

**Table 1. Summary and Comparison of Interim Action Alternatives Evaluation - Ranges 43-48
Record of Decision, Interim Action for Ordnance and Explosives
Former Fort Ord, California**

Evaluation Criteria	Interim Action Alternatives									
	Vegetation Clearance Alternatives				OE Remedial Action Alternatives			OE Detonation Alternatives		
	No Action	Prescribed Burning	Mechanical Methods	Manual Methods	No Action with Existing Site Security Measures	Enhanced Site Security Measures	Subsurface OE Removal	No Action	Detonation w/Engr Controls	Detonation Chamber & Detonation w/Engr Controls
<p>Effectiveness (Includes Overall Protection of Human Health and the Environment, Compliance with ARARs, Short-Term Effectiveness, Long-Term Effectiveness and Permanence, Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility or Volume Through Treatment)</p>	<p>Not effective in short or long term because it takes no action to address the need for vegetation clearance if Subsurface Removal of OE is selected as the OE Remedial Action alternative. Effective if No Action w/ Existing Site Security or Enhanced Site Security is selected as OE Remedial Action alternative because vegetation clearance would not be required. Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume criteria is not applicable to vegetation clearance.</p>	<p>Very effective in short term at clearing vegetation quickly over large areas; effective as a long term because it has beneficial effects on the regrowth and long term health of CMC vegetation. Would comply with ARARs and be protective of human health and the environment (with mitigation measures such as smoke management and relocation of affected residents during burning). Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume criteria is not applicable to vegetation clearance.</p>	<p>Effective in short term at clearing vegetation; however, could only be used in limited areas of 50 acres in size in CMC habitat reserve due to HMP requirements, and would not clear vegetation as thoroughly as burning. Not effective in the long term because it would have detrimental effects on the regrowth and long term health of CMC vegetation. Would not comply with ARARs if used on more than 50 acres in CMC habitat reserve, would not be protective of human health in terms of worker direct exposure to OE while clearing, and would not be protective of the environment. Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume criteria is not applicable to vegetation clearance.</p>	<p>Effective in short term at clearing vegetation; however, could only be used in limited areas of 50 acres in size in CMC habitat reserve due to HMP requirements, and would not clear vegetation as thoroughly as burning. Not effective in the long term because it would have detrimental effects on the regrowth and long term health of CMC vegetation. Would not comply with ARARs if used on more than 50 acres in CMC habitat reserve, would not be protective of human health in terms of worker direct exposure to OE while clearing, and would not be protective of the environment. Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume criteria is not applicable to vegetation clearance.</p>	<p>Not effective in short term or long term at reducing OE hazards because it takes no action beyond maintaining existing site security measures such as fencing, warning signs, and security patrols which have been breached by trespassers in the past. Would not be protective of human health or the environment if no action is taken to mitigate OE hazards. Would not reduce toxicity, mobility, or volume of OE.</p>	<p>Not effective in short term or long term at reducing OE hazards because it takes no action beyond enhancing existing site security measures such as fencing, warning signs, and security patrols which could still be breached by trespassers. Would not be as protective of human health or the environment since it does not reduce toxicity, mobility, or volume of OE.</p>	<p>Very effective in short term and long term at reducing OE hazards because it removes all OE to depths consistent with planned reuse of IA site. Would comply with ARARs and be protective of human health and the environment by removing OE hazards. Would reduce mobility and volume of OE.</p>	<p>Not effective in short term or long term because it takes no action to address OE hazards. Would not be protective of human health or the environment. Would not reduce toxicity, mobility, or volume of OE.</p>	<p>Very effective in short term and long term for 100% of OE items in reducing OE-related hazards through detonation. Would comply with ARARs and be protective of human health and the environment. Would reduce hazards associated with OE.</p>	<p><u>Detonation Chamber</u> Effective for 20% of OE items that can be safely transported to temporary chamber location. Requires additional handling of OE to place in chamber. Would comply with ARARs and be protective of human health and the environment. Effective in short and long term and would reduce hazards associated with OE.</p> <p><u>Engineering Controls</u> Very effective for 100% of OE items as previously described.</p>

**Table 1. Summary and Comparison of Interim Action Alternatives Evaluation - Ranges 43-48
Record of Decision, Interim Action for Ordnance and Explosives
Former Fort Ord, California**

