

ATTACHMENT G2-1  
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK CHECKLISTS

**ATTACHMENT G2-1  
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: MRS-27F, MRS-45A and MRS-59B  
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)?**

Yes		
-----	--	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

that the area in the vicinity of MRS-59 (including MRS-59B) may have been used to fire shoulder launched projectiles. No evidence was found during the literature search that would support this use. During a site walk of adjacent MRS-59 and MRS-59A no evidence was found to support the use of 2.36-inch rockets.

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

Yes		
-----	--	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

Because activities associated with these sites included Tactical Training, Training and Manuever Area and a Bivouac training, the use of small arms blank ammunition is likely. No evidence was found during the literature review to indicate that HE was used at these sites.

**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?**

Yes		
-----	--	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

To-date no pyrotechnic or smoke producing items have been found within the sites. However, training maps indicate that the area encompassing these sites was used for a variety of training activities including Tactical Training, Training and Manuever Area and as a Bivouac area. Pyrotechnic and smoke producing items were authorized for use in these areas (Range Control SOP). Additionally, expended pyrotechnic and smoke producing items were found in the vicinity of the sites during site reconnaissance. (RAC sheets for Sites B, D, G and H/I; Revised Archives Search Report (ASR), USAEDH 1997; Review of Fort Ord facilities and training maps).

**EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: MRS-27F, MRS-45A and MRS-59B  
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 1: LITERATURE REVIEW**

**TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED**

Yes                  No                  Inconclusive

**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**  
This area remains undeveloped.

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

Yes		
-----	--	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

Surrounding area include Bivouac areas, tactical training and maneuver areas. These areas would most likely have included the use of pyrotechnics and practice military munitions.

**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**  
A few small disturbed/bare areas, including roads and trails, present in the vicinity of the sites on the aerial photos. No clearly defined training areas with features that would permit the establishment of boundaries (e.g., ranges or targets) (1949, 1956, 1966, 6/16/78; 3/25/86).

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

Yes		
-----	--	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**  
A boundary for MRS-27F (Training Site 6/Bivouac Area) is the only one shown on the training facilities maps. Labels on the training facilities maps for Tactical Training and Maneuver areas indicate general areas of training only.

**EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: MRS-27F, MRS-45A and MRS-59B  
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 1: LITERATURE REVIEW**

**TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED**

	Yes	No	Inconclusive
<b>8. Should current boundaries be revised?</b>		No	

**Sources reviewed and comments**

No indication based on the literature review that the boundaries should be revised.

**RESULTS OF LITERATURE EVALUATION**

<b>Does the literature review provide sufficient evidence to warrant further investigation?</b>		No	
---	--	----	--

**Comments**

Review of literature including the After Action Report for Site OE-45 (MRS-45) and the Archives Search Report does not indicate that further 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. HLA#33006

Risk Assessment Procedures For Ordnance And Explosive Waste (OEW) Sites (RAC Sheet), Site K10 (MRS-59 and portions of MRS-27F, February 26, 1996).

Army, 1980. Range Regulations, Fort Ord Regulation 350-5. 9 September 1980.

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

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.

Training Facilities Map, Revised August 1945.

Field training Areas and range Map, April 27, 1964 (HR\_lit0007) LR07.

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

**EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: MRS-27F, MRS-45A and MRS-59B  
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 1: LITERATURE REVIEW**

**TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED**

Yes                  No                  Inconclusive

**References (continued)**

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.

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.

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

**ATTACHMENT G2-1  
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: MRS-27F, MRS-45A, and MRS-59B  
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**

During a site walk of adjacent MRS-59 and MRS-59A, no evidence was found to support the use of 2.36-inch rockets. No evidence of an impact area was found during the site walk at MRS-45.

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

	No	
--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

No evidence of HE or LE found during the site walks conducted at MRS-27F and MRS-45A (USAEDH, 1997; Parsons, 2002).

**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**

RAC sheet for Site K10, which includes portions of MRS-27F and MRS-59, indicates that pyrotechnic items (e.g., flares, signals) were found, but the specific location was not identified. No MEC or munitions debris was found within MRS-45A during the surface removal conducted in the BLM Area East of Parker Flats (Parsons, 2002).

