a modifying criterion (NCP section 300.430(e)(9)(iii)). The CERCLA program encourages and promotes public participation during all phases of the decision-making process at CERCLA sites. Just as risk information is used by RPMs and other EPA staff to assist in evaluation of remedial alternatives during the FS and to evaluate the selected remedial alternative during and after its

implementation, risk information also will be employed by the public in their acceptance of a selected remedy. Good communication of the risks of the remedy to the public is crucial to the community's acceptance of the remedy.

There is no single procedure for good risk communication. The actual mechanism used and the messages delivered will vary from site to site and will depend upon the public, their level of concern, the complexity of the site, the contaminants of concern, and the proposed remedial alternative. RPMs are encouraged to work with the risk assessor and community relations coordinator for the site to develop the appropriate means to communicate risks from the remedial alternative or any residual risks. RPMs should consider using fact sheets, public meetings, and the release of draft documents or "risk communication" summaries as vehicles for risk communication. *Community Relations in Superfund: A Handbook* (EPA 1988a) offers guidance on planning and conducting CERCLA community relations activities.

Regardless of the vehicles chosen for risk communication, the following rules, from *Seven Cardinal Rules of Risk Communication* (EPA 1988f), should be kept in mind.

- Accept and involve the public as a legitimate partner.
- Plan carefully and evaluate your efforts.
- Listen to the public's specific concerns.
- Be honest, frank, and open.
- Coordinate and collaborate with other credible sources.
- Meet the needs of the media.
- Speak clearly and with compassion.

As provided under the NCP, risk communication, public participation, and community relations at CERCLA sites begin well before the remedy selection phase. This is important, as communities near CERCLA sites may begin with a degree of outrage that must be addressed before effective communication can begin. Community relations, public involvement, and good risk communication continue throughout

the RI/FS process. A well-informed public will be better able to comment on — and provide input to — technical decisions. Establishing credibility through community relations, public participation, and effective risk communication practices early in the CERCLA process leads to greater community acceptance of the selected remedy.

1.5 MANAGEMENT AND DOCUMENTATION

One role of an RPM in the risk evaluation of remedial alternatives is to make risk management decisions. The RPM must have a comprehensive understanding of the risk evaluation in order to make these decisions. The first box on the next page provides questions that RPMs and other decision-makers should ask about the risks of remedial alternatives at their sites. The second box provides guidance on where to document the evaluations addressed in RAGS/HHEM Part C.

1.6 ORGANIZATION OF THE DOCUMENT

The remainder of this guidance is organized into two additional chapters and four appendices, as follows:

- Chapter 2: Risk Evaluation During the Feasibility Study;
- Chapter 3: Risk Evaluation After the Feasibility Study;
- Appendix A: Selected Remediation Technologies and Associated Potential Releases;
- Appendix B: Guidance for Quantifying Potential Releases from Selected Remediation Technologies;
- Appendix C: Short-term Toxicity Values; and
- Appendix D: Radiation Remediation Technologies.

In addition, several boxes, such as those below, provide useful information. A second kind of box, a "shadow" box, provides case studies. These boxes are presented at the end of Chapter 2.

QUESTIONS RPMs SHOULD ASK ABOUT HUMAN HEALTH RISKS OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES

- Which technologies can readily achieve all preliminary remediation goals (PRGs) in a given medium? What uncertainties are involved in this determination?
- Which alternatives will clearly not address the significant human exposure pathways identified in the baseline risk assessment?
- Are the expected residual risks or short-term risks from one alternative significantly different from another?
- What other risk-based benefits (e.g., shorter time to achieving goals) are realized by selecting one alternative over another?
- Will implementation of specific technologies create new chemicals of concern or new significant exposures or risks for the surrounding community?
- Is there a need for engineering controls or other measures to mitigate risks during implementation? Are such controls available? How reliable are these controls?
- Does the remedial alternative result in hazardous substances remaining at the site such that a five-year review or reviews would be required?

DOCUMENTATION OF RISK EVALUATIONS

- The risk evaluation conducted during the development and screening of alternatives (Section 2.1) and during the detailed analysis of alternatives (Section 2.2) should be documented in the FS.
- The proposed plan (Section 3.1) should contain a summary of the risk evaluations for the alternatives, including any new risk information identified during development of the proposed plan.
- The ROD (Section 3.2) should contain the results of the risk evaluations of the alternatives and the preferred alternative, including any results developed since the proposed plan.
- Any significant changes identified during RD/RA (Section 3.3) in the risk evaluations should be documented (e.g., in a memorandum).
- Each five-year review (Section 3.4) should contain a statement on protectiveness and, if necessary, a recalculation of risk and/or a new risk assessment.

