

Table 1. Summary of Reuse Areas
Feasibility Study, Parker Flats MRA RI/FS, Former Fort Ord, California

Reuse Area	Acres	Planned Reuse	MEC Risk Scores Estimated in RA	Sufficient Size, Co-Located, or Similar Area	Retain for Analysis in FS
Monterey Peninsula College EVOC	221.5	College for training of law enforcement personnel	YES	YES	YES
Parker Flats MRA Horse Park	85.7	Stable and horse riding facility with RV camping area	YES Same scores for both areas	YES Similar areas	YES Evaluate as single Reuse Area
MRS-13B Horse Park	97.2				
Parker Flats MRA Habitat Reserve	147.8	Oak woodland and maritime chaparral habitat reserve	YES	YES	YES
MRS-13B Habitat Reserve	1.1	Oak woodland and maritime chaparral habitat reserve	NO MEC not found	NO	NO Evaluate in future MR RI/FS
Central Coast Veterans Cemetery	102.1	Cemetery for interment of veterans	YES	YES	YES
Parker Flats MRA County Development Reserve	35.9	Monterey County development reserve; may include residential	YES	YES	YES
MRS-13B County Development Reserve	0.3	Monterey County development reserve; may include residential	YES	YES	YES
CSUMB Expansion	0.66	Open space or development	NO MEC not found	NO	NO Evaluate in future MR RI/FS
Monterey County Public Facilities	3.0	Development for Monterey County	NO MEC not found	YES Co-located and of sufficient size	YES
Army Maintenance Center	35.5	Retained by Army for facility maintenance	NO MEC not found in portion; paved with buildings in remainder of area	YES	YES
MST Transit Facility	24.2	Parking lot and maintenance facility for commuter vehicles	YES Same scores for both areas	YES Co-located and similar areas	YES Evaluate as single Reuse Area
MST Maintenance Center	2.8				

Checked by MS Approved by EJ

**Table 2. Screening of Land Use Controls—Monterey Peninsula College EVOC
Feasibility Study, Parker Flats MRA RI/FS, Former Fort Ord, California**

RECEPTOR	OVERALL MEC RISK SCORE	RECEPTOR ASSUMPTIONS		Additional Risk Management Needed to Protect Receptor?	LAND USE CONTROLS			
		During Development	During Reuse		Deed or Zoning Restriction	MEC Recognition Training	Construction Monitoring	Access Management Measures
Trespasser	A Lowest	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Site will be fenced and well guarded	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Site will be fenced and well guarded	NO	Not anticipated to provide additional risk management and/or would duplicate information provided by Parker Flats MRA long term management measures. The need for these types of restrictions can not be determined at this time, but will be assessed by the future property owner prior to reuse.	NA	NA	Not anticipated to provide additional risk management and/or would duplicate existing controls because the area will be fenced and well guarded during reuse
Construction Worker	E Highest	LIKELY RECEPTOR Will perform excavations for foundations, utilities, structural construction	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Unless reuse changes and new construction is performed	YES During development and any post-development intrusive activities.		√	√	NA
Outdoor Maintenance Worker	E Highest	LIKELY RECEPTOR Will perform landscape and gardening activities (e.g., lawn maintenance and planting)	LIKELY RECEPTOR Will perform landscape and gardening activities (e.g., lawn maintenance and planting)	YES During development and any post-development intrusive activities.		√	√	NA
Recreational User	A Lowest	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Site will be fenced and well guarded	LIKELY RECEPTOR Minimal uses (e.g., bicycling on paved roads, open space activities)	NO		NA	NA	NA
Indoor Worker	A Lowest	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Buildings will not have been constructed for occupation	LIKELY RECEPTOR Occupants typically isolated from interaction with ground (e.g., office, retail, or janitorial workers)	NO		NA	NA	NA
Student/Faculty	A Lowest	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Facilities will not have been constructed for use	LIKELY RECEPTOR Occupants typically isolated from interaction with ground (e.g., walking on paths, office work, training, firefighting and emergency response)	NO		NA	NA	NA

NA = Not applicable for mitigation of potentially remaining MEC risks to reuse receptors for the activities assumed in the RA / √ = Applicable for this receptor

Checked MS Approved GA

**Table 3. Screening of Land Use Controls—Horse Park
Feasibility Study, Parker Flats MRA RI/FS, Former Fort Ord, California**