**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**

This area remains undeveloped.

**ATTACHMENT G2-1  
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: MRS-27F, MRS-45A, and MRS-59B  
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 2: RECONNAISSANCE EVALUATION**

**TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED**

	Yes	No	Inconclusive
<b>5. Does use of area surrounding the site indicate that military munitions would have been used at the site?</b>			Inconclusive

**Sources reviewed and comments**

Surrounding area includes Bivouac areas, tactical training and maneuver areas. These areas would most likely included the use of pyrotechnics and practice items.

<b>6. Is there evidence of training areas on <u>aerial photographs</u> that could be used to establish site boundaries?</b>		No	
---	--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

A few small disturbed/bare areas, including roads and trails, are present in the vicinity of the sites on the aerial photos. No clearly defined training areas with features that would permit the establishment of boundaries (e.g., ranges or targets) (1949, 1956, 1966, 6/16/78; 3/25/86).

<b>7. Is there evidence of training on <u>historical training maps</u> that could be used to establish boundaries?</b>	Yes		
--	-----	--	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

A boundary for MRS-27F (Training Site 6/Bivouac Area) is shown on the training facilities maps. Labels on the training facilities maps for Tactical Training and Maneuver areas indicate general areas of training only.

<b>8. Was sampling and/or reconnaissance performed within appropriate area?</b>	Yes		
---	-----	--	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

The surface removal that took place in the BLM Area East of Parker Flats included walking much of MRS-45A. The reconnaissance of Site K10 included a portion of MRS-27F. A reconnaissance associated with the Basewide Range Assessment (BRA) included a portion of MRS-59B (USAEDH, 1997; Parsons, 2002; MACTEC/Shaw, 2005).

**ATTACHMENT G2-1  
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: MRS-27F, MRS-45A, and MRS-59B  
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 2: RECONNAISSANCE EVALUATION**

**TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED**

	Yes	No	Inconclusive
<b>9. Does reconnaissance indicate military munitions and/or ordnance-related scrap are present at the site?</b>			Inconclusive

**Sources reviewed and comments**

Inconclusive for MRS-27F and MRS-59B. RAC sheet for Site K10, which includes portions of MRS-27F and MRS-59, indicates that pyrotechnic items (e.g., flares, signals) were found, but the specific location was not identified. No MEC or munitions debris was found within MRS-45A during the surface removal conducted in the BLM Area East of Parker Flats (Parsons, 2002).

<b>10. Were the type(s) of items found consistent with the type of training identified for the site?</b>			Not Applicable
--	--	--	----------------

**Sources reviewed and comments**

No items have been identified as definitely being within MRS-27F and MRS-59B. No MEC or munitions debris were found during the reconnaissance conducted at MRS-45A (Parsons, 2002).

<b>11. Were the type(s) of items found consistent with the era(s) in which training was identified?</b>			Not Applicable
---	--	--	----------------

**Sources reviewed and comments**

No items have been identified as definitely being within MRS-27F and MRS-59B. No MEC or munitions debris were found during the reconnaissance conducted at MRS-45A.

<b>12. Was HE fragmentation found?</b>		No	
--	--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

Although the location of the military munitions found during the site walk at MRS-27F and MRS-59B was not recorded, the information states that what was found was pyrotechnic items only. No military munitions were found during the reconnaissance conducted at MRS-45A.



**ATTACHMENT G2-1  
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: MRS-27F, MRS-45A, and MRS-59B  
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 2: RECONNAISSANCE EVALUATION**

**TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED**

	Yes	No	Inconclusive
<b>13. Was HE found?</b>		No	

**Sources reviewed and comments**

Although the location of the military munitions found during the site walk at MRS-27F and MRS-59B was not recorded, the information states that what was found was pyrotechnic items only. No military munitions were found during the reconnaissance conducted at MRS-45A.

<b>14. Was LE found?</b>		No	
--------------------------	--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

Although the location of the military munitions found during the site walk at MRS-27F and MRS-59B was not recorded, the information states that what was found was pyrotechnic items only. No military munitions were found during the reconnaissance conducted at MRS-45A.

