06.01-08/06/93-00997

(804) 322-4793

5090 1823:LGB:jam

AUG 06, 1993

CERTIFIED MAIL RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

State of North Carolina Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources Division of Solid Waste Management Attn: Mr. Peter Burger 512 North Salisbury Street Raleigh, North Carolina 27604

Re: MCB Camp Lejeune; Responses to DEHNR Comments on the Draft Record of Decision for Site 48 (Operable Unit 3), MCB Camp Lejeune, North Carolina

Dear Mr. Burger:

We have received your comments (letter dated June 15, 1993) to the subject draft document. The Navy/Marine Corps responses to these comments are enclosed.

Any questions concerning these responses should be directed to Ms. Linda Berry at (804) 322-4793.

Sincerely,

L. A. BOUCHER, P.E. Head Installation Restoration Section (South) Environmental Programs Branch Environmental Quality Division By direction of the Commander

Encl: Response to DEHNR Comments on the Draft Record of Decision for Site 48, MCB Camp Lejeune, North Carolina

Copy to: EPA Region IV (Ms. Michelle Glenn) MCB Camp Lejeune (Mr. Neal Paul)

Blind copy to: 1823 (LGB) (2 copies w/encls) 18S F:\admin\typeout\ST48RES.LGB Response to Comments (Letter Dated June 15, 1993) Submitted by the North Carolina DEHNR on the Draft ROD for Site 48, MCB Camp Lejeune Comment

Specific Comments

1. The second paragraph of Section 1.0 (Introduction) was revised per the comment. The last sentence now reads, " The feasibility study (FS), which normally developsRI and risk assessments (RAs) indicated that no remedial action is required at the site."

2. Section 2.0 (Site Location and Description) has been revised to include a brief discussion of the topography, vegetation, and surface water drainage at the site.

3. Figure 2 has been revised; the reference to the one suspected disposal area has been removed.

4. The discussion pertaining to the analytical results of the RI (Section 3.0) has been revised to address the compounds exceeding Federal MCLs/MCLGs or North Carolina Water Quality Standards. In addition, the text has been revised to state that TCE, phenol, and acenaphthalene were found at extremely low levels and did not exceed any groundwater criteria; and that methylene chloride was probably the result of laboratory contamination and not site related contaminants.

5. The sentence has been revised as per the comment. The second sentence in the ninth paragraph of Section 3.0 has been revised to read, "Since these two constituents were also present in the New River upstream of the site, their presence is probably not related to any release at Site 48, and no fuel related activities are suspected to have occurred at Site 48."

6. A new table (Table 2) has been added to the ROD which lists the detected concentrations of contaminants found in the groundwater samples, Federal and State groundwater criteria, and the number of detects above the groundwater criteria.

7. Two sentences in the second to last paragraph of Section 3.0 have been revised as per the comment. The second sentence of this paragraph now reads, "The detected organic compounds were identified in only a few samples per media and at concentrations that do not present a risk to human health or the environment." The third sentence now reads, " Although various inorganic compounds were detected at the site in all of the media, no specific areas of concern have been noted that would present a risk to human health or the environment."

Enclosure

8. The last sentence in the first paragraph under the Risk Assessment Conclusions (Section 7.0), has been revised to read, "Based on current data, neither soil nor groundwater were impacted from any release or suspected release of contaminants at the site."

1.118 - 1884

Enclosure