RECEPTOR	OVERALL MEC RISK SCORE	RECEPTOR ASSUMPTIONS		Additional Risk Management Needed to Protect Receptor?	LAND USE CONTROLS			
		During Development	During Reuse		Deed or Zoning Restriction	MEC Recognition Training	Construction Monitoring	Access Management Measures
Trespasser	B Low	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Site will be fenced	POTENTIAL RECEPTOR Most of site will be fenced; wooded areas could be accessed	NO	Not anticipated to provide additional risk management and/or would duplicate information provided by Parker Flats MRA long term management measures. The need for these types of restrictions can not be determined at this time, but will be assessed by the future property owner prior to reuse.	NA	NA	Not anticipated to provide additional risk management and/or would duplicate existing controls. Facility-wide public access controls would prevent trespassing.
Construction Worker	E Highest	LIKELY RECEPTOR Will perform excavations for foundations, utilities, structural construction	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Unless reuse changes and new construction is performed	YES During development and any post-development intrusive activities.		√	√	NA
Outdoor Maintenance Worker	E Highest	LIKELY RECEPTOR Will perform landscape and gardening activities (e.g., lawn maintenance and planting)	LIKELY RECEPTOR Will perform landscape and gardening activities (e.g., lawn maintenance and planting)	YES During development and any post-development intrusive activities.		√	√	NA
RV Camper	A Lowest	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Site will not be open for camping	LIKELY RECEPTOR Facilities will be available; no intrusive activities anticipated	NO		NA	NA	NA
Recreational Horseback Rider	B Low	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Site will not be open for riding	LIKELY RECEPTOR Minimal uses (e.g., riding, bicycling, open space activities)	NO		NA	NA	NA

NA = Not applicable for mitigation of potentially remaining MEC risks to reuse receptors for the activities assumed in the RA / √ = Applicable for this receptor

Checked MS

Approved E/B

**Table 4. Screening of Land Use Controls—Habitat Reserve
Feasibility Study, Parker Flats MRA RI/FS, Former Fort Ord, California**

RECEPTOR	OVERALL MEC RISK SCORE	RECEPTOR ASSUMPTIONS		Additional Risk Management Needed to Protect Receptor?	LAND USE CONTROLS			
		During Development	During Reuse		Deed or Zoning Restriction	MEC Recognition Training	Construction Monitoring	Access Management Measures
Trespasser	A Lowest	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Site will be fenced	LIKELY RECEPTOR Most of site will be fenced	NO	Not anticipated to provide additional risk management and/or would duplicate information provided by Parker Flats MRA long term management measures. The need for these types of restrictions can not be determined at this time, but will be assessed by the future property owner prior to reuse.	NA	NA	Not anticipated to provide additional risk management and/or would duplicate existing controls. Facility-wide public access controls would prevent trespassing.
Construction Worker	E Highest	LIKELY RECEPTOR Will perform site work as needed	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Unless reuse changes and new construction is performed	YES During development and any post-development intrusive activities.		√	√	NA
Recreational User	A Lowest	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Site will not be open for recreational uses	LIKELY RECEPTOR Minimal uses (e.g., hiking, bicycling on dirt paths)	NO		NA	NA	NA
Habitat Monitor	A Lowest	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Site will not be monitored prior to reuse	LIKELY RECEPTOR Will perform habitat monitoring activities (e.g., tracking and logging species)	NO		NA	NA	NA
Habitat Worker	E Highest	LIKELY RECEPTOR Will perform habitat reserve assessment (e.g., species assessment and planting)	LIKELY RECEPTOR Will perform habitat reserve assessment (e.g., species assessment and planting)	YES During development and post-development reuse.		√	√	NA

NA = Not applicable for mitigation of potentially remaining MEC risks to reuse receptors for the activities assumed in the RA / √= Applicable for this receptor

Checked MS Approved CS

**Table 5. Screening of Land Use Controls—Veterans Cemetery
Feasibility Study, Parker Flats MRA RI/FS, Former Fort Ord, California**

