

TABLE 4-2 Comparative Analysis				
Site	Alternative 1 – No Further Action	Alternative 2 – Institutional Controls	Alternative 3 – Excavation And Offsite Disposal	Alternative 4 – Excavation And Onsite Disposal
Perimeter Drainage Ditch	Least effective of all alternatives because it would not be protective of human health and the environment throughout the development and maturation of the wetland. Offers a high degree of implementability since actions are not taken and there are no associated costs.	<p>Offers a high degree of effectiveness in achieving RAOs. Potential risks to human health and ecological receptors would not exist because exposure to COCs would be eliminated through implementation of the final wetland design performance criteria. The alternative would provide a minimum of three feet of cover, prevent and monitor exposure of receptors to the concentrations of COCs detected above their chemical-specific RAOs.</p> <p>Less effective in reducing the site-specific contaminant mobility than Alternatives 3 and 4. This alternative would have minimal implementation obstacles because the controls would be fully considered and incorporated in preparation of the final wetland design. In addition, there are minimal associated costs.</p>	This alternative would be protective of human health and the environment. Offers the highest degree of effectiveness in achieving RAOs and reducing contaminant mobility since the materials would be removed from the Inboard Area and from the BRAC Property. Offers a high degree of implementability since excavation is a widely used and accepted technology. However, prior to removal of the impacted sediments, specified portions of the channel would need to be dewatered through pumping or installation of coffer or diversion dams. After removal, the sediments may need to be dried or blended with dry soil prior to disposal, to meet landfill acceptance criteria. This alternative is the most expensive.	<p>This alternative would be protective of human health and the environment. Offers the higher degree of effectiveness in achieving RAOs and reducing site contaminant mobility, and than Alternatives 1 and 2 but not as effective as Alternative 3. Excavation of the contaminated material immediately removes the contaminants from the site; however, they remain onsite at a consolidation/disposal location. Also, the process of obtaining permits to build an Onsite Class II landfill may be complicated and time-consuming.</p> <p>Offers a high degree of implementability since excavation is a widely used and accepted technology. Prior to removal of the impacted sediments, specified portions of the channel would need to be dewatered through pumping or installation of coffer or diversion dams. After removal, the sediments may need to be dried or blended with dry soil prior to disposal, to meet consolidation acceptance criteria.</p> <p>The costs associated with this alternative are greater than Alternatives 1 and 2.</p>

TABLE 4-2 Comparative Analysis				
Site	Alternative 1 – No Further Action	Alternative 2 – Institutional Controls	Alternative 3 – Excavation And Offsite Disposal	Alternative 4 – Excavation And Onsite Disposal
Perimeter Drainage Ditch Spoils Piles	<p>Least effective of all alternatives because it would not be protective of human health and the environment throughout the development and maturation of the wetland. However, Spoils Pile L is an exception. The risk associated with this site was based on a sample point that was removed; therefore this alternative would be protective of human health and the environment for this Inboard Area site. This alternative, offers a high degree of implementability since actions are not taken and there are no associated costs.</p>	<p>Offers a high degree of effectiveness in achieving RAOs. Potential risks to human health and ecological receptors would not exist because exposure to COCs would be eliminated through implementation of the final wetland design performance criteria. The alternative would provide a minimum of three feet of cover, prevent and monitor exposure of receptors to the concentrations of COCs detected above their chemical-specific RAOs.</p> <p>The majority of the spoils piles have had soil removed to original grade during the interim removal actions. Spoils pile F is the only pile where there is no physical evidence indicating the location of the pile. However, the assumed location would be removed during installation of the main channel cut during wetland construction.</p> <p>Less effective in reducing the site-specific contaminant mobility than Alternatives 3 and 4. This alternative would have minimal implementation obstacles because the controls would be fully considered and incorporated in preparation of the final wetland design. In addition, there are minimal associated costs.</p>	<p>This alternative would be protective of human health and the environment. Offers the highest degree of effectiveness in achieving RAOs and reducing contaminant mobility since the materials would be removed from the Inboard Area and from the BRAC Property. Offers a high degree of implementability since excavation is a widely used and accepted technology. However, the proximity to the PDD may complicate excavation activities.</p> <p>The majority of the spoils piles have had soil removed to original grade during the interim removal actions. Spoils pile F is the only pile where there is no physical evidence indicating the location of the pile; therefore a removal action will occur at this spoils pile.</p> <p>This alternative is the most expensive.</p>	<p>This alternative would be protective of human health and the environment. Offers the higher degree of effectiveness in achieving RAOs and reducing site contaminant mobility, and than Alternatives 1 and 2 but not as effective as Alternative 3. Excavation of the contaminated material immediately removes the contaminants from the site; however, they remain onsite at a consolidation/disposal location. Also, the process of obtaining permits to build an Onsite Class II landfill may be complicated and time-consuming.</p> <p>Offers a high degree of implementability since excavation is a widely used and accepted technology.</p> <p>The majority of the spoils piles have had soil removed to original grade during the interim removal actions. Spoils pile F is the only pile where there is no physical evidence indicating the location of the pile.</p> <p>The costs associated with this alternative are greater than Alternatives 1 and 2.</p>

