

07.01-8/11/2000-02563



UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS BASE
PSC BOX 20004
CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA 28542-0004

IN REPLY REFER TO:

6286
BEMD

11 AUG 2000

From: Commanding General, Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune
To: Commander, Atlantic Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command,
(Code 1823), 1510 Gilbert Street, Norfolk, Virginia 23511-2699

Subj: DRAFT FISCAL YEAR 2001 SITE MANAGEMENT PLAN, MARINE CORPS
BASE CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA

Encl: (1) Comments on the Draft FY01 Site Management Plan

1. The Installation Restoration Division has reviewed the subject document. The comments are contained in the enclosure.
2. It is requested that the Installation Restoration Division, Environmental Management Department, Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune be notified of the actions taken to accommodate the comments.
3. If you have any questions or comments, please contact Mr. Rick Raines, Installation Restoration Division, Environmental Management Department, at DSN 751-5068 or commercial telephone number (910) 451-5068.

SCOTT A. BREWER, PE
By direction

Comments on FY01 Site Management Plan

1. Section 1.5 Page 1-3 Federal Facilities Agreement

This section states that we are currently assessing the need to amend the FFA. I am not aware of any proposed changes to the FFA. Please elaborate.

2. Section 2.1.3 Page 2-2 Site 78

The south plant was shut down in FY00 so we could do a NAE. Please include.

3. Section 2.2.1 Page 2-3 Site 6

DRMO was temporarily allowed back on the site in FY00. They were allowed back on through reuse of the site under the LUCIP. Is this relevant to this section?

4. Section 2.2.2 Page 2-3 Site 9

The new fire-training pit is complete. The contaminated soils under the pit were excavated. The fire-training pit will remain a POL Spill Training Pit.

5. Section 2.6.1 Page 2-6 Site 36

The third paragraph states that the offsite groundwater monitoring wells will be installed. The wells have been installed and no GW contamination was discovered. We now have engineering evidence that the GW will not flow under the creek, therefore, no contamination will migrate onto off-site properties.

6. Section 2.6.3 Page 2-7 Site 44

The third paragraph states that contamination in the creek was traced back to sites 89 and 93. The contamination that ended up in the creek originated at Site 89 not 93. Please correct.

7. Section 2.6.5 Page 2-8 Site 86

This site has been taken out of the ROD for OU6 due to inconsistencies in contaminant analyzes. This site will now be OU20. Please correct.

8. Section 2.7.1 Page 2-9 Site 1

The last sentence states that the monitoring program will be modified. How will it be modified? How many wells will be added or subtracted from the monitoring program?

9. Section 2.7.2 Page 2-10 Site 28

The last sentence states that the monitoring program will be modified. How will it be modified? How many wells will be added or subtracted from the monitoring program?

10. Section 2.12.1 Page 2-14 Site 3

The soils have been excavated from the site and will be disposed of at the landfill. We need to update this section and include information concerning the amended ROD.

11. Section 2.14 Page 2-15 Site 69

The ROD that was just signed was an IROD.

12. Section 2.15 Page 2-16 Site 88

The FS will not be prepared or completed in FY2001. It will probably be in FY2002 or 2003. This needs to be addressed in two separate locations in this site description.

13. Page 2-20

There needs to be a new section to deal with OU20 Site 86, which was taken out of OU6. This needs to be addressed in all the associated tables as well.