

ATTACHMENT G5-1

EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK CHECKLISTS

**ATTACHMENT G5-1
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: Parcel E20c.1.1.1
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 1: LITERATURE REVIEW**

TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED

Yes No Inconclusive

1. Is there evidence that the site was used as an impact area (i.e., fired military munitions such as mortars, projectiles, rifle grenades or other launched ordnance)?

	No	
--	----	--

Sources reviewed and comments

No evidence to indicate that Parcel E20c.1.1.1 was used as an impact area. It is possible that inert practice rifle grenades fired at adjacent MRS-24A may have missed their intended targets and landed in Parcel E20c.1.1.1.

2. Is there historical evidence that training involved use of High Explosive (HE) or Low Explosive (LE) items?

	No	
--	----	--

Sources reviewed and comments

No indication in the available documentation that Parcel E20c.1.1.1 was used for training with HE or LE.

3. Is there historical evidence that training involved use of pyrotechnic and/or smoke producing items (e.g., simulators, flares, smoke grenades) but not explosives?

		Inconclusive
--	--	--------------

Sources reviewed and comments

It is possible that practice mines, illumination signals, or smoke producing items were used at the RSOP area. It is also possible that training at adjacent MRS-24A may have included rifle-fired smoke grenades.

DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF THE SURROUNDING AREA

4. Does subsequent development or use of the area indicate that military munitions would have been used at the site?

		Inconclusive
--	--	--------------

Sources reviewed and comments

Minimal development has occurred (construction of a water reservoir and installation of electrical power lines only). Military housing was built immediately adjacent to the parcel (north side) in the late 1950s.

**EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: Parcel E20c.1.1.1
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 1: LITERATURE REVIEW**

TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED

Yes No Inconclusive

5. Does use of area surrounding the site indicate that military munitions would have been used at the site?

	No	
--	----	--

Sources reviewed and comments

Parcel E20c.1.1.1 is near the Impact Area (south side of Eucalyptus Road). Firing at the Impact Area was towards the south away from the parcel.

ESTABLISHMENT OF SITE BOUNDARIES

6. Is there evidence of training areas on aerial photographs that could be used to establish boundaries?

	No	
--	----	--

Sources reviewed and comments

Some areas within Parcel E20c.1.1.1 appear to be less densely vegetated than others based on aerial photos (1941, 1949, 1951, 1956, 1966, 1975), but not conclusive enough to establish that training occurred or to create site boundaries.

7. Is there evidence of training on historical training maps that could be used to establish boundaries?

Yes		
-----	--	--

Sources reviewed and comments

A portion of Parcel E20c.1.1.1 lies within a training area identified as RSOP on a 1956 training facilities map. The portion of the RSOP that lies within Parcel E20c.1.1.1 is being evaluated in this Approval Memorandum.

8. Should current boundaries be revised?

	No	
--	----	--

Sources reviewed and comments

The boundary of Parcel E20c.1.1.1 is a property boundary and is not based on evidence of the use of military munitions.

**EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: Parcel E20c.1.1.1
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 1: LITERATURE REVIEW**

TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED

Yes No Inconclusive

RESULTS OF LITERATURE EVALUATION

Does the literature review provide sufficient evidence to warrant further investigation?

	No	
--	----	--

Comments

Results of the literature review do not indicate that any additional investigation is necessary.

References

USAEDH, 1997. Revised Archives Search Report, Former Fort Ord, California, Monterey County, California. Prepared by US Army Corps of Engineers St. Louis District.

USA Environmental Inc. (USA), 2001. Final SS/GS Sampling After-Action Report, Inland Range Contract, Former Fort Ord, California, Site OE-45. September 30.

U.S. Army (Army), 1945. Training Facilities, Fort Ord and Vicinity, Calif. Revised August.

_____, 1946. Master Plan - Fort Ord. April 5.

Fred Map, generated from a 1995 interview with former Fort Ord Fire Chief Fred Stephani.

Camp Ord Showing Ultimate Layout of Concurrent Training Camps, June 20, 1940.

Field training Areas and range Map, April 27, 1964 (HR_lit0007) LR07.

Ranges and Training Area Overlay, November 15, 1987, LR28.

Basic Information Ranges & Training Facilities, Revised December 31, 1961.

Training Areas That Cannot Be Used at The Same Time, Circa 1954. (HR 00035) LR03.