TABLE 4-2 Comparative Analysis				
Site	Alternative 1 – No Further Action	Alternative 2 – Institutional Controls	Alternative 3 – Excavation And Offsite Disposal	Alternative 4 – Excavation And Onsite Disposal
Onshore Fuel Line – 54” Line	Least effective of all alternatives because it would not be protective of human health and the environment throughout the development and maturation of the wetland. Offers a high degree of implementability since actions are not taken and there are no associated costs.	<p>Offers a high degree of effectiveness in achieving RAOs. Potential risks to human health and ecological receptors would not exist because exposure to COCs would be eliminated through implementation of the final wetland design performance criteria. The alternative would maintain a minimum of three feet of cover, prevent and monitor exposure of receptors to the concentrations of COCs detected above their chemical-specific RAOs. Additionally, known sources of contamination (i.e., fuel line) have been removed.</p> <p>Less effective in reducing the site-specific contaminant mobility than Alternatives 3 and 4. This alternative would have minimal implementation obstacles because the controls would be fully considered and incorporated in preparation of the final wetland design. In addition, there are minimal associated costs.</p>	<p>This alternative would be protective of human health and the environment. Offers the highest degree of effectiveness in achieving RAOs and reducing contaminant mobility since the materials would be removed from the Inboard Area and from the BRAC Property. Offers a high degree of implementability since excavation is a widely used and accepted technology. However, site obstacles, such as the concrete 54-inch drain line and asphalt which overlays the surface, may complicate excavation. This alternative is the most expensive.</p>	<p>This alternative would be protective of human health and the environment. Offers the higher degree of effectiveness in achieving RAOs and reducing site contaminant mobility, and than Alternatives 1 and 2 but not as effective as Alternative 3. Excavation of the contaminated material immediately removes the contaminants from the site; however, they remain onsite at a consolidation/disposal location. Also, the process of obtaining permits to build an Onsite Class II landfill may be complicated and time-consuming.</p> <p>Offers a high degree of implementability since excavation is a widely used and accepted technology. Site obstacles, such as the concrete 54-inch drain line and asphalt which overlays the surface, may complicate excavation.</p> <p>The costs associated with this alternative are greater than Alternatives 1 and 2.</p>

TABLE 4-2 Comparative Analysis				
Site	Alternative 1 – No Further Action	Alternative 2 – Institutional Controls	Alternative 3 – Excavation And Offsite Disposal	Alternative 4 – Excavation And Onsite Disposal
Onshore Fuel Line – northern segment	Least effective of all alternatives because it would not be protective of human health and the environment throughout the development and maturation of the wetland. Offers a high degree of implementability since actions are not taken and there are no associated costs.	<p>Offers a high degree of effectiveness in achieving RAOs. Potential risks to human health and ecological receptors would not exist because exposure to COCs would be eliminated through implementation of the final wetland design performance criteria. The alternative would provide minimum of three feet of cover, prevent and monitor exposure of receptors to the concentrations of COCs detected above their chemical-specific RAOs. Additionally, known sources of contamination (i.e., fuel lines) have been removed.</p> <p>Less effective in reducing the site-specific contaminant mobility than Alternatives 3 and 4. This alternative would have minimal implementation obstacles because the controls would be fully considered and incorporated in preparation of the final wetland design. In addition, there are minimal associated costs.</p>	This alternative would be protective of human health and the environment. Offers the highest degree of effectiveness in achieving RAOs and reducing contaminant mobility since the materials would be removed from the Inboard Area and from the BRAC Property. Offers a high degree of implementability since excavation is a widely used and accepted technology. This alternative is the most expensive.	<p>This alternative would be protective of human health and the environment. Offers the higher degree of effectiveness in achieving RAOs and reducing site contaminant mobility, and than Alternatives 1 and 2 but not as effective as Alternative 3. Excavation of the contaminated material immediately removes the contaminants from the site; however, they remain onsite at a consolidation/disposal location. Also, the process of obtaining permits to build an Onsite Class II landfill may be complicated and time-consuming.</p> <p>Offers a high degree of implementability since excavation is a widely used and accepted technology.</p> <p>The costs associated with this alternative are greater than Alternatives 1 and 2.</p>

