

7.0 TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT

7.1 QUESTION A: IS THE REMEDY FUNCTIONING AS INTENDED BY THE DECISION DOCUMENTS?

Source Control and Soil (OU #1)

The review of documents, ARARs, and the results of the October 2003 site inspection indicate that the remedy is operating and functioning as designed. The vegetation appeared healthy and non-stressed. Based on observations during the site inspection, the RA has been determined to be performing as expected. OU #1 and OU #3 O&M activities resumed in 2003 after the OU #3 RA was completed and the O&M Plan was updated. There were no opportunities for system optimization observed during this review.

Indicators of potential issues pointing to a failing remedy would be leachate breakthrough, side slope erosion, cap settlement, liner exposure, and excessive leachate in the terminal manhole, none of which were observed during the site inspection.

No activities were observed that would violate the institutional controls. Institutional controls have been negotiated with current landowners and are in the process of being filed on the affected property deeds. Tire tracks were noted up the sides of the landfill and the surrounding areas. Chain link fencing exists around the landfill area with warning signs posted at regular intervals; however during the site inspection several signs were damaged, faded, or missing and two gates were unlocked.

Off-Site Groundwater (OU #2)

A remedy has not been implemented for OU #2 and therefore cannot be evaluated. The interim OU #2 ROD is currently under review.

Wetlands and Drainageways (OU #3)

The review of documents, ARARs, and the results of the October 2003 site inspection indicate that the remedy is operating and functioning as designed. The excavation and capping of mercury-contaminated sediments have achieved the remedial objectives to minimize the migration of contaminants to surface water and prevent direct contact with, or ingestion of, contaminants in sediments. Based on observations during the site inspection, the RA has been determined to be performing as expected. OU #1 and OU #3 O&M activities resumed in 2003 after the OU #3 RA was completed and the O&M Plan was updated. There were no opportunities for system optimization observed during this review.

Indicators of potential issues pointing to a failing remedy would be leachate breakthrough, side slope erosion, cap settlement, liner exposure, and excessive leachate in the terminal manhole, none of which were observed during the site inspection.

No activities were observed that would violate the institutional controls. Institutional controls have been negotiated with current landowners and are in the process of being filed on the affected property deeds. Tire tracks were noted up the sides of the landfill and the surrounding areas. Chain link fencing exists around the landfill area with warning signs posted at regular intervals; however during the site inspection several signs were damaged, faded, or missing and two gates were unlocked.

Site:	MA 01820
Break:	2.2
Other:	09762

**FIVE-YEAR REVIEW REPORT
FOR
NYANZA CHEMICAL WASTE DUMP SUPERFUND SITE**

Ashland, Massachusetts

April 2004

Prepared by:

United States Environmental Protection Agency
Region 1
Boston, Massachusetts

With Technical Assistance from:

Shaw Environmental, Inc.
100 Technology Center Drive
Stoughton, Massachusetts 02072

Approved by: Isaac Stettin
Director, Office of Site Remediation and Restoration
USEPA, Region 1

Date: 04/12/04