

06.01-05/13/97-D1875 ARF



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION 4
ATLANTA FEDERAL CENTER
61 FORSYTH STREET, S.W.
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-3104

May 13, 1997

4WD-FFB

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

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

SUBJ: MCB Camp Lejeune
Draft Basis of Design Phase I
Interim Remedial Action
Operable Unit No.10-Site 35

Dear Ms. Landman:

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

If you have any questions or comments, please call me at (404) 562-8538

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Gena D. Townsend".

Gena D. Townsend
Senior Project Manager

Enclosure

cc: David Lown, NCDEHNR
Neal Paul, MCB Camp Lejeune

1.0 GENERAL COMMENTS

1. Section 1.1, Page 1-1, Paragraph 5, states that one of the objectives of this Interim Remedial Action (IRA) is to assess the impact of air emissions on human health and the environment and verify that air emissions will not impact the proposed highway project. However, this objective is not met. The impact of air emissions on human health and the environment as it relates to the proposed highway project is not discussed. The document should include a discussion of the aforementioned issue so that this objective can be met.
2. Section 3.3, Page 3-4, Paragraph 2, discusses performance and monitoring requirements. However, the monitoring of CO₂ and O₂ levels in soil vapors is not addressed. The CO₂ and O₂ levels should be monitored as recommended by Angell (1992).

2.0 SPECIFIC COMMENTS

1. **Section 2.3.5.1, Page 2-7, Paragraph 6, Sentence 2.**
The text states that the draft Proposed Remedial Action Plan detailed the five Remedial Action Alternatives (RAAs) described in the Feasibility Study for the remediation of organic contamination of the surficial aquifer. However, Section 2.3.5, paragraph 2, states that six instead of five RAAs were listed. The discrepancy should be resolved.
2. **Appendix A, Page 2.**
Appendix A shows the construction cost estimate. The first table is the cost estimate for the IAS trench. However, the total cost for the IAS injection trench should be \$49,850 instead of \$49,100. The table should be corrected accordingly.
3. **Appendix A, Page 3.**
Appendix A shows the construction cost estimate. The first table is the cost estimate for the IAS trench. However, the total direct and indirect costs should be \$356,024 instead of \$275,311. The table should be corrected accordingly.
4. **Appendix A, Table, Page 1.**
Table 1 shows the cost estimate for the direct general costs for the installation of an IAS trench. However, the total preconstruction submittals costs of \$6,400.00 is incorrect and should be \$6,840.00. The table should be corrected accordingly.