TABLE 4-2 Comparative Analysis				
Site	Alternative 1 – No Further Action	Alternative 2 – Institutional Controls	Alternative 3 – Excavation And Offsite Disposal	Alternative 4 – Excavation And Onsite Disposal
Northwest Runway Area	Least effective of all alternatives because it would not be protective of human health and the environment throughout the development and maturation of the wetland. Offers a high degree of implementability since actions are not taken and there are no associated costs.	<p>Offers a high degree of effectiveness in achieving RAOs. Potential risks to human health and ecological receptors would not exist because exposure to COCs would be eliminated through implementation of the final wetland design performance criteria. The alternative would provide a minimum of three feet of cover, prevent and monitor exposure of receptors to the concentrations of COCs detected above their chemical-specific RAOs.</p> <p>Less effective in reducing the site-specific contaminant mobility than Alternatives 3 and 4. This alternative would have minimal implementation obstacles because the controls would be fully considered and incorporated in preparation of the final wetland design. In addition, there are minimal associated costs.</p>	This alternative would be protective of human health and the environment. Offers the highest degree of effectiveness in achieving RAOs and reducing contaminant mobility since the materials would be removed from the Inboard Area and from the BRAC Property. Offers a high degree of implementability since excavation is a widely used and accepted technology. This alternative is the most expensive.	<p>This alternative would be protective of human health and the environment. Offers the higher degree of effectiveness in achieving RAOs and reducing site contaminant mobility, and than Alternatives 1 and 2 but not as effective as Alternative 3. Excavation of the contaminated material immediately removes the contaminants from the site; however, they remain onsite at a consolidation/disposal location. Also, the process of obtaining permits to build an Onsite Class II landfill may be complicated and time-consuming.</p> <p>Offers a high degree of implementability since excavation is a widely used and accepted technology.</p> <p>The costs associated with this alternative are greater than Alternatives 1 and 2.</p>

TABLE 4-2 Comparative Analysis				
Site	Alternative 1 – No Further Action	Alternative 2 – Institutional Controls	Alternative 3 – Excavation And Offsite Disposal	Alternative 4 – Excavation And Onsite Disposal
Revetments	<p>Least effective of all alternatives because it would not be protective of human health and the environment throughout the development and maturation of the wetland. However, Revetments 15 and 20 are exceptions. The concentrations of cadmium and lead detected in the surface sample at Revetment 15 was detected at the comparator value; this alternative would be protective of human health and the environment. The concentrations of cadmium, phenanthrene, and pyrene were detected at their comparator values at Revetment 20 in one sample collected beneath the concrete; this alternative would be protective of human health and the environment. Offers a high degree of implementability since actions are not taken and there are no associated costs.</p>	<p>Offers a high degree of effectiveness in achieving RAOs. Potential risks to human health and ecological receptors would not exist because exposure to COCs would be eliminated through implementation of the final wetland design performance criteria. The alternative would provide a minimum of three feet of cover in those areas where contamination is at the surface, prevent and monitor exposure of receptors to the concentrations of COCs detected above their chemical-specific RAOs.</p> <p>Revetments 6 and 7 are in the path of the proposed main wetland channel; therefore these areas will require excavation.</p> <p>Less effective in reducing the site-specific contaminant mobility than Alternatives 3 and 4. This alternative would have minimal implementation obstacles because the controls would be fully considered and incorporated in preparation of the final wetland design. In addition, there are minimal associated costs.</p>	<p>This alternative would be protective of human health and the environment. Offers the highest degree of effectiveness in achieving RAOs and reducing contaminant mobility since the materials would be removed from the Inboard Area and from the BRAC Property. Offers a high degree of implementability since excavation is a widely used and accepted technology. However, the presence of the site-specific concrete revetment pads may complicate excavation activities.</p> <p>Revetments 6 and 7 are in the direct path of the proposed wetland channel. The concrete pad and underlying material would need to be removed during wetland construction. Underlying contamination would be addressed at that time.</p> <p>This alternative is the most expensive.</p>	<p>This alternative would be protective of human health and the environment. Offers the higher degree of effectiveness in achieving RAOs and reducing site contaminant mobility, and than Alternatives 1 and 2 but not as effective as Alternative 3. Excavation of the contaminated material immediately removes the contaminants from the site; however, they remain onsite at a consolidation/disposal location. Also, the process of obtaining permits to build an Onsite Class II landfill may be complicated and time-consuming.</p> <p>Revetments 6 and 7 are in the direct path of the proposed wetland channel. The concrete pad and underlying material would need to be removed during wetland construction. Underlying contamination would be addressed at that time.</p> <p>Offers a high degree of implementability since excavation is a widely used and accepted technology. Presence of the site-specific concrete revetment pads may complicate excavation activities.</p> <p>The costs associated with this alternative are greater than Alternatives 1 and 2.</p>