RECEPTOR	OVERALL MEC RISK SCORE	RECEPTOR ASSUMPTIONS		Additional Risk Management Needed to Protect Receptor?	LAND USE CONTROLS			
		During Development	During Reuse		Deed or Zoning Restriction	MEC Recognition Training	Construction Monitoring	Access Management Measures
Trespasser	A Lowest	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Site will be fenced	POTENTIAL RECEPTOR Most of site will be fenced; accessible in some areas	NO	Not anticipated to provide additional risk management and/or would duplicate information provided by Parker Flats MRA long term management measures. The need for these types of restrictions can not be determined at this time, but will be assessed by the future property owner prior to reuse.	NA	NA	Not anticipated to provide additional risk management and/or would duplicate existing controls. Facility-wide public access controls would prevent trespassing.
Construction Worker	E Highest	LIKELY RECEPTOR Will perform excavations for foundations, utilities, structural construction	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Unless reuse changes and new construction is performed	YES During development and any post-development intrusive activities.		√	√	NA
Outdoor Maintenance Worker	E Highest	LIKELY RECEPTOR Will perform landscape and gardening activities (e.g., lawn maintenance and planting)	LIKELY RECEPTOR Will perform landscape and gardening activities (e.g., lawn maintenance and planting)	YES During development and any post-development intrusive activities.		√	√	NA
Recreational User	A Lowest	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Site will be fenced	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Site will not be open for recreational uses	NO		NA	NA	NA
Cemetery Worker	E Highest	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Site will not be open for interment	LIKELY RECEPTOR Will perform grave digging and interment activities	YES During post-development reuse.		√	√	NA
Cemetery Visitor	A Lowest	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Site will not be open for visits	LIKELY RECEPTOR Minimal uses (e.g., walking)	NO		NA	NA	NA

NA = Not applicable for mitigation of potentially remaining MEC risks to reuse receptors for the activities assumed in the RA / √ = Applicable for this receptor

Checked MS Approved EJ

**Table 6. Screening of Land Use Controls—Monterey County Development Reserve
Feasibility Study, Parker Flats MRA RI/FS, Former Fort Ord, California**

RECEPTOR	OVERALL MEC RISK SCORE	RECEPTOR ASSUMPTIONS		Additional Risk Management Needed to Protect Receptor?	LAND USE CONTROLS			
		During Development	During Reuse		Deed or Zoning Restriction	MEC Recognition Training	Construction Monitoring	Access Management Measures
Trespasser	A Lowest	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Site will be secured	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Site will contain residential housing	NO	Not anticipated to provide additional risk management and/or would duplicate information provided by Parker Flats MRA long term management measures. The need for these types of restrictions cannot be determined at this time, but will be assessed by the future property owner prior to reuse.	NA	NA	Not anticipated to provide additional risk management and/or would duplicate existing controls. Facility-wide public access controls would prevent trespassing.
Construction Worker	E Highest	LIKELY RECEPTOR Will perform excavations for foundations, utilities, structural construction	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Unless reuse changes and new construction is performed	YES During development and any post-development intrusive activities		√	√	NA
Outdoor Maintenance Worker	E Highest	LIKELY RECEPTOR Will perform landscape and gardening activities (e.g., lawn maintenance and planting)	LIKELY RECEPTOR Will perform landscape and gardening activities (e.g., lawn maintenance and planting)	YES During development and any post-development intrusive activities		√	√	NA
Recreational User	A Lowest	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Site will be secured	LIKELY RECEPTOR Minimal uses (e.g., bicycling on paved roads, open space activities)	NO		NA	NA	NA
Indoor Worker	A Lowest	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Buildings will not have been constructed for occupation	LIKELY RECEPTOR Occupants typically isolated from interaction with ground (e.g., office, retail, or janitorial workers)	NO		NA	NA	NA
Adult/Child Resident	D High	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Buildings will not have been constructed for occupation	LIKELY RECEPTOR However, planned development is expected to reduce potentially remaining MEC risks to future residents. Occupants typically isolated from interaction with ground except during gardening and maintenance.	YES However, planned development will involve extensive ground-disturbing activities (e.g., construction, grading) that will be monitored by qualified MEC personnel, which is expected to reduce potentially remaining MEC risks to future residents. Developer/property owner will be responsible for maintaining LUCs protective of reusers conducting any intrusive activities during post-development reuse.		NA	NA	NA

NA = Not applicable for mitigation of potentially remaining MEC risks to reuse receptors for the activities assumed in the RA / √ = Applicable for this receptor

Checked MS

Approved [Signature]

**Table 7. Screening of Land Use Controls—Monterey County Public Facilities
Feasibility Study, Parker Flats MRA RI/FS, Former Fort Ord, California**

