

09.01-07/06/92-01150



UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS  
MARINE CORPS BASE  
CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA 28542-5001

IN REPLY REFER TO:

6286  
BEMD

06 JUL 1992

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry  
Environmental Health Scientist  
Attention: Ms. Gail D. Godfrey  
Executive Park, Building 33  
1600 Clifton Road, E-56  
Atlanta, Georgia 30333

Dear Ms. Godfrey:

Please find enclosed the transcript for the Public Meeting regarding the Proposed Plan for an Interim Remedial Action of the Shallow Aquifer at the Hadnot Point Industrial Area held on May 14, 1992. As required under the Superfund Amendment Reauthorization Act Section 117(a), this transcript will also be placed in the Administrative Record at the two Information Repositories for Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune.

If you have questions or comments, please contact Mr. George Radford, Installation Restoration Program, Environmental Management Department, at telephone (919) 451-5872/5874.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Julian I. Wooten".

JULIAN I. WOOTEN  
Acting Assistant Chief of Staff  
Environmental Management  
By direction of  
the Commanding General

Enclosure

Copy to: (w/o encl)  
LANTNAVFACENCOM Code 1823 (B. Brant)

✓

**PROPOSED PLAN FOR AN INTERIM REMEDIAL  
ACTION OF THE SHALLOW AQUIFER AT  
THE HADNOT POINT INDUSTRIAL AREA  
MARINE CORPS BASE, CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA**

**PUBLIC MEETING AGENDA**

**May 14, 1992**

Welcome & Introductions . . . . .	GEORGE RADFORD MCB, Camp Lejeune
Installation Restoration Program Overview . .	BYRON BRANT LANTDIV
History of Environmental Activities . . . . .	GEORGE RADFORD MCB, Camp Lejeune
Federal Facilities Agreement Purpose. . . . .	GEORGE RADFORD MCB, Camp Lejeune
Hadnot Point Industrial Area Overview . . . .	RAY WATTRAS Baker Env., Inc.
Summary of Previous Investigations. . . . .	RAY WATTRAS Baker Env., Inc.
Interim Remedial Action Alternatives. . . . .	RAY WATTRAS Baker Env., Inc.
Preferred Alternative . . . . .	RAY WATTRAS Baker Env., Inc.
Upcoming Activities . . . . .	RAY WATTRAS Baker Env., Inc.
Public Involvement. . . . .	GEORGE RADFORD MCB, Camp Lejeune
Questions . . . . .	GEORGE RADFORD MCB, Camp Lejeune
Conclusions . . . . .	GEORGE RADFORD MCB, Camp Lejeune

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS  
MARINE CORPS BASE, CAMP LEJEUNE  
PUBLIC MEETING

ON  
REQUIREMENTS FOR HADNOT POINT SHALLOW AQUIFER  
REMEDATION PROPOSED PLAN

May 14, 1992  
Meeting Attendees

(PLEASE PRINT) NAME	STREET OR P.O. BOX	CITY	STATE	ZIP	REPRESENTING	ADD TO MAILING LIST?
DEBRA DIAZ PICKETT	A-6 MADISON DR	HAVELOCK	NC	28532	EMD	NO
THOMAS S. MORRIS	94 PARKWAY DR.	JACKSONVILLE	NC	28540	EMD	NO
MICHAEL D. MULLIN	BOC - MCB	JAC	NC		EMD	NO
Raymond Wattras	420 Rouser Rd. Airport Office Park-Bldg. 3	Pittsburgh	PA	15108	Baker Environmental	No
TAMMI HALAPIN	420 ROUSER RD AIRPORT OFFICE PARK, Bld 3	PITTSBURGH	PA	15108	BAKER ENVIRONMENTAL	No
Cathleen M. Engels	JTMO PO Box 8438 <del>Camp Lejeune NC 28542</del>	CAMP Lejeune	NC	28542	Joint Public Affairs, CLWC	NO
Gail Godfrey	ATSDR 1600 CHFTON RD C-5B ATLANTA, GA 30244	ATLANTA	GA	30244	ATSDR	YES
Michelle M. Glenn	USEPA 345 Courtland St, NE Atlanta, GA 30365	Atlanta	GA	30365	EPA	NO
GEORGE W. RADFORD	IR PROGRAM, BLDG 1 MCB CAMP LEJEUNE	CAMP LEJEUNE	NC	28542	EMD	NO
Christie Bennett	128 Windsor Court	Jacksonville	NC	28540	EMD	No

PUBLIC MEETING

INTERIM REMEDIAL ACTION OF THE SHALLOW AQUIFER  
AT THE HADNOT POINT INDUSTRIAL AREA  
MARINE CORPS BASE, CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA

May 14, 1992  
7:00 to 7:50 P.M.  
TARAWA TERRACE I ELEMENTARY SCHOOL  
MARINE CORPS BASE  
CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA

TERRY WARNER  
Court Reporting Service  
200 Mike Loop Road  
Jacksonville, NC 28546  
(919) 346-6739

GEORGE RADFORD: I'd just like to welcome everyone here tonight. I'm George Radford, the Installation Restoration Program manager for Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune. And what we're here for tonight is to talk about the shallow aquifer at the Hadnot Point Industrial Area. What we'd like to go through is the information that's been put together on the aquifer and all the alternatives that we're looking at as far as how to remediate that, or begin the remediation.

