



06.01-4/28/2000-02561

**UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS**

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

IN REPLY REFER TO:

6286  
BEMD

28 APR 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: NO FURTHER REMEDIAL ACTION PLAN (NFRAP) DECISION  
DOCUMENTS FOR MARINE CORPS BASE, CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH  
CAROLINA

Encl: (1) Comments on the Draft NFRAPs for Sites 12, 68, 75, 76, & 87

1. The subject documents have been reviewed by the Installation Restoration Division. 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 (910) 451-5068.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Scott A. Brewer", is located below the list of items.

**SCOTT A. BREWER, PE**  
By direction

**Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune**  
**Comments on the Draft NFRAPs for Sites 12, 68, 75, 76, & 87**

**General Comments**

**In all the NFRAPs Section 1.1.1** states that there are six geographical locations on base. The areas listed include Montford Point and Camp Johnson. Montford Point is another name for Camp Johnson. Please correct this section by deleting the sentence that references Camp Johnson.

**SITE 68**

**Decision Summary; Page 1-1**

The last sentence on this page is duplicated as well as the first sentence on the following page. Please correct this error.

**Section 1.2.1.1 Previous Investigations Page1-4**

The first sentence discusses three wells. The second sentence starts discussing "both wells". Please correct.

**Section 2.5 Page 2-3**

The second sentence on this page contains spelling errors. Please correct.

**NC Superfund Section Comments Page 5-3**

Comment number 2. This paragraph contains spelling errors, multiple words not separated by spaces and the 4th sentence contains "moving further" duplicated. Please correct.

**Dave Lilley Comment number 3 Page 5-4**

The response to this comment states that an ecological risk assessment was not included in the SOW. Is this necessary to mention? If an ecological risk assessment is needed, we should do one. If it is not required, state that but let's take out the statement that we did not scope one as part of this assessment. It is also stated that "the contaminants were not believed to be related to this site." What evidence do we have to support this claim or belief? Let's state the reasons for this as we are basing no further action on this belief.

**Dave Liley's Comment number 4 Page 5-4**

This section states that it is highly unlikely that this site will ever be used for residential purposes. We are instituting a land use control that the site not be used for residential uses.

**General Comment**

Multiple places in this document refer to 2000 gallons of solvent reported to be disposed of at this site. After extensive testing, we have been unable to determine the location or the existence of contamination resulting from this disposal operation. The NFRAP and LUCIP are in response to contamination that we did find. Please take out references to these documents being a result of a possible disposal operation.

**Figure A-2, A-3 and A-4**

These figures show the extent of the current soil and shallow and deep groundwater contamination. The extents of contamination are labeled Boundary of current potential contamination. Please take out the word **potential**. After the extensive investigation performed at this site, we should have a definite area of known contamination. The word potential makes me think that we don't have confidence in our assessment skills and we are just covering ourselves.

**Site 75**

**Section 1.1.2 Page1-3**

The first paragraph incorrectly identifies US route 17 as bordering the eastern portion of the Base. US Route 17 actually borders the western portion of the Base.

**Section 1.2.1.1 Page 1-4**

Line 7- Insert wells. The sentence should read: as well as from three existing water supply wells in the vicinity of the site.

**Section 2.5 Page 2-2**

Line 13- Spelling error. bee. The sentence should read: Camp Lejeune has been the single...

**Site 12**

**Section 1.1.1 Page 1-3**

The six geographical locations fail to mention MCAS New River.

**Section 1.2 Site History and Enforcement Activities Page 1-3**

The last paragraph in this section states that there are enforcement activities related to this area in place at the site. What enforcement activities are in place? Please explain. Also this section says that the land use controls will be enforced through the LUCIP. It was previously determined through partnering that this site would go back to being an active range and handled under the range management plan. We will have no LUCIPs for this site. Please correct.

**Site 87**

**Section 1.1.2 Site 87**

The first paragraph states that US Route 17 makes up the eastern border of the base. The highway actually borders the base on the western side. Please correct.

**Site 76**

No Comments