Evaluation Criteria	Interim Action Alternatives									
	Vegetation Clearance Alternatives				OE Remedial Action Alternatives			OE Detonation Alternatives		
	No Action	Prescribed Burning	Mechanical Methods	Manual Methods	No Action with Existing Site Security Measures	Enhanced Site Security Measures	Subsurface OE Removal	No Action	Detonation with Engineering Controls	Detonation Chamber and Detonation with Engineering Controls
Implementability <i>(Includes State & Community Acceptance)</i>	Easy to implement because it takes no action to clear vegetation. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.	Easy to implement to clear vegetation quickly; would take approximately 1 month to coordinate burn and clear vegetation. Equipment and personnel readily available. Must be conducted in close coordination with agencies and public to address concerns about smoke and fire danger. Would require prior public notification, smoke management while conducting the burn, and temporary relocation of individuals from areas affected by smoke to unaffected areas to minimize impacts of smoke and emissions. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.	Difficult to implement to clear vegetation quickly; would take several months to clear vegetation over entire IA site and would require close coordination with OE remedial workers. Equipment and personnel readily available. However, cannot be used to clear vegetation over entire IA site (498 acres) due to HMP requirements that limit its use to 50 acres or less in CMC habitat reserve found at the IA site. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.	Difficult to implement to clear vegetation quickly; would take several months to clear vegetation over entire IA site and would require close coordination with OE remedial workers. Equipment and personnel readily available. However, cannot be used to clear vegetation over entire IA site (498 acres) due to HMP requirements that limit its use to 50 acres or less in CMC habitat reserve found at the IA site. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.	Easy to implement because it takes no additional action beyond maintaining existing site security measures such as fencing, warning signs, and security patrols for an interim period of 5 years while final long term O&M measures are decided in the basewide OE RI/FS. Equipment and personnel are readily available. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.	Moderately easy to implement because it takes no additional action beyond enhancing existing site security measures such as fencing, warning signs, and security patrols and maintaining new measures for an interim period of 5 years while final long term O&M measures are decided in the basewide OE RI/FS. Equipment and personnel are readily available. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.	Difficult to implement over large areas, but equipment and personnel are readily available. Performed for many years at Fort Ord. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.	Easy to implement because it takes no action to detonate UXO found during OE Remedial Action. Difficult to implement from an administrative perspective because detonation of UXO would be required to eliminate OE hazards once found. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.	Easy to implement; performed during OE removal activities at Fort Ord for many years. Equipment and personnel readily available. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.	Detonation Chamber Difficult to implement because it requires additional handling of OE to place in chamber and chambers cannot be moved over 498 acres of IA site. A chamber could be temporarily located at each of five access gates to the IA site, but OE would still have to be carried over hundreds of acres and stockpiled at the temporary locations to be detonated in the chamber, increasing the potential for accidental detonation. Based on site-specific surface OE removal data, 20% of OE items would be eligible for detonation in the chamber. Engineering Controls Can be used for 100% of OE items and implementable as previously described. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.
Cost	No Cost	Capital: \$1.7 million O&M: \$213,000 (5 years) TOTAL: \$1.9 million	Capital: \$1.4 million O&M: \$213,000 (5 years) TOTAL: \$1.6 million	Capital: \$2.5 million O&M: \$213,000 (5 years) TOTAL: \$2.8 million	Capital: None O&M: \$235,000 (5 years) TOTAL: \$235,000	Capital: \$1.1 million O&M: \$3.3 million (5 years) TOTAL: \$4.5 million	Capital: *\$10.6 - 11.2 million O&M: None TOTAL: *\$10.6 - 11.2 million	No Cost	Capital: \$1.1 million O&M: None TOTAL: \$1.1 million	Capital: \$1.1 million O&M: None TOTAL: \$1.1 million

* Range of Costs for Subsurface OE Removal based on estimated costs for 1 ft. to 4 ft. depth of removal.
ARAR Applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements. OE Ordnance and Explosives.
DTSC Department of Toxic Substances Control, a part of Cal/EPA. O&M Operations and Maintenance.
EPA U.S. Environmental Protection Agency UXO Unexploded Ordnance.
HMP Habitat Management Plan.