Specifically we want to talk about a proposed plan we've put together before the public and look for any comments that anyone might have. You're welcome to ask questions as we go through this. We also welcome the submitting of questions over the next 30 days. We'll have a public comment period from the 14th--which is tonight--through June 14th to ask any questions or putting the questions to us in writing. You can send them to Byron Brant at LANTDIV, or you can send them to the base, either way.

We have some fact sheets over on the table, an agenda, and anyone that has an interest or wants to read it is welcome to take one.

The purpose of this meeting is to ensure that the public is informed of the status and findings of what we've got going on at the shallow aquifer at Hadnot Point. We want to make sure all the citizens understand the issues

that are going on, what our options are, and what our legal requirements are. We're going to provide an opportunity for formal comment on our proposed action.

If anyone has any questions as we go through, I'd ask that you give your name for the court reporter's benefit so she can include that as she does her transcript of the meeting. We have some Administrative Records that are established at two libraries. One is the base library, and it's in the old cafeteria building on base. The other one is the Onslow County Library which is on Doris Avenue. Those Administrative Records are the legal set of records of pretty much everything that's happened related to Hadnot Point shallow aquifer to this date.

At this time I'd like to turn it over to Byron Brant who's the Atlantic Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command and he's going to talk about the Installation Restoration Program.

BYRON BRANT: Thank you, George. My name is Byron Brant. I'm the Remedial Project manager with the Atlantic Division of the Naval Facilities Engineering Command. Basically I'd like to provide some background to what the Naval Facilities Engineering Command's mission is so you understand what my role is.

The Naval Facilities Engineering Command is charged with providing facilities support for Naval and Marine Corps

shore installations in an area that includes the states of Virginia, North Carolina, West Virginia, Kentucky, Puerto Rico, and also many areas on the Atlantic Ocean, installations on the Atlantic Ocean.

As I said, I'm Remedial Project manager for LANTDIV. Specifically I'm responsible for managing the Installation Restoration Program with George for Camp Lejeune. I work closely with George and his staff, and basically we're trying to work with these sites and get them cleaned up.

First, I'd like to go over the Department of Defense Installation Restoration Program briefly. It was initiated by the Department of Defense in 1975 to identify, investigate and remediate hazardous materials disposal sites, and to control potential hazards to health and the environment that might have resulted from past activities at DoD installations such as Camp Lejeune.

The process would begin typically with a preliminary assessment and site inspection--and/or site inspection. The purpose of this step is to identify threats to human health and the environment. From that point it would move to a remedial investigation, the purpose of which is to analyze contaminants and determine possible contamination migration from site and what the risks are to human health and the environment.

Once that's done, we can prepare something called a

Feasibility Study. The purpose of the Feasibility Study is to evaluate cleanup methods to achieve proper environmental standards for human health and the environment and to ensure human health and the environment are safe on that site for whatever alternative we would take.

The proposed Remedial Action Plan is something that we put together after the Feasibility Study in which the lead agency, in this case would be the Navy and Marine Corps, specifies recommended cleanup method and works closely with the regulators in that specification and explains rationale for the selected method.

At that point we would have a public commenting period and a meeting. We're having the meeting right now. This step allows for the public examination of the proposed Plan and for expression of comments to the agency. And the public meeting is held to present the Plan and answer any questions you might have.

From there we would try to achieve a Record of Decision for this site. The Record of Decision is a legal document that specifies the cleanup method after evaluating what the public comments are. At that point we would use something called a Remedial Design which prepare construction specifications and other design plans and other required documents, and from there to Remedial Action where we actually implement the Design.



At some sites it is necessary to have a continuing monitoring program, depending on groundwater monitoring and other types of monitoring depending on what those proposed plans do.

Very quickly I'd just like to go over some of the legal regulations that we're trying to abide by. First of all, the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 was legislated by the Congress to investigate and clean up or remediate areas contaminated from past waste disposal practices. And I guess the key word there is "past waste disposal practices." Those will address any sites that may be caused from current operations.

Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act of 1986, better known as SARA, confirms CERCLA's applicability to federal agencies and requires federal agencies to comply with CERCLA requirements. The amendments define the process federal agencies must follow in undertaking remedial action. It also stipulates the state and local officials must be given the opportunity to participate in the planning and selection of any remedial action.