<b>15. Were pyrotechnics found?</b>			Inconclusive
-------------------------------------	--	--	--------------

**Sources reviewed and comments**

Inconclusive for MRS-27F and MRS-59B. RAC sheet for Site K10, which includes portions of MRS-27F and MRS-59, indicates that pyrotechnic items (e.g., flares, signals) were found, but the specific location was not identified. No MEC or munitions debris was found within MRS-45A during the surface removal conducted in the BLM Area East of Parker Flats (Parsons, 2002).

<b>16. Were smoke producing items found?</b>		No	
--	--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

RAC sheet for Site K10, which includes portions of MRS-27F and MRS-59, does not state that any smoke producing items were found. No MEC or munitions debris was found within MRS-45A during the surface removal conducted in the BLM Area East of Parker Flats (Parsons, 2002).

**ATTACHMENT G2-1  
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: MRS-27F, MRS-45A, and MRS-59B  
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 2: RECONNAISSANCE EVALUATION**

**TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED**

	Yes	No	Inconclusive
<b>17. Were explosive items found (e.g. rocket motors with explosive components, fuzes with explosive components)?</b>		No	

**Sources reviewed and comments**

RAC sheet for Site K10, which includes portions of MRS-27F and MRS-59, does not state that any smoke producing items were found. No MEC or munitions debris was found within MRS-45A during the surface removal conducted in the BLM Area East of Parker Flats (Parsons, 2002).

<b>18. Do items found in the area indicate training would have included use of training items with energetic components?</b>	Yes		
--	-----	--	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

Military munitions found in adjacent locations include practice and smoke producing hand grenades, illumination signals, practice mines and a projectile simulator.

<b>19. Were items found in a localized area (possibly the remnants of a cleanup action)?</b>		No	
--	--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

The items that have been found in the vicinity of MRS-27F and MRS-59B were isolated. No cleanup actions have occurred in the vicinity of MRS-27F or MRS-59B. No MEC or munitions debris were found during the reconnaissance conducted at MRS-45A.

<b>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?</b>		No	
---	--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

The sites are very small in size and dividing into sectors would not be appropriate.

**ATTACHMENT G2-1  
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: MRS-27F, MRS-45A, and MRS-59B  
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 2: RECONNAISSANCE EVALUATION**

**TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED**

	Yes	No	Inconclusive
<b>21. <i>Should site boundaries be revised?</i></b>		No	

**Sources reviewed and comments**

No indication that the boundaries should be revised on the basis of the reconnaissance completed at MRS-27F, MRS-45A or MRS-59B.

<b>22. <i>Has the field data been collected and managed in accordance with quality control standards established for the project?</i></b>	Yes		
---	-----	--	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

The site reconnaissance conducted as part of the PA/SI was performed in accordance with USACE guidance (USACE, 1995). RAC sheet documentation includes a map of the area walked and a record of what was found. The reconnaissance of MRS-45A was conducted in accordance with the Parker Flats to East Garison BLM Area OE Surface Removal and the Programmatic Work Plan (Parsons, 2001a and 2001b). The reconnaissance conducted as part of the BRA was completed in accordance with the sampling and analysis plan for the characterization of small arms and multi ranges (Shaw, 2003).

**Result of Reconnaissance Evaluation**

<b><i>Does the reconnaissance evaluation provide sufficient evidence to warrant further investigation?</i></b>		No	
--	--	----	--

**Comments**

On the basis of the reconnaissance conducted at MRS-27F, MRS-45A and MRS-59B no further investigation is warranted.