**Table 2. Summary and Comparison of Interim Action Alternatives Evaluation – Range 30A
Record of Decision, Interim Action for Ordnance and Explosives
Former Fort Ord, California**

Evaluation Criteria	Interim Action Alternatives									
	Vegetation Clearance Alternatives				OE Remedial Action Alternatives			OE Detonation Alternatives		
	No Action	Prescribed Burning	Mechanical Methods	Manual Methods	No Action with Existing Site Security Measures	Enhanced Site Security Measures	Subsurface OE Removal	No Action	Detonation w/Engr Controls	Detonation Chamber & Detonation w/Engr Controls
<p>Effectiveness (Includes Overall Protection of Human Health and the Environment, Compliance with ARARs, Short-Term Effectiveness, Long-Term Effectiveness and Permanence, Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility or Volume Through Treatment)</p>	<p>Not effective in short or long term because it takes no action to address the need for vegetation clearance if Subsurface Removal of OE is selected as the OE Remedial Action alternative. Effective if No Action w/ Existing Site Security or Enhanced Site Security is selected as OE Remedial Action alternative because vegetation clearance would not be required. Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume criteria is not applicable to vegetation clearance.</p>	<p>Very effective in short term at clearing vegetation quickly over large areas; effective as a long term because it has beneficial effects on the regrowth and long term health of CMC vegetation. Would comply with ARARs and be protective of human health and the environment (with mitigation measures such as smoke management and relocation of affected residents during burning). Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume criteria is not applicable to vegetation clearance.</p>	<p>Effective in short term at clearing vegetation; however, could only be used in limited areas of 50 acres in size in CMC habitat reserve due to HMP requirements, and would not clear vegetation as thoroughly as burning. Not effective in the long term because it would have detrimental effects on the regrowth and long term health of CMC vegetation. Would not comply with ARARs if used on more than 50 acres in CMC habitat reserve, would not be protective of human health in terms of worker direct exposure to OE while clearing, and would not be protective of the environment. Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume criteria is not applicable to vegetation clearance.</p>	<p>Effective in short term at clearing vegetation; however, could only be used in limited areas of 50 acres in size in CMC habitat reserve due to HMP requirements, and would not clear vegetation as thoroughly as burning. Not effective in the long term because it would have detrimental effects on the regrowth and long term health of CMC vegetation. Would not comply with ARARs if used on more than 50 acres in CMC habitat reserve, would not be protective of human health in terms of worker direct exposure to OE while clearing, and would not be protective of the environment. Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume criteria is not applicable to vegetation clearance.</p>	<p>Not effective in short term or long term at reducing OE hazards because it takes no action beyond maintaining existing site security measures such as fencing, warning signs, and security patrols which have been breached by trespassers in the past. Would not be protective of human health or the environment if no action is taken to mitigate OE hazards. Would not reduce toxicity, mobility, or volume of OE.</p>	<p>Not effective in short term or long term at reducing OE hazards because it takes no action beyond enhancing existing site security measures such as fencing, warning signs, and security patrols which could still be breached by trespassers. Would not be as protective of human health or the environment since it does not reduce toxicity, mobility, or volume of OE.</p>	<p>Very effective in short term and long term at reducing OE hazards because it removes all OE to depths consistent with planned reuse of IA site. Would comply with ARARs and be protective of human health and the environment by removing OE hazards. Would reduce mobility and volume of OE.</p>	<p>Not effective in short term or long term because it takes no action to address OE hazards. Would not be protective of human health or the environment. Would not reduce toxicity, mobility, or volume of OE.</p>	<p>Very effective in short term and long term for 100% of OE items in reducing OE-related hazards through detonation. Would comply with ARARs and be protective of human health and the environment. Would reduce hazards associated with OE.</p>	<p><u>Detonation Chamber</u> Effective for 20% of OE items that can be safely transported to temporary chamber location. Requires additional handling of OE to place in chamber. Would comply with ARARs and be protective of human health and the environment. Effective in short and long term and would reduce hazards associated with OE.</p> <p><u>Engineering Controls</u> Very effective for 100% of OE items as previously described.</p>

**Table 2. Summary and Comparison of Interim Action Alternatives Evaluation – Range 30A
Record of Decision, Interim Action for Ordnance and Explosives
Former Fort Ord, California**