SARA also requires the lead agency to publish a notice and brief analysis of the proposed remedial action plan and make the plan available to the public.

At this point I'd like to turn it back over to George

and he's got the discussion on the history of the activities at Camp Lejeune.

GEORGE RADFORD: I'd just like to briefly cover some of the things that have already gone on at Camp Lejeune. The first of those began in 1983, a very initial look at the sites on the base that have a potential to be considered a dump site or an old hazardous disposal site.

The formal name for the study or the report review was the Initial Assessment Study. In that we identified potential threats to human health and the environment. The main way we did that was to look at aerial photographs that compared sites of different ages, different years. And additionally, we interviewed and discussed some of the sites and the history of the sites with former employees or retirees trying to find out additional information of what might have gone on at some of these sites. That report identified 76 sites that were potentially contaminated. Out of those, the reports stated that none of those posed an immediate threat to human health or the environment. That does not mean that we don't need to take a further look at some of the sites. They were not an immediate threat that would need to take immediate action.

Twenty-two (22) of those sites warranted further investigation to assess their long-term impacts, potential for contamination migration or potential health effects long

into the future.

The Hadnot Point Industrial Area, that we're talking about tonight and the shallow aquifer being part of that site, was listed as one of those 22 sites.

In 1991, we signed along with the EPA Region IV in Atlanta, and the State Department of the Environment, Health and Natural Resources, a Federal Facilities Agreement in February of '91. And that Agreement was prompted because we were listed on the National Priorities List in November of 1989. That listing occurred after a scoring process was accomplished on the sites on base, that the initial assessment study was scored through a process developed by EPA and scoring received at some of the sites and can be listed on that priorities list.

Any sites listed on the National Priorities List must be investigated in accordance with the National Contingency Plan. That's what we've been striving to do.

Now what's the purpose of the Federal Facilities Agreement? The Federal Facility Agreement ensures that all the environmental impacts associated with all these past activities with dump sites are thoroughly investigated and the CERCLA is fully complied with and will be implemented wherever it's necessary to protect public health, welfare and the environment.

They also establish the framework within which we work

to look at the sites and investigate the sites. There are schedules in the Federal Facilities Agreement applicable to EPA, state and base. They all have to abide by it, make sure the process moves forward in a timely manner and that we make sufficient progress each year so that we can spend the money that's been appropriated to clean up the sites and investigate the sites. And also facilitates cooperation, exchange of information and the full participation of all the parties in all of our actions.

I'd like to turn it over at this point to Ray Wattras. Ray is with Baker Environmental who works with us through the Atlantic Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command as our contractor to investigate these sites and to work on all the investigative parameters, all the scientific work of installations, those type things that we need to do.

RAY WATTRAS: Good evening. My name is Ray Wattras and as George mentioned I'm the Project manager of Baker Environmental. As you already know, we're talking about the Hadnot Point Industrial Area. This site, which is referred to as Site 78, is part of an operable unit. You can define this operable unit as the Hadnot Point Industrial Area. One definition of an operable unit is that an operable unit may address geographical portions of a site--in this case Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune--or to address specific site problems or initial phases of an action. In addition, it

may consist of any set of actions performed over time or any actions that are concurrent but located in different parts of a site.

We combine three sites of operable unit number one Site 21, 24 and 78 because of two reasons. Number 1, they are located relatively close to one another and I'll show you a figure here. (Using overhead projector) This is the Hadnot Point Industrial Area. It's quite large. It's over one square mile in total area. It's bounded by Holcomb Boulevard, Sneads Ferry Road to the north, Louis Street to the east, and the southern border would primarily be the Main Service Road.

As I mentioned before, Site 21, which is located right here, it's a transformer storage lot, and Site 24 are located--one is located within Hadnot Point Industrial Area and the other one is located right along the border. Because they are that close to one another, we decided to study them because it is possible that impacts from the three sites combined could be affecting one aquifer. So there would be a good reason to study them together. And that's what we will be doing.

I'd like to talk about, or give you really a brief summary of previous investigations at the Hadnot Point Industrial Area. Various areas of concern throughout Hadnot Point have been identified by the Site Assessment Study that

was conducted by E S & E. These areas of concern have been investigated by conducting groundwater and soil investigations. And the areas of concern that appear to be problematic include the 900 Building Area and the 1600 Building Area.

Both of these Areas consist of vehicle and heavy equipment maintenance shops that used solvents in degreasing operations. It is believed that the spent solvents may have been disposed directly on the ground, or underground storage tanks, which contain fewer solvents, may be leaking. Or there could have been spills in the refueling of these storage tanks that caused the groundwater problem.

