



**DIRECTIVE NUMBER:** 9481-08(84)

**TITLE:** ACL Demonstrations, Risk Level, and Subsurface Environment

**APPROVAL DATE:** 7-19-84

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** 7-19-84

**ORIGINATING OFFICE:** Office of Solid Waste

**FINAL**

**DRAFT**

**STATUS:** [ ] A- Pending OMB approval  
[ ] B- Pending AA-OSWER approval  
[ ] C- For review &/or comment  
[ ] D- In development or circulating

**REFERENCE (other documents):** headquarters

---

**OSWER OSWER OSWER**  
**VE DIRECTIVE DIRECTIVE DI**

---

---

**JUL 19 1984**

**International Paper ACL Demonstration**

**Randall W. Breeden, Hydrologist  
Land Disposal Branch (WH-565E)**

**Bob Stewart, Environmental Engineer  
Hazardous Materials Branch, Region VII**

The meeting with International Paper on June 21, 1984, answered some of our questions concerning the latest resubmittal of IP's ACL demonstration (May 1, 1984). IP answered the questions of whether or not the proposed AEL values would become IP's proposed ACL values and, will all ACLs be calculated using a  $10^{-5}$  risk level to protect human health and the environment. IP stipulated that the calculated AEL values would become their proposed ACL value at the point of compliance, and that a  $10^{-5}$  risk level will be used to calculate the ACL values.

We informed IP that the methodology used to calculate the AEL values was reasonable and adequate. We also provided them with a copy of Dr. Michael Dourson's memo and comments.

Two important decisions have since been made by senior management pertaining to the ACL issue as a result of this demonstration. The first concerns the acceptable level of risk that the Agency will adopt as adequately protecting human health. The second deals with IP's proposal to use ACL values that are based on a  $10^{-5}$  risk to human health and the environment. On June 6, 1984, Lee Thomas signed the Record of Decision for the Reilly Tar Pits Site (CERCLA) establishing the level of risk that the Agency accepts as being protective of human health. That risk level was  $10^{-6}$ . Therefore the  $10^{-6}$  risk level is policy for future ACL demonstrations where risks to human health are calculated.

There is another problem with IP's proposed ACL demonstration. Due to the nature of the subsurface environment at the IP facility, specifically the mine shafts and vents, groundwater flow beyond the facility boundary via the horizontal mine shafts is probable. Hence, retardation and attenuation mechanisms that could act to decrease the concentration of a hazardous constituent along the flow path from the point of compliance to a point of use will not occur in the subsurface channels. Therefore, in order for IP to justify the proposed ACL values they must adequately demonstrate to the Agency that there will be an order of magnitude decrease in concentration of hazardous constituents in the horizontal mine shafts from the point of compliance to the property boundary. If IP can successfully and adequately demonstrate this, then the proposed ACL values will be based on a  $10^{-6}$  risk level and a

factor of 10 reduction of concentration in the mine shafts. It should be noted that these ACL values for hazardous constituents will be equivalent to IP's proposed  $10^{-5}$  risk level values with no reduction in concentration occurring.