Evaluation Criteria	Interim Action Alternatives									
	Vegetation Clearance Alternatives				OE Remedial Action Alternatives			OE Detonation Alternatives		
	No Action	Prescribed Burning	Mechanical Methods	Manual Methods	No Action with Existing Site Security Measures	Enhanced Site Security Measures	Subsurface OE Removal	No Action	Detonation with Engineering Controls	Detonation Chamber and Detonation with Engineering Controls
Implementability <i>(Includes State & Community Acceptance)</i>	Easy to implement because it takes no action to clear vegetation. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.	Easy to implement to clear vegetation quickly; would take approximately 1 month to coordinate burn and clear vegetation. Equipment and personnel readily available. Must be conducted in close coordination with agencies and public to address concerns about smoke and fire danger. Would require prior public notification, smoke management while conducting the burn, and temporary relocation of individuals from areas affected by smoke to unaffected areas to minimize impacts of smoke and emissions. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.	Difficult to implement to clear vegetation quickly; would take several months to clear vegetation over entire IA site and would require close coordination with OE remedial workers. Equipment and personnel readily available. However, cannot be used to clear vegetation over entire IA site (388 acres) due to HMP requirements that limit its use to 50 acres or less in CMC habitat reserve found at the IA site. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.	Difficult to implement to clear vegetation quickly; would take several months to clear vegetation over entire IA site and would require close coordination with OE remedial workers. Equipment and personnel readily available. However, cannot be used to clear vegetation over entire IA site (388 acres) due to HMP requirements that limit its use to 50 acres or less in CMC habitat reserve found at the IA site. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.	Easy to implement because it takes no additional action beyond maintaining existing site security measures such as fencing, warning signs, and security patrols for an interim period of 5 years while final long term O&M measures are decided in the basewide OE RI/FS. Equipment and personnel are readily available. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.	Moderately easy to implement because it takes no additional action beyond enhancing existing site security measures such as fencing, warning signs, and security patrols and maintaining new measures for an interim period of 5 years while final long term O&M measures are decided in the basewide OE RI/FS. Equipment and personnel are readily available. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.	Difficult to implement over large areas, but equipment and personnel are readily available. Performed for many years at Fort Ord. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.	Easy to implement because it takes no action to detonate UXO found during OE Remedial Action. Difficult to implement from an administrative perspective because detonation of UXO would be required to eliminate OE hazards once found. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.	Easy to implement; performed during OE removal activities at Fort Ord for many years. Equipment and personnel readily available. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.	<u>Detonation Chamber</u> Difficult to implement because it requires additional handling of OE to place in chamber and chambers cannot be moved over the 388 acres IA site. A chamber could be temporarily located at each of five access gates to the IA site, but OE would still have to be carried over hundreds of acres and stockpiled at the temporary locations to be detonated in the chamber, increasing the potential for accidental detonation. Based on site-specific surface OE removal data, 20% of OE items would be eligible for detonation in the chamber. <u>Engineering Controls</u> Can be used for 100% of OE items and implementable as previously described. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.
Cost	No Cost	Capital: \$1.4 million O&M: \$149,000 (5 years) TOTAL: \$1.5 million	Capital: \$1.8 million O&M: \$149,000 (5 years) TOTAL: \$1.9 million	Capital: \$2.0 million O&M: \$149,000 (5 years) TOTAL: \$2.1 million	Capital: None O&M: \$164,000 (5 years) TOTAL: \$164,000	Capital: \$1.0 million O&M: \$3.2 million (5 years) TOTAL: \$4.2 million	Capital: *\$6.8 to \$7.7 million O&M: None TOTAL: *\$6.8 to \$7.7 million	No Cost	Capital: \$124,000 O&M: None TOTAL: \$124,000	Capital: \$136,000 O&M: None TOTAL: \$136,000

* Range of Costs for Subsurface OE Removal based on estimated costs for 1 ft. to 4 ft. depth of removal.
 ARAR Applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements. HMP Habitat Management Plan. UXO Unexploded Ordnance.
 DTSC Department of Toxic Substances Control, a part of Cal/EPA. OE Ordnance and Explosives. O&M Operations and Maintenance.
 EPA U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

**Table 3. Summary and Comparison of Interim Action Alternatives Evaluation – Site OE-16
Record of Decision, Interim Action for Ordnance and Explosives
Former Fort Ord, California**

