

03.01 - 5/12/2000 - 02559  
46  
25 June 00



**UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS**

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

IN REPLY REFER TO:

6286  
BEMD

**2** MAY 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 SUPPLEMENTAL GROUNDWATER INVESTIGATION REPORT  
OU 17, SITES 90, 91 AND 92, MARINE CORPS BASE CAMP LEJEUNE,  
NORTH CAROLINA

Encl: (1) Comments on the Draft Supplemental Groundwater Investigation Report  
OU 17, Sites 90, 91 and 92

1. The subject document has 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.

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

**Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune**  
**Comments on the Draft Supplemental Groundwater Investigation Report OU 17,  
Sites 90, 91 and 92**

**1. Section 1.0 Introduction Page 1-1**

The first paragraph has some typographical errors. The first sentence should read, "... the Focused Remedial Investigation (RI) 'that' was conducted ...". The next to last sentence reads, "... because no permanent wells at the site." The Focused RI mentions the sampling of three permanent monitoring wells at this location. Please correct this sentence; I'm not sure what is trying to be stated here.

**2. Section 1.1 Site Description Page 1-2**

The seventh line in the first paragraph lists a fuel unloading area as a potential source of contamination. The referenced drawing lists the area as a fuel uploading area. Please correct this discrepancy.

**3. Section 3.1 Results Page 3-1**

The third paragraph states that data may be qualified as an estimate for several reasons. In the results section's tables, almost every detection of a contaminant has the qualifier J or estimate. What were the reasons for the qualifier? One of the reasons stated is that the detection may be lower than the Contract Required Detection or Quantitation Limit. Are any of these Js for this reason? If the NCWQS for TCE is 2.8 ug/l and a result of 3 ug/l gets a J qualifier because we are not requiring testing to the proper detection limit, it may be time to review the contract specs.

**4. Section 3.5 Conclusion Page 3-7**

I concur with the recommendation that additional wells need to be installed down gradient of well MW-04 to delineate the TDCE contamination. We have no information on the types of chemicals that were used at this facility for dry cleaning operations.