

**Response to Comments  
Pilot Study Report  
Site 82, Operable Unit 2  
MCB Camp Lejeune, North Carolina**

---

PREPARED FOR: Bob Lowder, MCB Camp Lejeune  
Gary Tysor, NAVFAC Mid-Atlantic  
Gena Townsend, EPA Region 4  
Randy McElveen, NCDENR

PREPARED BY: CH2M HILL

DATE: December 23, 2008

### **Introduction**

The purpose of this document is to address comments on the Pilot Study Report for Site 82, Operable Unit 2. Comments were provided by the North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources (NCDENR). The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) indicated in the August 2008 Partnering Meeting that they had no comments on the report. The responses to comments are provided in bold.

**Comments from Randy McElveen  
North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources  
Dated June 6, 2008**

### **Specific Comments**

1. Please review all Tables and Figures references throughout the report. Many of the references are incorrect. Concentration data is referenced in Section 3.6.1 on page 3-5. Table 3-5 is Wet Chemistry Parameters not concentration data. Please make appropriate corrections.

**The references for the tables and figures have been corrected.**

2. Table 3-6 is referenced at the top of page 3-6 for water quality parameters during the pilot study. Table 3-6 is concentrations of concern (COCs) data. Please make appropriate corrections.

**The table numbering and references have been corrected.**

3. Section 3.6.3 on page 3-6 references Section 3.5.3 for the description of a bromide tracer. Section 3.5.3 is not included in the Draft Report. Please make appropriate corrections in the Final Report.

**The section reference has been corrected.**

4. Section 4.1 on page 4-1 references Table 3.1 as a Summary of typical VOC concentrations. Table 3-1 in the text of the report on page 3-1 is a chronology of events not VOC concentrations. Please make appropriate corrections.

**The referenced table has been corrected.**

5. In the Recommendations Section on page 5-1 it discusses the locations of the existing extraction wells such as 6-DRW01 as "not being ideally located to efficiently extract impacted groundwater". It is likely that the cone of influence around the injection wells (6-DRW01) have been cleaned up but nearby contaminants, with a greater travel time to the extraction well, are being pulled into the extraction wells. When the extraction wells are shut down the cone of depression around the extraction wells is filled with clean recharge water. For locating DNAPL, these locations are probably very good. If the concentrations around the extraction wells are low this would actually be ideal conditions for a recirculation treatment system. Inject ERD or other substrate into the intermediate areas of the extraction wells and recirculate it back into the extraction well.

**Noted. The results are as discussed in the report. The Camp Lejeune Partnering Team should discuss the site approach and any future actions for further reducing contaminant concentrations.**