Evaluation Criteria	Interim Action Alternatives									
	Vegetation Clearance Alternatives				OE Remedial Action Alternatives			OE Detonation Alternatives		
	No Action	Prescribed Burning	Mechanical Methods	Manual Methods	No Action with Existing Site Security Measures	Enhanced Site Security Measures	Subsurface OE Removal	No Action	Detonation w/Engr Controls	Detonation Chamber & Detonation w/Engr Controls
<p>Effectiveness (Includes Overall Protection of Human Health and the Environment, Compliance with ARARs, Short-Term Effectiveness, Long-Term Effectiveness and Permanence, Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility or Volume Through Treatment)</p>	<p>Not effective in short or long term because it takes no action to address the need for vegetation clearance if Subsurface Removal of OE is selected as the OE Remedial Action alternative. Effective if No Action w/ Existing Site Security or Enhanced Site Security is selected as OE Remedial Action alternative because vegetation clearance would not be required. Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume criteria is not applicable to vegetation clearance.</p>	<p>Very effective in short term at clearing vegetation quickly over large areas; effective as a long term because it has beneficial effects on the regrowth and long term health of CMC vegetation. Would comply with ARARs and be protective of human health and the environment (with mitigation measures such as smoke management and relocation of affected residents during burning). Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume criteria is not applicable to vegetation clearance.</p>	<p>Effective in short term at clearing vegetation; however, could only be used in limited areas of 50 acres in size in CMC habitat reserve due to HMP requirements, and would not clear vegetation as thoroughly as burning. Not effective in the long term because it would have detrimental effects on the regrowth and long term health of CMC vegetation. Would not comply with ARARs if used on more than 50 acres in CMC habitat reserve, would not be protective of human health in terms of worker direct exposure to OE while clearing, and would not be protective of the environment. Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume criteria is not applicable to vegetation clearance.</p>	<p>Effective in short term at clearing vegetation; however, could only be used in limited areas of 50 acres in size in CMC habitat reserve due to HMP requirements, and would not clear vegetation as thoroughly as burning. Not effective in the long term because it would have detrimental effects on the regrowth and long term health of CMC vegetation. Would not comply with ARARs if used on more than 50 acres in CMC habitat reserve, would not be protective of human health in terms of worker direct exposure to OE while clearing, and would not be protective of the environment. Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume criteria is not applicable to vegetation clearance.</p>	<p>Not effective in short term or long term at reducing OE hazards because it takes no action beyond maintaining existing site security measures such as fencing, warning signs, and security patrols which have been breached by trespassers in the past. Would not be protective of human health or the environment if no action is taken to mitigate OE hazards. Would not reduce toxicity, mobility, or volume of OE.</p>	<p>Not effective in short term or long term at reducing OE hazards because it takes no action beyond enhancing existing site security measures such as fencing, warning signs, and security patrols which could still be breached by trespassers. Would not be as protective of human health or the environment since it does not reduce toxicity, mobility, or volume of OE.</p>	<p>Very effective in short term and long term at reducing OE hazards because it removes all OE to depths consistent with planned reuse of IA site. Would comply with ARARs and be protective of human health and the environment by removing OE hazards. Would reduce mobility and volume of OE.</p>	<p>Not effective in short term or long term because it takes no action to address OE hazards. Would not be protective of human health or the environment. Would not reduce toxicity, mobility, or volume of OE.</p>	<p>Very effective in short term and long term for 100% of OE items in reducing OE-related hazards through detonation. Would comply with ARARs and be protective of human health and the environment. Would reduce hazards associated with OE.</p>	<p><u>Detonation Chamber</u> Effective for 20% of OE items that can be safely transported to temporary chamber location. Requires additional handling of OE to place in chamber. Would comply with ARARs and be protective of human health and the environment. Effective in short and long term and would reduce hazards associated with OE.</p> <p><u>Engineering Controls</u> Very effective for 100% of OE items as previously described.</p>

**Table 3. Summary and Comparison of Interim Action Alternatives Evaluation – Site OE-16
Record of Decision, Interim Action for Ordnance and Explosives
Former Fort Ord, California**

