04.01-02/22/94-01075

State of North Carolina
Department of Environment,
Health and Natural Resources
Division of Solid Waste Management

James B. Hunt, Jr., Governor Jonathan B. Howes, Secretary William L. Meyer, Director



February 22, 1994

maiais dai:

Commander, Atlantic Division

Naval Facilities Engineering Command

Code 1823-1

Attention:

MCB Camp Lejeune, RPM

Ms. Linda Berry, P. E.

Norfolk, Virginia 23511-6287

Commanding General

Attention:

AC/S, EMD/IRD

Marine Corps Base

PSC Box 20004

Camp Lejeune, NC 28542-0004

RE:

Draft Project Plans, Contaminated Soil and

Groundwater Remedial Design for Operable Unit 2

(sites 6, 9, and 82)

Dear Ms. Berry:

The referenced document has been received and reviewed by the North Carolina Superfund Section. Our comments are attached. Please call me at (919) 733-2801 if you have any questions about this.

Sincerely,

Data da Mata

Patrick Watters Environmental Engineer Superfund Section

Attachment

cc: Gena Townsend, US EPA Region IV

Neal Paul, MCB Camp Lejeune

Bruce Reed, DEHNR - Wilmington Regional Office

## North Carolina Superfund Comments Camp Lejeune MCB Operable Unit 2 Draft Remedial Design Project Plans

colorational administra

regrati alsto

## Work Plan Comments

- 1. General
  - There is very little discussion of any predesign studies intended for soil Area of Concern (AOC) 2 other than a site survey and possible unexploded ordnance (UXO) clearance. The work plan should indicate why AOC 2 is not included in the soil sampling activities being conducted for the other soil AOCs.
- 2. Page 3-1, Section 3.2 This section indicates that four soil areas of concern (AOC) were identified that require excavation of contaminated soils. Figure 4-1 shows 5 soil AOCs (2 through 6) that require excavation.
- 3. Page 4-2, Section 4.1.1
  This section discusses the planned soil removal actions for OU
  No. 2 but does not include AOC 6. AOC 6 is indicated in
  Figure 4-1 as requiring soil removal action.
- 4. Page 4-7, Section 4.6
  The acronym HTRW is not defined in the text.
- 5. Page 8-2, Figure 8-1
  The schedule allows only 14 days for the agency review of the 90% Design / Draft Final Design Report. This is not enough time to properly review this document. A minimum of 30 days should be allotted for agency reviews. Also, future review times for RD Work Plans should be increased to a minimum of 30 days.

## Sampling and Analysis Plan Comments

- 6. Page 3-9, Section 3.2.4.3
  This section indicates a pesticide cleanup action level of  $60,000~\mu g/kg$  which corresponds to a risk level of 1E-04. The pesticide cleanup level for OU-5 was based on a 1E-06 risk level (page 1-12 of the Draft Feasibility Study for OU-5).
- 7. <u>Page 3-13, Section 3.9</u>
  The reference to the QA/QC sample requirements table does not include a table number.