

ATTACHMENT G3-1

EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK CHECKLISTS

**ATTACHMENT G3-1  
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: Parcel L23.5.2 (portion FBTA)  
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**

There is no evidence to indicate that the site was used as an impact area. Training maps indicate that the site vicinity was used as a Field Battalion Training Area or Firing Battery Training Area on a 1956 training facility map. FBTA's were established to train personnel on selection, setup, operating, and defending an artillery position. No live fire was allowed in these areas.

**References**

Army 1956; Hall, 2005.

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

Yes		
-----	--	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

FBTA training may have involved the use of blank artillery ammunition as well as signals, practice mines, booby traps, and artillery simulators. However, the historical evidence suggesting the use of HE or LE consists of a single map with assumed activity associated with the area.

**References**

Hall, 2005.

**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**

Some of the items mentioned in the response to Question #2 can contain pyrotechnic charges. However, the historical evidence suggesting the use of pyrotechnics consists of a single map with assumed activity associated with the area.

**References**

Hall, 2005.

**ATTACHMENT G3-1  
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: Parcel L23.5.2 (portion FBTA)  
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?**

	No	
--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

There is no evidence to indicate military munitions use. Housing was built adjacent to training area beginning in 1962.

**References**

Army 1954, 1956, 1957.

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

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

**Sources reviewed and comments**

The surrounding areas include MRS-49 and MRS-50 EXP. MRS-49, west of Parcel L23.5.2, appeared to have been used for practice rifle grenade training which would not be associated with a FBTA. MRS-50 EXP, east of the parcel was used for live fire training and contained a substantial amount of UXO and MD that has been removed. However, activities at MRS-50 EXP appear to have occurred in Parker Flats, east of Parker Flats Cutoff.

**References**

MACTEC, 2004; MACTEC, 2005.

**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**

The limits of the FBTA, if present, could not be determined from aerial photographs of that era.

**References**

Aerial photographs dated 6/23/1951, 5/14/1956, and 5/2/1966.

**ATTACHMENT G3-1  
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: Parcel L23.5.2 (portion FBTA)  
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 1: LITERATURE REVIEW**

**TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED**

Yes                  No                  Inconclusive

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

Yes		
-----	--	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

Boundaries of the FBTA, which overlaps Parcel L23.5.2, are identified on the circa 1956 map.

**References**

Army, 1956.

**8. Should current boundaries be revised?**

	No	
--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

The site boundary for the FBTA was established from a single 1956 map. The boundary for Parcel L23.5.2 is based on property reuse boundaries. The site was walked and only one munitions debris (MD) item was found, which was determined to be discarded. This information does not indicate a site boundary modification is necessary.

**References**

Army, 1956, Parsons, 2005.

**RESULTS OF LITERATURE EVALUATION**

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

Yes		
-----	--	--

**Comments**

Based on area designated as FBTA on the circa 1956 map and it's proximity to MRS-50 EXP, there was sufficient evidence to warrant the site walk performed by Parsons on 8/24/05.

**ATTACHMENT G3-1**  
**EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: Parcel L23.5.2 (portion FBTA)**  
**EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 1: LITERATURE REVIEW**

**TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED**

	Yes	No	Inconclusive
<b>References</b>			
Army 1954. Training Areas That Cannot Be Used at the Same Time, Circa 1954.			
Army, 1956. Map of Fort Ord Training Areas & Facilities. December.			
Army, 1957. Map of Fort Ord Training Areas & Facilities. July.			
Hall, Thomas, 2005. Personal communication with Bruce Wilcer of MACTEC E&C. November 4 and 10.			
MACTEC, 2004. Final Track 1 Ordnance and Explosives Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study, Former Fort Ord, California. June.			
MACTEC, 2005. Draft Track 2 Munitions Response Remedial Investigation /Feasibility Study, Parker Flats Munitions Response Area, Former Fort Ord California. March.			
Parsons, 2005. Memorandum for Record, Results of Walkabout at Parcel L23.5.2. August 24.			

**ATTACHMENT G3-1  
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: Parcel L23.5.2 (Portion FBTA)  
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 2: SITE WALK 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**

There is no evidence to suggest that the area was an impact area. One item of launched munitions debris ( tail boom from a M83 series 60mm illumination mortar) was found and appeared to have been thrown there.

**References**

Parsons, 2005.

**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 MEC was found during the sire walk.

**References**

Parsons, 2005.

**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**

No evidence of MEC was found during the sire walk.

**References**

Parsons, 2005.

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

	No	
--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

There is no evidence to indicate military munitions use.

**References**

Parsons, 2005.

**ATTACHMENT G3-1  
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: Parcel L23.5.2 (Portion FBTA)  
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 2: SITE WALK 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**

The potential for military munitions to be present in Parcel L23.5.2 is based on it's proximity to MRS-50 EXP, which contained MEC, and MRS-49, which is a Track 1 site. No evidence of training with military munitions was found on the parcel; however, because Fort Ord was a military base, the possibility exists for military munitions to be present.

**References**

MACTEC, 2004 and 2005; and Parsons, 2005.

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

	No	
--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

The limits of the FBTA, if present, could not be determined from aerial photographs of that era.

**References**

Aerial photographs dated 6/23/1951, 5/14/1956, and 5/2/1966.

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

Yes		
-----	--	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

Boundaries of the FBTA, which overlaps Parcel L23.5.2, are identified on the circa 1956 map.

**References**

Army, 1956.