Evaluation Criteria	Interim Action Alternatives									
	Vegetation Clearance Alternatives				OE Remedial Action Alternatives			OE Detonation Alternatives		
	No Action	Prescribed Burning	Mechanical Methods	Manual Methods	No Action with Existing Site Security Measures	Enhanced Site Security Measures	Subsurface OE Removal	No Action	Detonation with Engineering Controls	Detonation Chamber and Detonation with Engineering Controls
Implementability <i>(Includes State & Community Acceptance)</i>	Easy to implement because it takes no action to clear vegetation. State and Community Acceptance will be addressed in the IA RI/FS ROD once comments on the IA RI/FS report and Proposed Plan have been received.	Easy to implement to clear vegetation quickly; would take approximately 1 month to coordinate burn and clear vegetation. Equipment and personnel readily available. Must be conducted in close coordination with agencies and public to address concerns about smoke and fire danger. Would require prior public notification, smoke management while conducting the burn, and temporary relocation of individuals from areas affected by smoke to unaffected areas to minimize impacts of smoke and emissions. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.	Difficult to implement to clear vegetation quickly; would take several months to clear vegetation over entire IA site and would require close coordination with OE remedial workers. Equipment and personnel readily available. However, cannot be used to clear vegetation over entire IA site (80 acres) due to HMP requirements that limit its use to 50 acres or less in CMC habitat reserve found at the IA site. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.	Difficult to implement to clear vegetation quickly; would take several months to clear vegetation over entire IA site and would require close coordination with OE remedial workers. Equipment and personnel readily available. However, cannot be used to clear vegetation over entire IA site (80 acres) due to HMP requirements that limit its use to 50 acres or less in CMC habitat reserve found at the IA site. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.	Easy to implement because it takes no additional action beyond maintaining existing site security measures such as fencing, warning signs, and security patrols for an interim period of 5 years while final long term O&M measures are decided in the basewide OE RI/FS. Equipment and personnel are readily available. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.	Moderately easy to implement because it takes no additional action beyond enhancing existing site security measures such as fencing, warning signs, and security patrols and maintaining new measures for an interim period of 5 years while final long term O&M measures are decided in the basewide OE RI/FS. Equipment and personnel are readily available. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.	Difficult to implement over large areas, but equipment and personnel are readily available. Performed for many years at Fort Ord. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.	Easy to implement because it takes no action to detonate UXO found during OE Remedial Action. Difficult to implement from an administrative perspective because detonation of UXO would be required to eliminate OE hazards once found. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.	Easy to implement; performed during OE removal activities at Fort Ord for many years. Equipment and personnel readily available. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.	Detonation Chamber Difficult to implement because it requires additional handling of OE to place in chamber and chambers cannot be moved over 80 acres of IA site. A chamber could be temporarily located at each of five access gates to the IA site, but OE would still have to be carried over many acres and stockpiled at the temporary locations to be detonated in the chamber, increasing the potential for accidental detonation. Based on site-specific surface OE removal data, 20% of OE items would be eligible for detonation in the chamber. Engineering Controls Can be used for 100% of OE items and implementable as previously described. Community acceptance is addressed in Section 3 of the ROD. DTSC has reviewed and commented on the Army's selected remedies, which are consistent with DTSC's comments.
Cost	No Cost	Capital: \$288,000 O&M: \$30,000 (5 years) TOTAL: \$318,000	Capital: \$228,000 O&M: \$30,000 (5 years) TOTAL: \$258,000	Capital: \$411,000 O&M: \$30,000 (5 years) TOTAL: \$441,000	Capital: None O&M: \$35,000 (5 years) TOTAL: \$35,000	Capital: \$412,000 O&M: \$1.4 million (5 years) TOTAL: \$1.8 million	Capital: *\$1.29 - \$1.3 million O&M: None TOTAL: *\$1.29 - \$1.3 million	No Cost	Capital: \$13,000 O&M: None TOTAL: \$13,000	Capital: \$28,000 O&M: None TOTAL: \$28,000

* Range of Costs for Subsurface OE Removal based on estimated costs for 1 ft. to 4 ft. depth of removal.
ARAR Applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements. OE Ordnance and Explosives.
DTSC Department of Toxic Substances Control, a part of Cal/EPA. O&M Operations and Maintenance.
EPA U.S. Environmental Protection Agency UXO Unexploded Ordnance.
HMP Habitat Management Plan.