Proposed Plan Overview

- Describes the various cleanup alternatives proposed for the Ricochet Area MRS
- Identifies the proposed cleanup alternative
- Provides the public an opportunity to comment on the proposed cleanup alternative
Cleanup Objective

- Reduce explosives safety risk and to ensure protection of human health, public safety, and the environment

- Minimize exposure to:
  - The public while maintaining access for recreational activities
  - Pennsylvania Game Commission (PGC) personnel and contractors
Feasibility Study Summary

- Finalized in January 2012
- Develops and analyzes cleanup alternatives
- Five cleanup alternatives were evaluated
Cleanup Alternatives

• Alternative 1: No action
• Alternative 2: Containment and controls
• Alternative 3: Surface removal of munitions with containment and controls
• Alternative 4: Focused surface and subsurface removal of munitions with containment and controls
• Alternative 5: Removal of munitions to detection depth with containment and controls
Evaluation Criteria – Compared to Each Alternative

1. Overall protection of human health and the environment
2. Compliance with applicable or relevant and appropriate requirement (ARARs)
3. Long-term effectiveness and performance
4. Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume
5. Short-term effectiveness
6. Implementability
7. Cost
8. State (support agency) acceptance
9. Community acceptance
Cleanup Alternative 1

- No Action
  - Baseline for comparison to the other proposed alternatives
  - No action will be taken to locate, remove, and dispose of munitions
  - No implementation of programs to inform the public of explosives hazards
  - Cost: $0
Cleanup Alternative 2

• Containment and Controls
  - Reduce exposure risk through public awareness
  - Containment and controls may include:
    • Brochures and fact sheets
    • Signs and information added to printed material
    • Notifications included with permits and contracts
    • Awareness videos
  - Cost: $181,998
Cleanup Alternative 3

- Surface Removal of Munitions with Containment and Controls
  - Removal of munitions detected on the ground surface across the entire 3,262 acre MRS with magnetometer instrument
  - Munitions in the subsurface will not be removed
  - Brush clearing as needed for accessibility
  - This alternative also includes containment and controls
  - Cost: $16,182,335
Cleanup Alternative 3

- Ricochet Area MRS (3,262 acres)
- Alternative 3: Surface Removal of Munitions with Containment and Controls
Cleanup Alternative 4

• Focused Surface and Subsurface Removal of Munitions with Containment and Controls
  – Surface removal in locations with the highest probability of encountering munitions (1,334 acres)
  – Removal of munitions to detection depth within herbaceous openings (11 acres)
  – Brush clearing as needed for accessibility
  – This alternative also includes containment and controls and construction support as needed for timber management
  – Cost: $6,757,826
Cleanup Alternative 4

- Ricochet Area MRS (3,262 acres)
- Alternative 4: Focused Surface and Subsurface Removal of Munitions with Containment and Controls

FORT INDIANTOWN GAP INSTALLATION
Cleanup Alternative 5

- Removal of Munitions to Detection Depth with Containment and Controls
  - Removal of munitions to detection depth across the entire 3,262 acre MRS
  - Brush clearing as needed for accessibility
  - This alternative also includes containment and controls
  - Cost: $24,315,156
Cleanup Alternative 5

- --- Ricochet Area MRS (3,262 acres)

Alternative 5: Removal of Munitions to Detection Depth with Containment and Controls
## Evaluation of Cleanup Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
<th>Alternative 5</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall protection of human health and the environment</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Compliance with applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Long-term effectiveness and permanence</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reduction of toxicity, mobility or volume through treatment</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Short-term effectiveness</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Implementability</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cost</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$181,998</td>
<td>$16,182,335</td>
<td>$6,757,826</td>
<td>$24,315,156</td>
<td>$24,315,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. State regulator acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will be evaluated after public comment period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Community acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will be evaluated after public comment period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- □ = Favorable, meets criteria
- □ = Moderately favorable
- □ = Not favorable, does not meet criteria
Next Steps

• Public comment period June 7 to July 6, 2012
• Comments are used to evaluate the preferred alternative prior to deciding on the final cleanup strategy
• The selected alternative will be advertized and documented in a Record of Decision