**ATTACHMENT G2-1**  
**EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: MRS-27F, MRS-45A, and MRS-59B**  
**EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 2: RECONNAISSANCE EVALUATION**

**TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED**

	Yes	No	Inconclusive
<b>References</b>			
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, 1995. Procedures For Conducting Preliminary Assessments At Potential Ordnance Response Sites. ETL 1110-1-165, April.			
_____, 1996. Risk Assessment Procedures For Ordnance And Explosive Waste (OEW) Sites (RAC Sheet), Site K10, January.			
Parsons, 2001a. Final Technical Memorandum, Parker Flats to East Garrison BLM Area OE Surface Removal. December.			
Parsons, 2001b. Former Fort Ord OE Cleanup, Programmatic Work Plan. May.			
Parsons, 2002. Final Technical Information Paper, Surface Removal BLM Area East of Parker Flats. April.			
Shaw, 2003. Draft Final Sampling and Analysis Plan, Characterization of Small Arms and Multi Ranges, Former Fort Ord, California. April.			
MACTEC/Shaw, 2005. Draft Final Comprehensive Basewide Range Assessment Report, Former Fort Ord, California. Rev 0.			

**ATTACHMENT G2-1  
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: MRS-45A  
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 3: SAMPLING EVALUATION**

**TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED**

Yes          No          Inconclusive

**HISTORICAL INFORMATION**

**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 of fired military munitions was found within the sample grids within MRS-45A or the sample grid that is adjacent to MRS-45A.

**References**

After Action Report for Site OE-45 (USA, 2001).

**2. Is there evidence that training involved use of explosive items?**

	No	
--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

No evidence of explosive military munitions was found within the sample grids within MRS-45A or the sample grid that is adjacent to MRS-45A.

**References**

After Action Report for Site OE-45 (USA, 2001).

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

	No	
--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

Not within MRS-45A. Pyrotechnic and smoke producing items were found within adjacent MRS-45.

**References**

After Action Report for Site OE-45 (USA, 2001).

**ATTACHMENT G2-1  
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: MRS-45A  
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 3: SAMPLING EVALUATION**

**TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED**

**SAMPLING RESULTS** Yes      No      Inconclusive

**4. Was sampling performed within the appropriate area?** 

Yes		
-----	--	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**  
 Sample grids were placed throughout the area identified on historical training maps as a Tactical Training Area (MRS-45). One sample grid and a portion of a second sample grid were within MRS-45A. A third grid was placed outside of MRS-45 and MRS-45A, but immediately adjacent to MRS-45A.

**References**  
 USA, 2001; Army, 1956.

**5. Does sampling indicate that MEC or munitions debris are present at this site?** 

Yes		
-----	--	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**  
 No MEC was found within MRS-45A. Only small arms ammunition clips/links and hand grenade safety levers were found.

**References**  
 USA, 2001.

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

Yes		
-----	--	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**  
 No MEC was found within MRS-45A. Small arms ammunition clips/links and hand grenade safety levers were found within MRS-45A. The types of items found in adjacent MRS-45 are consistent with use as a Tactical Training area.

**References**  
 USA, 2001.

**ATTACHMENT G2-1  
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: MRS-45A  
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 3: SAMPLING EVALUATION**

**TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED**

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

Yes	No	Inconclusive
Yes		

**Sources reviewed and comments**  
The ammunition clips/links and hand grenade safety levers found are consistent with use of MRS-45 and MRS-45A for Tactical Training in the 1940s through 1970s.

**References**  
USA, 2001.

**8. Was HE fragmentation found?**

	No	
--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**  
No HE fragmentation was found within MRS-45A or adjacent MRS-45.

**References**  
USA, 2001; Fort Ord Military Munitions Response Program database (USACE, 2005).

**9. Was HE found?**

	No	
--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**  
No HE found within MRS-45A or adjacent MRS-45.

**References**  
USA, 2001; Fort Ord Military Munitions Response Program database (USACE, 2005).

**10. Was LE found?**

	No	
--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**  
No LE was found within MRS-45A. Practice mine with spotting charge found within adjacent MRS-45.

**References**  
USA, 2001; Fort Ord Military Munitions Response Program database (USACE, 2005).

**ATTACHMENT G2-1  
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: MRS-45A  
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 3: SAMPLING EVALUATION**

**TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED**

	Yes	No	Inconclusive
<b>11. Were pyrotechnics found?</b>		No	

**Sources reviewed and comments**  
Pyrotechnics were found within adjacent MRS-45.

**References**  
USA, 2001; Fort Ord Military Munitions Response Program database (USACE, 2005).

<b>12. Were smoke producing items found?</b>		No	
--	--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**  
No smoke producing items were found within MRS-45A.  
Smoke producing items were found within adjacent MRS-45.