RECEPTOR	OVERALL MEC RISK SCORE*	RECEPTOR ASSUMPTIONS		Additional Risk Management Needed to Protect Receptor?	LAND USE CONTROLS			
		During Development	During Reuse		Deed or Zoning Restriction	MEC Recognition Training	Construction Monitoring	Access Management Measures
Trespasser	A Lowest	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Site will be fenced	POTENTIAL RECEPTOR Site will be paved	NO	Not anticipated to provide additional risk management and/or would duplicate information provided by Parker Flats MRA long term management measures. The need for these types of restrictions can not be determined at this time, but will be assessed by the future property owner prior to reuse.	NA	NA	Not anticipated to provide additional risk management and/or would duplicate existing controls. Facility-wide public access controls would prevent trespassing.
Construction Worker	E Highest	LIKELY RECEPTOR Will perform excavations for foundations, utilities, structural construction	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Unless reuse changes and new construction is performed	YES During development and any post-development intrusive activities.		√	√	NA
Outdoor Maintenance Worker	E Highest	LIKELY RECEPTOR Will perform landscape and gardening activities (e.g., lawn maintenance and planting)	LIKELY RECEPTOR Will perform landscape and gardening activities (e.g., lawn maintenance and planting)	YES During development and any post-development intrusive activities.		√	√	NA
Indoor Worker	A Lowest	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Buildings will not have been constructed for occupation	LIKELY RECEPTOR Occupants typically isolated from interaction with ground (e.g., office, retail, or janitorial workers)	NO		NA	NA	NA
Public Facility Visitor	A Lowest	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Facilities will not have been constructed	LIKELY RECEPTOR Site will be paved	NO		NA	NA	NA

* Overall MEC Risk Scores were assumed for this area because RA did not evaluate MEC risks / no MEC was found during investigations.

NA = Not applicable for mitigation of potentially remaining MEC risks to reuse receptors for the activities assumed in the RA / √ = Applicable for this receptor

Checked MS Approved CP

Table 8. Screening of Land Use Controls—Army Maintenance Center Feasibility Study, Parker Flats MRA RI/FS, Former Fort Ord, California

RECEPTOR	OVERALL MEC RISK SCORE*	RECEPTOR ASSUMPTIONS		Additional Risk Management Needed to Protect Receptor?	LAND USE CONTROLS			
		During Development	During Reuse		Deed or Zoning Restriction	MEC Recognition Training	Construction Monitoring	Access Management Measures
Trespasser	A Lowest	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Site is paved	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Site is paved, and will be fenced and well guarded	NO	Not anticipated to provide additional risk management and/or would duplicate information provided by Parker Flats MRA long term management measures. The need for these types of restrictions can not be determined at this time, but will be assessed by the future property owner prior to reuse.	NA	NA	Not anticipated to provide additional risk management and/or would duplicate existing controls. Facility-wide public access controls would prevent trespassing.
Construction Worker	E Highest	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Development is not planned; existing pavement and buildings	POTENTIAL RECEPTOR Unless reuse changes and new construction is performed	YES During development and any post-development intrusive activities.		√	√	NA
Indoor Worker	A Lowest	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Development is not planned; existing pavement; buildings already occupied	LIKELY RECEPTOR Occupants typically isolated from interaction with ground (e.g., office, retail, or janitorial workers)	NO		NA	NA	NA
Public Facility Visitor	A Lowest	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Facilities will not have been constructed	LIKELY RECEPTOR Site will be paved	NO		NA	NA	NA

* Overall MEC Risk Scores were assumed for this area because RA did not evaluate MEC risks / no MEC was found during investigations.

NA = Not applicable for mitigation of potentially remaining MEC risks to reuse receptors for the activities assumed in the RA / √ = Applicable for this receptor

Checked MS Approved CJ

**Table 9. Screening of Land Use Controls—MST Facility
Feasibility Study, Parker Flats MRA RI/FS, Former Fort Ord, California**