**ATTACHMENT G3-1**  
**EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: Parcel L23.5.2 (Portion FBTA)**  
**EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 2: SITE WALK EVALUATION**

**TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED**

Yes                  No                  Inconclusive

**8. Was the site walk performed within appropriate area?**

Yes		
-----	--	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

The site walk was performed mostly within Parcel L23.5.2, which has surveyed boundaries. The use of a GPS unit allowed accurate navigation through the site.

**References**

Parsons, 2005.

**9. Does reconnaissance (site walk) indicate MEC and/or munitions debris are present at the site?**

	No	
--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

One munition debris item ( tail boom from a M83 series 60mm illumination mortar) was found and appeared to have been thrown there, which does not suggest that MEC is present as a result of training with military munitions.

**References**

Parsons, 2005.

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

	No	
--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

The illumination mortar tail boom is not consistent with the operation of a non-firing artillery training area.

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

Yes		
-----	--	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

The illumination mortar tail boom found was available for use in the 1950s, but no live firing was allowed in a FBTA and the item was determined to be discarded.

**References**

MACTEC, 2005; Parsons, 2005.



**ATTACHMENT G3-1  
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: Parcel L23.5.2 (Portion FBTA)  
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 2: SITE WALK EVALUATION**

**TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED**

Yes                  No                  Inconclusive

**12. Was HE fragmentation found?**

	No	
--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

No HE fragmentation were found during the 2005 site walk.

**References**

Parsons, 2005.

**13. Was HE found?**

	No	
--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

No HE were found during the 2005 site walk.

**References**

Parsons, 2005.

**14. Was LE found?**

	No	
--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

No LE were found during the 2005 site walk.

**References**

Parsons, 2005.

**15. Were pyrotechnics found?**

	No	
--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

One munition debris item ( tail boom from a M83 series 60mm illumination mortar, inert) was found and appeared to have been thrown there.

**References**

Parsons, 2005.

**16. Were smoke-producing items found?**

	No	
--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

No smoke-producing items were found during the 2005 site walk.

**References**

Parsons, 2005.

**ATTACHMENT G3-1  
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: Parcel L23.5.2 (Portion FBTA)  
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 2: SITE WALK EVALUATION**

**TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED**

Yes                  No                  Inconclusive

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

	No	
--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

No explosive items were found during the 2005 site walk.

**References**

Parsons, 2005.

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

	No	
--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

The only munitions-related item found was not associated with training at the site.

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

	No	
--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

One munition debris item ( tail boom from a M83 series 60mm illumination mortar, inert) was found and appeared to have been thrown there.

**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 are no distinct site features that would support dividing the site.

**21. Should site boundaries be revised?**

	No	
--	----	--

**Sources reviewed and comments**

Current boundaries are based on parcel reuse boundaries, which do not need modification based on investigation of the site.

**ATTACHMENT G3-1  
EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS WORK: Parcel L23.5.2 (Portion FBTA)  
EVALUATION CHECKLIST PART 2: SITE WALK EVALUATION**

**TYPE OF TRAINING AND MILITARY MUNITIONS EXPECTED**

	Yes	No	Inconclusive
<b>22. 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 site walk was completed according to general practices described in the munitions response program Programmatic Work Plan.

**References**

Parsons, 2004.

**Does the site walk evaluation provide sufficient evidence to warrant further investigation?**

	No	
--	----	--

**Comments**

The results of the site walk indicated there is no need to investigate the site further.

**References**

Army, 1956. Map of Fort Ord Training Areas & Facilities. December.

MACTEC, 2004. Final Track 1 Ordnance and Explosives Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study, Former Fort Ord, California. June.

MACTEC, 2005. Draft Track 2 Munitions Response Remedial Investigation /Feasibility Study, Parker Flats Munitions Response Area, Former Fort Ord California. March.

Parsons, 2004. Former Fort Ord, Monterey, California, Military Munitions Response Program, Programmatic Work Plan. May.

Parsons, 2005. Memorandum for Record, Results of Walkabout at Parcel L23.5.2. August 24.

ATTACHMENT G3-2  
SITE WALK RESULTS,  
PARCEL L23.5.2

**Attachment G3-2. Site Walk Results, Parcel L23.5.2**  
**Track 1 Plug-In Approval Memorandum**  
**Multiple Sites, Groups 1 to 4**  
**Former Fort Ord, California**

ID	DIG_RESULT	COMMENTS	DEPTH (INCHES)	DESCRIPTION	X	Y
1	CD	Water Main System	0		5740408	2126518
2	CD	Water line	0		5740432	2126494
3	CD	House hold trash dumped over hill	0		5740477	2126375
4	CD	Silver ware	0		5740625	2126284
5	CD	Re-bar	3		5740625	2126279
6	MD-E	Tail boom - this item appears to have been thrown	0	projo, 60mm, mortar, illum, M83 series	5740640	2126246
7	CD	Re-bar	2		5740650	2126237
8	CD	Wire	4		5740615	2126246
9	CD	Scaffolding leg	16		5740642	2126201
10		Fox hole	0		5741023	2126020
11		Fox hole	0		5741040	2126024
12	CD	Re-bar	4		5740918	2126614
13	MD	M1 clip	0		5740710	2126414
14	CD	Metal strap	0		5740715	2126410
15	CD	Fence post	4		5740595	2127023
16	CD	Fence post	2		5740569	2127034
17	CD	Lawn mower blade	0		5740451	2127056

Notes:

- CD Cultural Debris
- MD-E Munitions Debris - Expended
- MD Munitions Debris
- X Northing Coordinate
- Y Easting Coordinate

Provided by Parsons