**References**  
USA, 2001; Fort Ord Military Munitions Response Program database (USACE, 2005).

<b>13. Were explosive items found (e.g., rocket motors with explosive components, fuzes with explosive components)?</b>		No	
---	--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**  
No explosive items were found.

**References**  
USA, 2001; Fort Ord Military Munitions Response Program database (USACE, 2005).

<b>14. Do items found in the area indicate training would have included use of training items with other energetic components?</b>		No	
--	--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**  
No.

**References**  
USA, 2001; Fort Ord Military Munitions Response Program database (USACE, 2005).



**ATTACHMENT G2-1  
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: MRS-45A  
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 3: SAMPLING EVALUATION**

**TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED**

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

Yes	No	Inconclusive
	No	

**Sources reviewed and comments**

No, the only items found were small arms ammunition clips/links and hand grenade safety levers.

**References**

USA, 2001.

**SITE INVESTIGATION DESIGN**

**16. Was the site divided into subareas to focus on areas of common usage, similar topography and vegetation, and/other unique site features?**

Yes		
-----	--	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

For sampling purposes (SS/GS sampling program) MRS-45 was subdivided into sectors.

**References**

USA, 2001.

**17. Should current site boundaries be revised based on sampling results?**

	No	
--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

Based on the sampling results there is no need to revise the site boundaries. Only small arms ammunition clips/links and hand grenade safety levers were found within the grids within MRS-45A (TC-2 and TC-3).

**References**

USA, 2001.

**ATTACHMENT G2-1  
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: MRS-45A  
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 3: SAMPLING EVALUATION**

**TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED**

**EQUIPMENT REVIEW** Yes      No      Inconclusive

**18. Was equipment used capable of detecting items suspected at the site at the maximum expected depth?**

Yes		
-----	--	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

The equipment used for sampling at MRS-45A (and MRS-45) was the Schonstedt Model GA-52/Cx. Based on results of the Ordnanced Detection and Discrimination Study (ODDS), the instrument is effective at detecting ferrous items in the near surface. It is expected based on review of sampling and removal actions throughout Fort Ord that the surface and near surface items such as signals, hand grenades, flares, and simulators are detectable in the near surface using a Schonstedt GA-52/Cx. Schonstedt tools would not be able to detect plastic mines or brass small arms ammunition casings.

**References**

USAESCH, 1997; Parsons 2001.

**19. Was equipment used capable of detecting the types of items (e.g., non-ferrous) suspected at the site?**

Yes		
-----	--	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

As stated above, the Schonstedt GA-52/Cx is effective at detecting near surface ferrous items. The majority of the items suspected to have been used and found at MRS-45 and MRS-45A contain ferrous material. Items that would be more difficult to detect using the Schonstedt GA-52/Cx include grenade fuzes (they contain little ferrous material) and inert non-metallic practice mines that may be present.

**References**

USA, 2001.

**ATTACHMENT G2-1  
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: MRS-45A  
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 3: SAMPLING EVALUATION**

**TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED**

**20. Do the results of the ODDS indicate that items suspected at the site would have been detected by the instrument used at the time of investigation?**

	Yes	No	Inconclusive
Yes			

**Sources reviewed and comments**

The Schonstedt Model GA-52/Cx magnetometer was used by USA during SS/GS sampling. Although not directly comparable to MRS-45A, the results of the ODDS indicate that these magnetometers are capable of detecting the ferrous military munitions expected at this site. Items found adjacent to MRS-45A include practice and smoke producing hand grenades, hand grenade fuzes, practice mines and illumination signals. Items that may be expected include booby trap firing devices associated with the practice mines. Practice mines and booby trap firing devices were not listed as items of study in the ODDS, but would probably be categorized as Type I or Type II. It should be noted that inert non-metallic practice mines and brass small arms ammunition could not be detected by the equipment used because they are non-ferrous.

**References**

USA, 2001; Parsons, 2001; USAESCH, 1997.

