

04.01-02/08/94-01067



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION IV

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

February 8, 1994

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

4WD-FFB

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

SUBJ: MCB Camp Lejeune - OU5
Draft Feasibility Study

Dear Ms. Berry:

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has completed its review of the "Draft Feasibility Study, Operable Unit 5, Site 2, dated December 21, 1993. The comments from Risk Assessment on the human health aspects are enclosed.

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Gena D. Townsend", is written over a horizontal line.

Gena D. Townsend
Senior Project Manager

Enclosure

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

Comments

1. Section 2 - Throughout this section, references are made to "COPCs" (Chemicals of Potential Concern). EPA region IV policy is that contaminants carried from the baseline risk assessment into the FS be referred to as "Contaminants of Concern" (COCs). Note: EPA refers to the list of chemicals that are evaluated in the baseline risk assessment as the Chemicals of Potential Concern (COPCs).
2. Table 2-5 - Since EPA Health Advisory values are listed, the table should also include the available "Lifetime Health Advisory" values.
3. Appendix B, last page - The risk-based remedial goals ("Action Levels") for ground water are incorrectly calculated. The "absorption fraction of the contaminant" (0.01) should not be included in the dose equations for groundwater exposure. The absorbed fraction value (other than 1.0) is appropriate to use only in assessing dermal risk from soil; for groundwater exposure, the chemical-specific partition coefficient (PC) accounts for the amount absorbed via the dermal route of exposure. For groundwater and soil ingestion, the fraction absorbed is assumed to be 1.0 (relative to the study on which the RfD or slope factor is based). Please make corrections to values in Tables 2-6 and 2-7 affected by these calculations.