RECEPTOR	OVERALL MEC RISK SCORE	RECEPTOR ASSUMPTIONS		Additional Risk Management Needed to Protect Receptor?	LAND USE CONTROLS			
		During Development	During Reuse		Deed or Zoning Restriction	MEC Recognition Training	Construction Monitoring	Access Management Measures
Trespasser	A Lowest	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Site will be fenced	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Site will be fenced and paved	NO	Not anticipated to provide additional risk management and/or would duplicate information provided by Parker Flats MRA long term management measures. The need for these types of restrictions can not be determined at this time, but will be assessed by the future property owner prior to reuse.	NA	NA	Not anticipated to provide additional risk management and/or would duplicate existing controls. Facility-wide public access controls would prevent trespassing.
Construction Worker	E Highest	LIKELY RECEPTOR Will perform excavations for foundations, utilities, structural construction	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Unless reuse changes and new construction is performed	YES During development and any post-development intrusive activities.		√	√	NA
Recreational User	A Lowest	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Site will be fenced	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Site will be paved	NO		NA	NA	NA
Indoor Worker	A Lowest	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Buildings will not have been constructed for occupation	LIKELY RECEPTOR Occupants typically isolated from interaction with ground (e.g., office, retail, or janitorial workers)	NO		NA	NA	NA
Public Facility Visitor	A Lowest	UNLIKELY RECEPTOR Facilities will not have been constructed	LIKELY RECEPTOR Site will be paved	NO		NA	NA	NA

NA = Not applicable for mitigation of potentially remaining MEC risks to reuse receptors for the activities assumed in the RA / √ = Applicable for this receptor

Checked MS Approved E JS

**Table 10. Summary of Remedial Alternatives Evaluation
Feasibility Study, Parker Flats MRA RI/FS, Former Fort Ord California**

REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVE	EPA's 9 CERCLA EVALUATION CRITERIA								
	Threshold Criteria		Balancing Criteria				Modifying Criteria		
	Overall Protection of Human Health & Environment	Compliance with ARARs	Short-Term Effectiveness	Long-Term Effectiveness & Permanence	Reduction of T, M, V Through Treatment	Implementability	Cost	State Acceptance	Community Acceptance
No Further Action	Not protective; does not mitigate potentially remaining MEC risks to intrusive workers	No ARARs were identified for this alternative	No MEC risk mitigation measures	No MEC risk mitigation measures	None; although MEC removals have been conducted	Not administratively feasible	No costs	To Be Determined	To Be Determined
Land Use Controls	Protective; mitigates potentially remaining MEC risks to intrusive workers	No ARARs were identified for this alternative	Yes MEC recognition and safety training & construction monitoring would be required during intrusive activities	Yes MEC recognition and safety training & construction monitoring would be required during intrusive activities	None; although MEC removals have been conducted	Administratively feasible Moderate level of effort to implement from a technical perspective	See Table 11	To Be Determined	To Be Determined
Additional MEC Remediation	Would be determined after investigation is complete and MEC risks are reevaluated	Would be implemented using methods that comply with ARARs	Would be determined after investigation is complete and MEC risks are reevaluated	Would be determined after investigation is complete and MEC risks are reevaluated	Yes; if MEC is found	Administratively feasible High level of effort to implement from a technical perspective	See Table 11	To Be Determined	To Be Determined

Footnotes

ARARs = Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements

MEC = munitions and explosives of concern

T, M, V = toxicity, mobility, volume

Checked MS

Approved CS

**TABLE 11. SUMMARY OF COSTS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES
FEASIBILITY STUDY, PARKER FLATS MRA RI/FS, FORMER FORT ORD, CALIFORNIA**

Parker Flats MRA Reuse Area	No Further Action ⁽¹⁾	Land Use Controls ⁽²⁾	Additional MEC Remediation ⁽³⁾
Monterey Peninsula College EVOC	--	\$125,000	\$5,316,000
Horse Park	--	\$221,000	\$4,382,000
Habitat Reserve	--	\$75,000	\$3,547,000
Veterans Cemetery	--	\$245,000	\$2,448,000
Monterey County Development Reserve	--	\$153,000	\$864,000
Monterey County Public Facilities	--	\$56,000	\$72,000
Army Maintenance Center	--	\$50,000	\$852,000
MST Transit Facility	--	\$70,000	\$648,000
Parker Flats MRA	Long Term Management Measures		
	Deed Notice, Annual Monitoring, 5-Year Review Reporting		
	\$258,000		

EXPLANATION

(1) There are no costs associated with this alternative.

(2) Costs estimates for this alternative are provided in Appendix A.

(3) Costs estimates for this alternative (a) are provided in Appendix A, and (b) do not include costs for additional risk management measures that may be required after remediation is completed and MEC risks are reevaluated.

Checked MS

Approved [Signature]