

Alternative 11A, the selected alternative, does not include any treatment.

### 3. SHORT-TERM EFFECTIVENESS

For the selected alternative, 11A, and Alternatives 3A and 4A, short-term effects are similar: construction and traffic congestion, including possible construction of a water treatment facility to treat water from the dewatering process; exposure of on-Site workers to contaminants in excavated sediments; and temporary disturbance of wetlands, wildlife habitat and the aquatic community. These impacts would be mitigated by (1) minimizing, to the extent possible, off-Site construction activities and off-Site movement of construction vehicles; (2) implementation of on-Site worker protection measures, as needed; (3) protection of the aquatic community through the use of silt curtains and/or sedimentation basins; and (4) restoration or wetlands, wildlife habitat and the aquatic community at the conclusion of remedial activities. Furthermore, alternatives 3A and 4A would have all of the short term impacts stated above, but would have additional potential impacts due to the construction of a sediment treatment plant on or near the Property and transportation of contaminated materials off-Site to an appropriate disposal facility. Alternative 4A would require the greatest amount of contaminated materials to be transported off-Site to a disposal facility.

### 4. IMPLEMENTABILITY

The selected alternative, 11A, is the most easily implemented. It is technically feasible, requires limited land area for implementation, and requires little specialized equipment or materials. Furthermore, because the location for disposing the excavated sediment is the cell constructed in the OU I cap, no off-Site landfill capacity need be obtained. Alternatives 3A and 4A are technically feasible but require specialized equipment and operators, and may not be administratively feasible if significant land acquisition and permitting are necessary. Land availability in the vicinity of the Nyanza Property is limited because most of the Property is either wetland area or is already being utilized for active industrial uses. In addition, Alternatives 3A and 4A will require off-Site landfill capacity for disposal of sediment treatment residuals; the capacity needed for Alternative 4A is greater.

### 5. COST

The capital, operation and maintenance, and total cost for each 'A' alternative is provided as part of the Description of Alternatives in Sections VIII and X of this ROD. It should be noted, however, that the Operation and Maintenance costs for these alternatives assume 30 years of Operation and Maintenance estimated at approximately 6.8 to 7.3 million dollars (net present worth). These Operation and Maintenance costs were calculated in the FS to include activities such as annual monitoring and institutional controls for the Sudbury River. However, because investigations under OU IV will be performed concurrently with the implementation of the OU III remedy, monitoring of the River will be conducted as part of these OU IV investigations. In addition, institutional controls are an interim remedy only, pending the OU IV remedy decision. Therefore, these costs are expected to be far less than the 30-year cost estimate.

Of the 'A' alternatives, the selected alternative, 11A, is the least expensive at \$20,419,000 and is the most cost-effective since it achieves a protective clean-up level at the smallest cost. Alternative 3A is the next most expensive at \$24,593,000, while 4A is the most costly alternative at

**EPA Superfund  
Record of Decision:**

**NYANZA CHEMICAL WASTE DUMP  
EPA ID: MAD990685422  
OU 03  
ASHLAND, MA  
03/30/1993**