OU1 RISK ASSESSMENT

Quantitative Assessment	Qualitative Assessment
Pros: • NCP refers to numerical departure points for cancer: evaluate risk range 1E-6 – 1E-4 • RAGs guidance recommends quantitative assessment • Uses best available science. (Note: More data will likely not reduce variability or improve correlation between ABS data and visible score. The OU4 risk assessment needs additional exposure assessment information (background, low-activity, and worker exposures) and nature and extent information (rescreening for visual vermiculite), NOT a better correlation.)	Pros: • Does not set precedence regarding quantitative assessment methodology.
Cons: • Concern about setting precedence for OU4. • Correlation between OU4 ABS data and Vis. Verm. Score is statistically poor because of the variability.	Cons: • Does not (*but could*) address current risk from surface conditions at site. • Still sets precedence with respect to other OUs, since it's the first risk assessment. • Sets precedence regarding impact of subsurface material as OU4 also has subsurface source material. • Does not use the best available quantitative information; sets precedence for rejecting data on the basis of variability, which will be an issue at all OUs.

Summary:
Whether qualitative or quantitative assessment is performed, the OU1 risk assessment sets precedence for other OUs.

Consensus Toxicologists' Recommendation:
Develop both a quantitative cancer risk assessment (addressing surface conditions) and a qualitative assessment (addressing both surface and subsurface conditions) to provide a multiple lines of evidence justification for the remedy. Do not develop a quantitative non-cancer risk; instead qualitatively discuss non-cancer risks (e.g. using ATSDR information), since the Draft RfC has not yet been peer reviewed.