

05.01-02/14/96-01636



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

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

5090.5

Ser EP/WE:4123/ 03711

14 FEB 1996

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

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

Ref: (a) Baker Environmental, Inc. transmittal ltr of 21 Dec 95

Encl: (1) Medical Review of "Draft Long-Term Monitoring Work
Plan for Operable Unit No. 7, Sites 1 and 28, Marine
Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina"
(2) Medical/Health Comments Survey

1. Per reference (a), we have completed a medical review of the
"Draft Long-Term Monitoring Work Plan for Operable Unit No. 7,
Sites 1 and 28, Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina."

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

3. We are available to discuss the enclosed information by
telephone with you and, if necessary, with you and your
contractor. If you require additional assistance, please call
Mr. William H. Etheridge or Mr. David McConaughy at (804) 363-
5549 or (804) 363-5557, DSN prefix 864.

W. E. Luttrell

W. E. LUTTRELL

By direction

**MEDICAL REVIEW OF
DRAFT LONG-TERM MONITORING WORK PLAN FOR
OPERABLE UNIT NO. 7, SITES 1 AND 28
MARINE CORPS BASE
CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA**

Ref: (a) Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund, Vol I, Part A: Human Health Evaluation Manual, Dec 1989 (EPA 540/1-89/002)

General Comments:

1. The draft document entitled "Draft Long-Term Monitoring Work Plan For Operable Unit No. 7, Sites 1 and 28, Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina" dated 21 December 1995 was provided to the Navy Environmental Health Center (NAVENVIRHLTHCEN) for review on 27 December 1995. The draft Long-Term Monitoring Work Plan was prepared for the Atlantic Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command by Baker Environmental, Inc. We have only one administrative comment and recommendation concerning this document.

2. We noted in Tables 1-1 and 1-2 that the analytical results from the remedial investigation (RI) conducted at Sites 1 and 28 were often presented as "ND" and defined in the footnotes as "non-detected." Non-detected results usually are reported as sample quantitation limits (SQL) and designated with a U qualifier preceded by the SQL or contract-required quantitation limit (CRQL) (e.g., 10 U), as recommended by reference (a). Additionally, if there is reason to believe that the chemical is present in a sample at a concentration below the SQL, one-half of the SQL is used as a proxy concentration. We recommend that the "ND" footnote further define the applicable quantitation limit used rather than stating "non-detected."

Enclosure (1)