Fort Ord Training Areas and Facilities, December 20, 1956. LR08.

Basic Information Ranges & Training Facilities, December 31, 1958.

EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: Parcel E20c.1.1.1
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 1: LITERATURE REVIEW

TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED

Yes No Inconclusive

References (continued)

Ranges And Training Area Overlay, Revised July 15, 1976.
Ranges And Training Area Overlay, Revised January 1978.
Ranges And Training Area Overlay, Revised June 1, 1981.
Ranges And Training Area Overlay, Revised April 1, 1982.
Ranges And Training Area Overlay, Revised November 15, 1987.

Aerial Photographs Reviewed:

7/25/1941
8/17/1949
6/23/1951
5/14/1956
5/2/1966
12/17/1975

Note: Checklist questions have been updated to reflect current Department of Defense military munitions terminology.

**ATTACHMENT G5-1
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: Parcel E20c.1.1.1
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 2: RECONNAISSANCE EVALUATION**

TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED

Yes No Inconclusive

1. Is there evidence that the site was used as an impact area (i.e., fired military munitions such as mortars, projectiles, rifle grenades or other launched ordnance)?

	No	
--	----	--

Sources reviewed and comments

No evidence to indicate that Parcel E20c.1.1.1 was used as an impact area. It is possible that inert practice rifle grenades fired at adjacent MRS-24A may have missed their intended targets and landed in Parcel E20c.1.1.1.

2. Is there evidence that training involved use of High Explosive (HE) or Low Explosive (LE) items?

	No	
--	----	--

Sources reviewed and comments

Only two unknown fragments were found during the site reconnaissance conducted on Parcel E20c.1.1.1 (USACE, 2003). If training had included the use of HE or LE items, more munitions debris associated with this training would be present.

3. Is there evidence that training involved use of pyrotechnic and/or smoke producing items (e.g., simulators, flares, smoke grenades) but not explosives?

		Inconclusive
--	--	--------------

Sources reviewed and comments

A single illumination signal (munitions debris) was found during the site reconnaissance conducted on Parcel E20c.1.1.1 (USACE, 2003). It is expected that if training had included the use of pyrotechnic or smoke producing items, more munitions debris associated with this training would be present.

4. Does subsequent development or use of the area indicate potential that military munitions would have been used at the site?

		Inconclusive
--	--	--------------

Sources reviewed and comments

Only minimal development has occurred. Military housing was built immediately adjacent to the parcel (north side) in the late 1950s.

**EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: Parcel E20c.1.1.1
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 2: RECONNAISSANCE EVALUATION**

TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED

Yes No Inconclusive

5. Does use of area surrounding the site indicate that military munitions would have been used at the site?

		Inconclusive
--	--	--------------

Sources reviewed and comments

Parcel E20c.1.1.1 is near the Impact Area (south of Eucalyptus Road) and adjacent to MRS-24A. Firing at the Impact Area was towards the south, away from the parcel. MRS-24A was a rifle grenade training area. It is possible that rifle-fired smoke grenades and illumination signals may be present at Parcel E20c.1.1.1 as a result of this training.

6. Is there evidence of training areas on aerial photographs that could be used to establish site boundaries?

	No	
--	----	--

Sources reviewed and comments

Some areas within Parcel E20c.1.1.1 appear to be less densely vegetated than others based on aerial photos (1941, 1949, 1951, 1956, 1966, 1975), but not conclusive enough to establish that training occurred or to create site boundaries.

7. Is there evidence of training on historical training maps that could be used to establish boundaries?

Yes		
-----	--	--

Sources reviewed and comments

A portion of Parcel E20c.1.1.1 lies within a training area identified as RSOP on a 1956 training facilities map. The portion of the RSOP that lies within Parcel E20c.1.1.1 is being evaluated in this Approval Memorandum.

8. Was sampling and/or reconnaissance performed within appropriate area?

Yes		
-----	--	--

Sources reviewed and comments

The reconnaissance of Parcel E20c.1.1.1 was conducted throughout the parcel (USACE, 2003).

**EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: Parcel E20c.1.1.1
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 2: RECONNAISSANCE EVALUATION**

TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED

Yes No Inconclusive

9. Does reconnaissance indicate military munitions and/or ordnance-related scrap are present at the site?

Yes		
-----	--	--

Sources reviewed and comments

Munitions debris found during the site reconnaissance conducted at Parcel E20c.1.1.1 (USACE, 2003).

