

8/17/01-3374

FW Comments on 78 MNA.txt

From: Stevens, Kirk (EFDLANT)
Sent: Friday, August 17, 2001 10:02 AM
To: Capito, Bonnie P. (EFDLANT)
Subject: FW: Comments on 78 MNA

For Admin Record.

Thanks

-----Original Message-----

From: Raines GS12 Rick H [mailto:RainesRH@lejeune.usmc.mil]
Sent: Friday, August 17, 2001 9:41 AM
To: Burton GS09 Thomas H; Stevens, Kirk (EFDLANT)
Subject: Comments on 78 MNA

Kirk,
Here are my comments for this report. Thomas may have additional comments to add.
Rick

Comments on Site 78 NAE

General Comments

This report will eventually serve as one of the lines of evidence for changing the remediation technology at this site to MNA. The document needs to have all the info supporting MNA laid out in an easy to follow route that leads to MNA as the technology of choice. The way the document is presented it is hard to find and put together the maps and tables with the appropriate text. i.e.. the text will say one thing but it is not evident from the maps and tables. There is good data presented in this report it just needs to be presented in a way that supports MNA at this site.

1. Section 1.3, Page 1-2

The second paragraph states that the ROD specifies the pump and treat system for site remediation. In fact the ROD states that the system is for the control of contaminant migration. Please add this to the statement.

The last paragraph references Figure 1-2 as the extent of present plume for site 78. Fig 1-3 should be the figure referenced in this section.

Section 4 Figures

Is there an explanation for the differences between the contaminant plume maps that are presented for the Oct. 2000 sampling round and the Jan 2001 sampling round? An example would be well 78-GW24 which showed a result of 16 ppb in Oct (map 4-14) and 15ppb in Jan (map 4-15) yet the modeling produce significantly varied maps. It would seem that different algorithms are being used for the different sampling events modeling and it is difficult to compare the two.

Section 5.2.2.1 Page 5-2

This section states that figures 4-4, 4-12 and 4-13 illustrates the BTEX levels at the site during three sampling events. The figures show the same sampling results for the Sept 2000 sampling round in different ways. Please correct.

Section 5.2.2.9 Page 5-4

This section states that new well 78-GW45 was installed as a background well. What were the results of the chloride sampling from this well? Where is the review of the background

Section 8.2.1 Page 8-2

FW Comments on 78 MNA.txt

The second paragraph second sentence has a typographical error. The statement discussing enhanced biological processes needs to be rewritten to make sense.