**21. Do results of the investigation indicate that suspected items could be detected with a high level of confidence at observed and expected depth ranges?**

Yes		
-----	--	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

With the exception of non-metallic practice mines, the suspected items are non-penetrating and would be expected to be found at or near the ground surface.

**References**

USA, 2001.

**ATTACHMENT G2-1  
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: MRS-45A  
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 3: SAMPLING EVALUATION**

**TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED**

	Yes	No	Inconclusive
<b>22. Were all the instruments used to evaluate the site maintained and calibrated in accordance with associated work plan and manufacturer's specifications?</b>	Yes		

**Sources reviewed and comments**

Throughout sampling operations at MRS-45, USA performed daily operational checks and quality control inspections of its work.

**References**

USA, 2001.

<b>23. Based on the anticipated target density (MEC items per acre) has the minimal amount of sampling acreage been completed in accordance with the scope of work or contractor plan?</b>			Not Applicable
--	--	--	----------------

**Sources reviewed and comments**

The sampling that included a portion of MRS-45A was not specific to this site, but was part of the sampling effort associated with adjacent MRS-45.

**References**

USA, 2001.

<b>24. Based on sampling procedure (e.g., grids, transects, and/or random walks) was a percentage of the site completed to provide 95% confidence in a MEC density estimate, and if so provide total area investigated and the MEC density estimate?</b>			Not Applicable
--	--	--	----------------

**Sources reviewed and comments**

The sampling that included a portion of MRS-45A was not specific to this site, but was part of the sampling effort associated with adjacent MRS-45. No MEC was found within MRS-45A.

**References**

USA, 2001.

**ATTACHMENT G2-1  
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: MRS-45A  
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 3: SAMPLING EVALUATION**

**TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED**

	Yes	No	Inconclusive
<b>25. What percentage of the anomalies were intrusively investigated?</b>			Inconclusive

**Sources reviewed and comments**

One grid (TC-3) and a portion of a second grid (TC-2) associated with MRS-45 lie within MRS-45A. 28% of the anomalies (69 of 245) were intrusively investigated within grid TC-2. 31% of the anomalies (26 of 83) were intrusively investigated within grid TC-3.

**References**

USA, 2001.

**DATA PROCESSING AND DATA MANAGEMENT**

<b>26. Was the appropriate data processing scheme used for the site, and how was the data processed?</b>			Not Applicable
--	--	--	----------------

**Sources reviewed and comments**

Not Applicable. No digital geophysical data were collected.

**References**

<b>27. Has the field data been collected and managed in accordance with quality control standards established for the project?</b>	Yes		
--	-----	--	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

The two grids that were sampled in MRS-45A were not subject to formal Quality Control (QC) inspections because of the nature of the SiteStats/GridStats procedures. Throughout operations at MRS-45, CMS performed daily operational checks and QC inspections of its work. No deficiency reports were written during inspections of the SiteStats/GridStats sampling work done on this site.

**References**

USA, 2001.

**ATTACHMENT G2-1  
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: MRS-45A  
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 3: SAMPLING EVALUATION**

**TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED**

**RESULTS OF SAMPLING EVALUATION** Yes      No      Inconclusive

**28. Does the sampling evaluation provide sufficient evidence to warrant further investigation?**

	No	
--	----	--

**Comments**

Based on the review of existing site data, it is not anticipated that MEC would be present at this site.

**References**

USA, 2001. Final SS/GS Sampling After-Action Report, Site OE-45. September 30.

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

Parsons, 2001. Draft Final Ordnance Detection And Discrimination Study, Volume I Text, Former Fort Ord, California, Presidio of Monterey, California. Prepared for US Army Corps of Engineers Sacramento District. December.

USACE, 2005. Fort Ord Military Munitions Response Program database, currently maintained by Parson. January 4

USAESCH, 1997. Penetration of Projectiles Into Earth, An Analysis of UXO Clearance Depths at Ft. Ord. September 10. Appendix F of the Phase 2 EE/CA.

U.S. Army (Army), 1956. Map of Fort Ord Training & Facilities. Enclosure I to Annex "O". Revised December 20.

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