03.01-02/27/95-01375



UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS MARINE CORPS BASE PSC BOX 20004

CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA 28542-0004

Admin Rec

IN REPLY REFER TO:

6286 BEMD 7 FEB 1995

From: Commanding General, Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune To: Commander, Atlantic Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Attn: Ms. Kate Landman (Code 1824), 1510 Gilbert Street, Norfolk, Virginia 23511-2699

Subj: DRAFT INTERIM FEASIBILITY STUDY, OPERABLE UNIT 10, SITE 35

Encl: (1) Comments concerning the Draft Interim Feasibility Study, Operable Unit 10, Site 35

1. The subject document has been reviewed by the Installation Restoration Division. Our comments are contained 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.

ilius.

ROBERT L. WARREN By direction

COMMENTS CONCERNING THE DRAFT INTERIM FEASIBILITY STUDY, OPERABLE UNIT 10, SITE 35

1. Page ES-2, para 1; and page 1-3, para 3 - Please substitute ". . . although no records of the incident are available," for the statement: ". . . although records of the incident have since been destroyed" to indicate that the records cannot be obtained.

2. Page ES-7, last para; page ES-9, page ES-10, para 2; page 4-1, last para; page 4-3, para 3; and page 5-6, para 2 - Baker Environmental, Incorporated; COMLANTNAVFACENGCOM; and Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune are still attempting to work out how to approach the North Carolina Department of Transportation for access on the creek side of the new highway.

3. Table ES-4 (Continued) and Table 5-5 (Continued) - In the Implementability section for RAA3, RAA4, and the In Well Aeration and Off-Gas Carbon Adsorption alternative, there is a sentence stating: "Air and water discharge permits required." As a Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act site, permits are not required providing the intent is met.

4. Page ES-12, para 7 - Replace the word "priority" with the word proprietary.

5. Page 1-26, last bullet - How does this new recommended Interim Remedial Action Feasibility Study differ from what we have already done or have planned?

6. Table 3-2 (Continued) - In the description column of the Collection Actions General Response Action, a reference is made to the use of "injection wells" to inject uncontaminated groundwater to enhance collection of contaminated or "material" into the aquifer to remediate groundwater in-situ. Will the North Carolina Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources approve this technology? In the past they have frowned on this activity.

Enclosure (1)