



06.01-04/20/95-01435

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION IV

345 COURTLAND STREET, N.E.
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30365

April 20, 1995

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

4WD-FFB

Ms. Linda Saksvig
Department of the Navy - Atlantic Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Code 1823
Norfolk, Virginia 23511-6287

SUBJ: MCB Camp Lejeune - OU4
Draft Record of Decision
Proposed Remedial Action Plan

Dear Ms. Saksvig:

The Environmental Protection Agency has completed its review of the above subject document. Comments are enclosed.

If there are any questions or comments, please call me at (404) 347-3016 or 347-3555, vmx-6459.

Sincerely,

Gena D. Townsend
Gena D. Townsend
Senior Project Manager

Enclosure

cc: Mr. Neal Paul, MCB Camp Lejeune
Mr. Patrick Watters, NCDEHNR

Post-It™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671		# of pages ▶ 2
To <i>Ray Watters</i>	From <i>Linda Saksvig</i>	
Co.	Co.	
Dept.	Phone #	
Fax #	Fax #	

ROD Comments

1. Page 2-2, second paragraph -
"detected" misspelled

2. Page 5-1, fourth dot -

This paragraph states that there is a problem with Lead, Iron and Manganese. It also implies that with a change in the sampling method the initial detected concentrations are greatly reduced. This can give the reader the impression that a sampling method was chosen that would produce acceptable results. Please explain the problems with the first round of sampling (turbid samples) and the need to use another approved method.

3. Table 1

Is this table using the round one sampling data? The round two sampling data should be used, since this is the basis for the final decision.

PRAP Comments

1. Page 1.1, paragraph 5 & 6
These paragraphs should be combined.

2. Page 2-3, Section 2.3.1, paragraph 3

The phrase stating exceedance by an "order of magnitude" is not appropriate for this document. The terminology can be confusing to the general public. Also, is the metal concentration data used in this section taken from the second round of sampling? The sampling round should be identified. (see ROD comment no. 2)

3. Page 2-3, Section 2.3.1, paragraph 4
(See ROD comment no. 2)

4. Page 2-4, Section 2.3.2, last paragraph

Dissolved samples are irrelevant for this section. They are filtered samples. This section implies that the elevated levels are above the State and Federal drinking water standards until the samples were filtered, thereby, removing all contaminants. This paragraph needs to be rewritten to explain the use of the dissolved samples in correlation to the turbid samples and the change in sampling procedures.