

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District (COE), is submitting this Feasibility Study (FS) for the National Priorities List (NPL) project at Fort Ord, California. The report was prepared by Harding Lawson Associates (HLA) as part of the basewide Remediation Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS), which is being conducted in accordance with a Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA) signed in July 1990 by representatives from Fort Ord, the U.S. Army (Army), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX (EPA), and the California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA), including the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC, formerly the Toxic Substances Control Program of the California Department of Health Services [DDS]) and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Coast Region (RWQCB).

The following sections describe the purpose and objectives of the FS report.

### 1.1 Objectives and Scope

Recently, Congress mandated a three-year completion schedule for RI/FS documents for Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) sites such as Fort Ord (Public Law 102-190). Furthermore, acceleration measures suggested by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's draft Superfund Acceleration Cleanup Model (SACM) Guidance Manual recommend allocating and expanding resources to clean up areas that pose the greatest risk to human health and the environment while expending resources on sites that can (1) be cleaned up quickly in keeping with reuse goals and objectives and (2) be verified as clean and turned over to government agencies or sold to private entities for use and further development (EPA, 1992k).

The economic impact of Fort Ord's closure is another impetus to accelerate the implementation of remedial actions. Closure of Fort Ord will have significant repercussions on the local economy, and timely conversion of Fort Ord

property to civilian uses is a high priority to both the local community as well as the Army.

### 1.2 Feasibility Study Strategy

For each of the five RI sites at Fort Ord, an FS that evaluates and recommends remedial alternatives for site cleanup is included in this report. One of the main components of an FS is to develop and analyze site-specific remedial alternatives that will lead to remedial action. The initial screening of remedial technologies, the first step of the FS, considers the universe of technologies that could apply to cleanup of a site. The *Draft Remedial Technology Screening Report (RTS)*, dated February 9, 1994, describes a process to expedite the initial screening of technologies for each FS by developing a matrix of applicable, proven technologies for each Group of Compounds (GOCs) in each medium. For each FS the type of contamination and affected media were identified using the RI data. The RTS was then used to identify and screen implementable, proven technologies. These technologies were then evaluated using site specific information to select those technologies that could be developed into site-specific alternatives. By utilizing the RTS process at sites eligible for RI/FSs, a large portion of Fort Ord property impacted by chemicals could be remediated and made ready for civilian use earlier than originally projected by reducing the time required to perform each FS. If remediation of these areas were implemented prior to the final basewide Record of Decision (ROD), which is anticipated to be completed in 1995, base closure would be accelerated.

### 1.3 Report Organization

Sections 2.0 through 6.0 contain the FSs for Sites 2 and 12, 16 and 17, 3, 31, and 39, respectively. Each FS section contains the following subsections.

- Subsection 1 - Background. This subsection summarizes the site history and description, the nature and extent of contamination, and a summary of the Baseline Risk Assessment (BRA). Applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) are also discussed and target cleanup levels (TCLs) are established for the site.
- Subsection 2 - Identification and Screening of Technologies. This subsection establishes remedial action objectives, remedial units, and provides a summary of appropriate remedial technologies from the RTS that are then included in site-wide remedial alternatives.
- Subsection 3 - Development of Remedial Alternatives. This subsection provides a detailed description of each alternative retained for consideration. Equipment and services, procedures and treatment processes, and site restoration is described.
- Subsection 4 - Criteria for Detailed Analysis of Remedial Alternatives. This subsection describes the nine CERCLA-established criteria: (1) overall protection of human health and the environment, (2) compliance with ARARs, (3) long-term effectiveness, (4) reduction of toxicity, mobility, and volume, (5) short-term effectiveness, (6) implementability, (7) costs, (8) regulatory acceptance, and (9) community acceptance.
- Subsection 5 - Detailed Analysis of Remedial Alternatives. This subsection presents a detailed analysis and comparison of each remedial alternative with respect to the nine CERCLA-established criteria.
- Subsection 6 - Comparison of Remedial Alternatives. This subsection summarizes a comparison of the detailed analyses for each alternative.
- Subsection 7 - Selection of Preferred Remedial Alternative. This subsection presents the preferred remedial alternative and the rationale for its selection.

**1.4 Response to Agency Comments**

Responses to regulatory agency comments on the Draft FS follow the FS for Site 39 at the end of Volume V. Responses to regulatory agency comments on the Draft Final FS are included in Volume VI.