10. Were the type(s) of items found consistent with the type of training identified for the site?

		Inconclusive
--	--	--------------

Sources reviewed and comments

Several of the items found (ten 3.5-inch rockets found in a burial pit, the tail fin assembly from a mortar, and two pieces of unknown fragments [all munitions debris]) are inconsistent with RSOP training. The expended illumination signal may have been used during RSOP and/or Target Detection training. The practice rifle grenades are consistent with training at adjacent MRS-24A (USAEDH, 1997; USACE, 2003).

11. Were the type(s) of items found consistent with the era(s) in which training was identified?

Yes		
-----	--	--

Sources reviewed and comments

M11 practice rifle grenades, 3.5-inch rockets, and the illumination signal (M21A1) were available for use in the 1950s (Hogg, 2001).

12. Was HE fragmentation found?

		Inconclusive
--	--	--------------

Sources reviewed and comments

Two unknown fragments were reported (USACE, 2003).

13. Was HE found?

	No	
--	----	--

Sources reviewed and comments

No HE MEC found during the site reconnaissance conducted at Parcel E20c.1.1.1 (USACE, 2003).

EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: Parcel E20c.1.1.1
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 2: RECONNAISSANCE EVALUATION

TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED

Yes No Inconclusive

14. Was LE found?

	No	
--	----	--

Sources reviewed and comments

No LE MEC found during the site reconnaissance (USACE, 2003).

15. Were pyrotechnics found?

	No	
--	----	--

Sources reviewed and comments

No pyrotechnic MEC found during the site reconnaissance (USACE, 2003). One expended illumination signal (munitions debris) was identified.

16. Were smoke producing items found?

	No	
--	----	--

Sources reviewed and comments

No smoke producing MEC found during the site reconnaissance (USACE, 2003).

17. Were explosive items found (e.g., rocket motors with explosive components, fuzes with explosive components)?

	No	
--	----	--

Sources reviewed and comments

No MEC items were found during the site reconnaissance (USACE, 2003).

18. Do items found in the area indicate training would have included use of training items with energetic components?

	No	
--	----	--

Sources reviewed and comments

No items with energetic components (e.g., plastic explosives) were found.

19. Were items found in a localized area (possibly the remnants of a cleanup action)?

	No	
--	----	--

Sources reviewed and comments

No indication of this noted in the Site Visit Report (USACE, 2003).

EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: Parcel E20c.1.1.1
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 2: RECONNAISSANCE EVALUATION

TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED

Yes No Inconclusive

20. Is it appropriate to divide the site into sectors to focus on areas of common usage, similar topography and vegetation, and/or unique site features?

	No	
--	----	--

Sources reviewed and comments

There is no indication that the Parcel should be divided.

21. Should site boundaries be revised?

	No	
--	----	--

Sources reviewed and comments

The boundary of Parcel E20c.1.1.1 is a property boundary and is not based on evidence of the use of military munitions.

22. Has the field data been collected and managed in accordance with quality control standards established for the project?

Yes		
-----	--	--

Sources reviewed and comments

Site reconnaissance conducted by the USACE was conducted in accordance with EM-1110-1-4009 (USACE, 2003)

Result of Reconnaissance Evaluation

Does the reconnaissance evaluation provide sufficient evidence to warrant further investigation?

	No	
--	----	--

Comments

Based on the results of the site reconnaissance there is no indication that additional investigation is necessary.

EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: Parcel E20c.1.1.1
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 2: RECONNAISSANCE EVALUATION

TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED

Yes No Inconclusive

References

Hogg, 2001. The American Arsenal. The World War II Official Standard Ordnance Catalog of Small Arms, Tanks, Armored Cars, Artillery, Antiaircraft Guns, Ammunitions, Grenades, Mines, etcetera. Greenhill Military Paperback.

USAEDH, 1997. Revised Archives Search Report, Former Fort Ord, California, Monterey County, California. Prepared by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers St. Louis District.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2000. EM-1110-1-4009, Engineering and Design, Ordnance and Explosives Response. June.

_____, 2003. Site Visit Report, Parcels E20c.1.1.1 and E20c.1.1.2, Former Fort Ord, Monterey, California, Ordnance and Explosives (OE) Cleanup. April.