

MCB Camp Lejeune
 Operable Unit No. 7 (Sites 1, 28, and 30)
 Draft RI/FS Project Plans
 LANTDIV Comments on Responses to NC, EPA, and CLEJ Comments

OC - will be included in Final version
 per Dan Bank
 Rick Bonelli
 11/23/93

NC Specific Comments

2. Revised sentence in Draft Final does not mention 1GW3, 1GW4, or 1GW5 as stated in comment response. Either the text or the response should be revised so that they correspond. Also, the run-on sentence should be corrected (in Draft Final on page 2-14, Section 2.2.5.3, 1st sentence).
5. Response states that groundwater flow direction was added to Figure 2-4; however, Figure 2-4 in the Draft Final still does not show groundwater flow direction. This needs to be added.
6. Response states that changes were made to the text regarding mercury concentrations in wells 1GW1, 1GW2, and 1GW6. Text of Draft Final has been changed, but only mentions 1GW2 and 1GW6. Was 1GW1 omitted accidentally?
8. Response identifies the pond by the name Orde Pond. Later references are made to Orde Pond by name in the Draft Final Work Plan and Sampling & Analysis Plan (note that earlier versions of these documents did not identify the pond by name, just as "site pond"). Judging by previous comments received, there is apparently considerable confusion surrounding the identification of the pond. To avoid further confusion, I suggest that all text references to the HPBD pond and Figures 2-5, 2-6, 5-3, 5-4 (Work Plan) and Figures 1-4, 3-4 thru 3-7 (Sampling & Analysis Plan) identify the pond by name, "Orde Pond" as opposed to just "site pond."
9. Response indicates that GW flow direction was added to Figure 2-5. The Draft Final version of Figure 2-5 still does not show GW flow direction. This should be added.
12. See #8.
19. Changes to text appearing in Draft Final still do not make clear the point referenced in the original comment. Also, changes made to Table 5-2 and Figure 5-2 have introduced new confusion concerning the unknown wells. Apparently, 2 of the unknown wells have been re-identified as wells 1GW14 and 1GW15 and identified on Figure 5-2 using the "existing well" symbol instead of the "unknown well" symbol. However, the text still refers to unknown wells. Figure 5-2, Table 5-2 and the text should be revised to resolve these inconsistencies.
25. Page 5-27 of the Draft Final still has 2 references to 1GW1. These should all have been changed to 28GW1.

26. Section heading 5.4.1.4 on page 5-28 should be 5.4.2.4.
31. The Draft Final contains a revised Table 2-1 that is identical to Table 4-1 of the Work Plan for Site 1. However, tables for Sites 28 & 30 are not included. In addition, the text of the FSAP discusses the table as being a conceptual site model, including contaminant transport/migration pathways. The Draft version table included this information. The point of the original comment, I believe, was not to duplicate the entire Table 4-1 of the work plan, but simply to ensure that the RI/FS objectives of both tables (as listed in Column 2 of both tables) match. Table 4-1 should be revised to address this.
35. The revised text of the Draft Final versions (page 5-13 of Work Plan and page 3-8 of FSAP) still do not make this point very clear. Both Draft Final documents state " 7 existing monitoring wells are present...."; this is misleading. The Final versions should clarify that there are a total of 10 existing wells, 7 of which will be sampled as follows:
- | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 6 wells from 1984 - 1 damaged (1GW5) | --> 5 to be sampled |
| 3 unknown wells north of bldg FC120 | --> 1 to be sampled |
| 1 unknown well behind bldg FC134 | --> 1 to be sampled |
| ----- | ----- |
| 10 total existing wells | 7 wells to be sampled |
38. Although the both the Draft Final Work Plan and FSAP now indicate 4 soil borings will be used to assess thickness of the fill, the revised text of the Work Plan (page 5-34) states "approximately 4 soil borings...the final number to be determined...." However, the FSAP (page 3-26) states that exactly 4 will be used. The Final documents should agree.

Camp Lejeune Specific Comments - Work Plan/FSAP

1. Figure 2-1 of Work Plan and Figure 1-1 of FSAP are still not revised in Draft Final as indicated in comment response. (Main Service Road is incorrectly identified as River Road.)

EPA Comments - Risk Assessment Section

-OK-

to Dan 9:40 AM
11/14/93

**Atlantic Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Environmental Quality Division**

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

TOTAL # OF PAGES: 3	DATE: ^{10 Nov 1993} 18 October 1993
TO: Dan Bonk	FROM: Kate Landman, Code 1823
COMPANY: Baker Environmental, Inc.	PHONE #: (804) 322-4818
PHONE #: (412) 269-2063	DSN: 262-4818
FAX #: (412) 269-2002	FAX #: (804) 322-4805

REMARKS: Camp Lejeune, OU #7 (Sites 1, 28, and 30) Draft Project Plans

Dan,
Attached are some comments/questions on your responses to EPA, NC, and CLEJ comments on the Draft project plans for OU#7. Please look them over & let me know what you think. As we did for OU#10, I'd like to revise your responses to incorporate changes as needed and/or indicate that revisions will appear in the Final version.

Thanks,
Kate