Table ES-2
Comparative Analysis of Groundwater Alternatives
Operable Unit 3 (old city dump), Riverfront Superfund Site
New Haven, Missouri

Evaluation Criteria	Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Institutional Controls	Alternative 3 Institutional Controls and Monitoring	Alternative Ranking
Overall Protection	This alternative would not provide protection of human health or the environment. No remedial action objectives would be satisfied.	Protective by implementing restrictions that would prevent contact with contaminated groundwater. Remedial action objectives should be met but would be difficult to quantify.	Protective by monitoring changes in contamination and by implementing restrictions that would prevent contact with contaminated groundwater. Remedial action objectives would be met.	Ranked from the alternative that would provide the most overall protection to least overall protection: 3,2,1
Compliance with Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs)	Currently, seeps do not comply with chemical specific ARARs. No location-specific ARARs were identified. Action-specific ARARs would not be applicable.	Currently, seeps do not comply with chemical specific ARARs. No location-specific ARARs were identified. Action-specific ARARs would not be applicable.	Alternative would comply with all Federal and State ARARs.	Would meet ARARs: 3 Would not meet ARARs: 1,2
Long-Term Effectiveness	This alternative does not provide active reduction in long-term risks. No long-term controls would be implemented.	Implementation would reduce the long-term risk to health from human usage of contaminated groundwater. A long-term risk would continue to exist for the environment, as the contaminated groundwater would remain in the aquifer and would not be monitored.	Implementation would reduce the long-term risk to health from human usage of contaminated groundwater, and monitoring would provide additional control of contaminated groundwater. However, the aquifer would not be actively restored. A long-term risk would continue to exist for the environment, as the contaminated groundwater would remain in the aquifer.	Ranked from alternative that would provide the most long-term effectiveness to least long-term effectiveness: 3, 2, 1

Table ES-2 (Continued)
Comparative Analysis of Groundwater Alternatives
Operable Unit 3 (old city dump), Riverfront Superfund Site
New Haven, Missouri

Evaluation Criteria	Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Institutional Controls	Alternative 3 Institutional Controls and Monitoring	Alternative Ranking
Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility, and Volume	Unknown if reduction of contamination would be achieved. There would be no mechanisms to monitor contamination levels.	Unknown if reduction of contamination would be achieved. There would be no mechanisms to monitor contamination levels.	Monitoring would be effective in determining the reductions, if any, of the toxicity, mobility, or volume of the contaminants in the groundwater.	Ranked from alternative that would provide the most reduction of toxicity, mobility, and volume to least: 3, 2, 1
Short-Term Effectiveness	Because no actions would be conducted, there would be no increase in the short-term risks to the community or the environment.	Because no intrusive actions would be conducted, there would be no increase in the short-term risks to the community or the environment.	Risk to the community and to workers would be low if proper measures were taken.	Ranked from alternative that would provide the most short-term effectiveness to least short-term effectiveness: 1, 2, 3
Implementability	An evaluation of implementability during remediation is not applicable.	Administratively and technically feasible.	Administratively and technically feasible.	Ranked from alternative that would be the easiest to implement to the hardest to implement: 1, 2, 3
Cost (Total Present Worth*)	$163,500	$249,000	$992,000	Ranked from least costly to most costly: 1, 2, 3

*Assuming a 3.9% discount rate.