

03.01 - 06/26/95 - 01401

Admin Rec



UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS BASE
PSC BOX 20004
CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA 28542-0004

IN REPLY REFER TO:

6286
BEMD

12 6 JUN 1995

From: Commanding General, Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune
To: Commander, Atlantic Division, Naval Facilities Engineering
Command, Attn: Katherine Landman (Code 1823), 1510
Gilbert Street, Norfolk, Virginia 23511-2699

Subj: REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY PROJECT PLANS FOR
OPERABLE UNIT NO. 13 (SITE 63), MARINE CORPS BASE, CAMP
LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA

Encl: (1) Comments for the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility
Study Project Plans for Operable Unit No. 13 (Site
63), Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina

1. The subject document has been reviewed, and our comments are contained in the enclosure. It is requested that the Installation Restoration Division, Environmental Management Department, Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune be notified of the actions taken to accommodate the comments provided in the enclosure.

2. If you have any questions or comments, please contact Mr. Neal Paul, Director, Installation Restoration Division, Environmental Management Department, at telephone (910) 451-5068.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Robert L. Warren".

ROBERT L. WARREN
By direction

**Comments for the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Project
Plans for Operable Unit No. 13 (Site 63), Marine Corps Base,
Camp Lejeune, North Carolina**

1. Page 2-5, section 2.1.6, eighth paragraph: The term "sand shell rock" is geologically improper and vague. Does this refer to a sandy, molluscan mold limestone, a fossiliferous limestone, an unconsolidated sand with shell deposits, or something else?
2. Page 2-6, third paragraph: Change the term "potentiometer surface" to "potentiometric surface."
3. Page 2-9, sub-section 2.1.10.2, first paragraph: The report states "The remaining personnel and dependents live off base and have had dramatic effects on the surrounding area." To which dramatic effects does the report refer? Either include these effects in the text, or delete this statement.
4. Page 2-9, section 2.1.11, fourth paragraph: The report states "Based on a review of a USGS water supply well location map, there are no supply wells located within a one-half mile radius of Site 63." This statement implies that Baker ignored important information from the Camp Lejeune special map as well as Camp Lejeune's "Wellhead Management Program" report. Ensure that information from these and other Base resources are included in all site investigation activities.
5. Figure 2-3: Neither a horizontal scale, nor a vertical exaggeration value are provided with this figure. Although the diagram has been referenced from a USGS report, please provide a horizontal scale and vertical exaggeration value if available.
6. Figure 2-4: The legend states "SCALE: 1 in = 2,000 ft." However, this statement becomes irrelevant when the map is photocopied for reduction or enlargement. Provide a bar scale within the "legend" section of the figure.
7. Figures 2-5 and 4-1: Delete the groundwater flow direction arrow. It is irrelevant with respect to these maps.
8. Figure 4-2: Since this map displays the groundwater elevations in each monitoring well and the direction of groundwater flow, equipotential contour lines should be included.
9. Page 6-4, subsection 6.4.3: The proposed methodology for the purging of wells seems to contradict explicit guidance from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Regardless of Baker's justification, approval from EPA must be provided before this purging method is executed. If such approval has already been granted, then explain in the text.