

05.07-05/04/95-01416



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

NAVY ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH CENTER
2510 WALMER AVENUE
NORFOLK, VIRGINIA 23513-2617

5090.5

Ser EP/WB:4068/

01259

4 MAY 1995

From: Commanding Officer, Navy Environmental Health Center
To: Commanding Officer, Atlantic Division, Naval Facilities
Engineering Command, ATTN: Katherine Landman, 1510 Gilbert
Street, Norfolk, VA 23511-2699

Subj: MEDICAL REVIEW OF INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM
DOCUMENTS FOR MARINE CORPS BASE, CAMP LEJEUNE, NC

Ref: (a) Baker Environmental transmittal ltr of 3 Apr 95

Encl: (1) Medical Review of Interim Feasibility Study Operable
Unit No. 10, Site 35 - Camp Geiger Area Fuel Farm,
Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina
(2) Medical/Health Comments Survey

1. As you requested in reference (a), we completed a medical review of the "Interim Feasibility Study Operable Unit No. 10, Site 35 - Camp Geiger Area Fuel Farm, Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina." The attached comments are included for your information as enclosure (1).

2. Please complete and return enclosure (2). Your comments are needed to continually improve our services to you.

3. The points of contact for this review are Ms. Wendy Bridges or Mr. David McConaughy, Health Risk Assessment Department. If you would like to discuss this medical review or if you desire further technical assistance, please call them at (804) 444-7575 or DSN 564-7575, extensions 428 and 434, respectively.

Y. P. Walker
Y. P. WALKER
By direction

**MEDICAL REVIEW OF DRAFT
FINAL
INTERIM FEASIBILITY STUDY
OPERABLE UNIT NO. 10,
SITE 35 - CAMP GEIGER AREA FUEL FARM
MARINE CORPS BASE
CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA**

General Comments:

1. The draft document entitled "Interim Feasibility Study Operable Unit No. 10, Site 35 - Camp Geiger Area Fuel Farm, Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina," dated 4 April 1995 was provided to the Navy Environmental Health Center (NAENVIRHLTHCEN) for review on 7 April 1995. The report was prepared for LANTNAVFACENGCOM by Baker Environmental, Inc.
2. Throughout this report, several tables were referenced, including the final list of Contaminants of Potential Concern (COPCs) (Table 2-1). These tables are missing from the report. Lack of this information makes it difficult to conclusively agree that the appropriate COPCs have been selected for this remediation.

Review Comments and Recommendations:

1. Page ES-5, "Summary of Site Risks"

Comment: The text states that calculations were performed to assess the human health risk for future potential exposure to groundwater and current potential exposure to fish in excess of the Region III Risk Based Concentrations (RBCs). The text does not address risks related to the exposure of surface/subsurface soil. During the construction of a highway through this site surface/subsurface soil may be stirred up causing a higher chance for inhalation of airborne Chemicals of Potential Concern (COPCs) for future construction workers.

Recommendation: The pathway involving the inhalation of airborne COPCs by future construction workers should be evaluated as a potential exposure risk or sufficient justification should be provided as to why it is not included.

2. Page 4-3, Section 4.1.3, "Remedial Action Alternative (RAA) 3: Groundwater Collection and On-Site Treatment"

Comment: Under RAA 3, collected groundwater is treated and then discharged into Brinson Creek. There is no mention of sampling the discharge before it enters Brinson Creek.

Recommendation: The groundwater should be periodically sampled before it is discharged into Brinson Creek to evaluate the effectiveness of RAA 3.

3. Page 4-4, Section 4.1.4, "RAA 4: In Situ Air Sparging and Off-Gas Carbon Adsorption"

Comment: For RAA 4, in situ air sparging and off-gas carbon adsorption will be used for the purpose of removing organic contaminants primarily via volatilization and secondarily via aerobic biodegradation. There is no mention of any air sampling which may occur to periodically monitor possible air emissions.

Recommendation: Periodic air sampling should occur to monitor the effectiveness of RAA 4.

4. Table 5-5, "Summary of Detailed Analysis Operable Unit No. 10 (Site 35), Interim Feasibility Study, CTO-0232, MCB Camp Lejeune, North Carolina"

Comment: Under the Adequacy and Reliability of Controls for RAA 2, it is stated that "enforcement is likely as Camp Geiger is a controlled military installation." Camp Geiger may no longer be a controlled military installation, once the highway is built.

Recommendation: Discuss the accessibility to Site 35 once the highway is built.

FROM: _____
 (YOUR NAME/COMMAND)
TO: NAVENVIRHLTHCEN, ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS
FAX: COM: (804) 444-7261/DSN: 564-7261

MEDICAL/HEALTH COMMENTS - YOUR VIEW

Please help us improve our review process by indicating the extent to which you agree or disagree about the comments we provided for to your activity.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. "Value added" to IR/BRAC process?	1	2	3	4	5
2. Received in a timely manner?	1	2	3	4	5
3. High level of technical expertise?	1	2	3	4	5
4. Very useful to the RPM?	1	2	3	4	5
5. Contractor incorporated comments?	1	2	3	4	5
6. Easily readable/useful format?	1	2	3	4	5
7. Overall review was of high quality?	1	2	3	4	5
8. NAVENVIRHLTHCEN was easily accessible?	1	2	3	4	5
9. NAVENVIRHLTHCEN input during scoping or workplan development would be "value added"?	1	2	3	4	5
10. Added involvement in IR/BRAC document needed?	1	2	3	4	5

Please return by fax using the box provided at the top of this page. If you have any other comments, please list them below or call Mr. David McConaughy, Health/Risk Assessment Department, at (804) 444-7575, or DSN 564, extension 434, at any time to discuss your viewpoint. As our customer, your comments and suggestions of how we can improve our services to you are important!