The result is that the groundwater near the 900 Area and 1600 Building Area is contaminated with solvent constituents and fuel related constituents. I'd like to point out that water supply wells near the Hadnot Point Industrial Area have been shut down since the mid 1980s.

I'd like to just turn back to the figure again. I'll show you where these areas of concern are located. (Using projector to illustrate) The 900 Building Area is located right along Sneads Ferry Road. And the 1600 Building Area is located primarily about the middle of the site itself.

With regard to the groundwater investigations at Hadnot Point, there are over 30 shallow monitoring wells in the aquifer. These wells are located throughout the Industrial

Area. The purpose of the wells, there were various areas of concern. The wells were located to monitor whether an area of concern was responsible for a problem.

In some of the wells, elevated levels of trichloroethene--otherwise known as TCE which is a solvent--and benzene, toluene, ethyl benzene, and xylene--otherwise referred to as BTEX--were detected above both state and federal drinking water standards. The extent of contamination appears to be limited and within the Hadnot Point Industrial Area to the best of our knowledge.

The shallow aquifer contains higher levels of contamination than the deeper aquifers. There are a limited number of wells in the deeper aquifer. Some of these wells, primarily the ones located near the source areas, have showed low levels of both BTEX and TCE.

I'd like to point out again, as I said before, the drinking water is obtained from the deeper aquifers. That's where the drinking water supply wells obtain their water. None of the drinking water supply wells obtain water from the shallow aquifer.

Right now because the shallow aquifer is not used as a water supply, there is no impact to human health. However, the reason we're studying this is because there is a possibility that the shallow aquifer could migrate either horizontally which would move offsite, or it could move

vertically into the deeper aquifer. And that's where the real problem lies because that's where the water supply wells obtain their water. Now the closest water supply well to Hadnot Point is over a half a mile away, approximately a half a mile away.

I have another figure here that I'd like to go over with you and this pretty much outlines the areas of contamination. As you can see in blue here, this is the boundary of the plume. As I mentioned before, there were two areas of concern that we're looking at: the 900 Building Area. This plume primarily contains the solvents. There are some low levels of BTEX observed in the wells in the southern part of this plume. The second plume is located around the 1600 Building Area, and this is the approximate boundary of contamination in the shallow aquifer.

I'd like to talk about an Interim Remedial Action for the shallow aquifer. The objective of this aquifer would be to contain the migration of contaminated groundwater in the shallow aquifer, and to reduce the level of contamination in the aquifer to acceptable state and federal drinking water standards. Baker Environmental conducted a Feasibility Study for an Interim Remedial Action and we identified seven alternatives for remediating the shallow aquifer.

I'll go over these alternatives very quickly here until



we get to another slide which I'll expand upon them. The seven alternatives are: The No Action alternative; No Action with Institutional Controls; Biological Treatment at the Hadnot Point Sewage Treatment Plant; Air Stripping; Carbon Adsorption; Thermal Treatment; and RCRA Facility. I'll explain to you what those alternatives are all about.

The No Action alternative is always included in the Feasibility Study. It is used as a base line. Even when it seems obvious sometimes that No Action may not be the right decision to make, you have to include it for purposes of comparison. In this case, of course, the No Action would not be protective of the public health or environment because it does not reduce toxicity, mobility--which is the key here--or the volume of contamination.

A second alternative, which is an offshoot of the first one, would be No Action with Institutional Controls. This alternative, there would not be any remediation of the shallow aquifer; however, there would be long term groundwater monitoring to see if the levels in the groundwater are reduced or becoming lower over time, and there would be restrictions on the use of the shallow aquifer. In other words, if somebody wanted to put--nobody would be allowed to install any shallow wells in that area.

The third alternative which is the preferred alternative is Biological Treatment. In this case what we

would do, we would extract groundwater using pumping wells. We would have four wells in each plume area. As I mentioned before, there are two (Plumes) at Hadnot Point. The groundwater after it's extracted would be pretreated to remove elevated levels of iron and other metals that could interfere with the following treatment.

After we pretreat it, we will discharge it into the sanitary sewer system which will then be treated at the Hadnot Point Industrial Area sewage treatment plant. The sewage treatment plant has a biological system and that's how we get the name of this alternative, Biological Treatment.

Following the treatment it would discharge at the sewage treatment plant, we would monitor the groundwater to see how the alternative is working. That's one reason why you want it monitored, is to evaluate the alternative itself. And finally we would place restrictions on the use of the aquifer.

The next alternative, Air Stripping, would also involve the extraction of groundwater use in pumping wells. Again, the water would need to be pretreated because of elevated metals. We would treat it on site using an air stripper. There would be two air strippers, one placed in each area of concern. After it's treated, we would discharge the water to the sanitary sewer system where it would go to the sewage

treatment plant, run through that system, and again, we would monitor groundwater and place restrictions on the aquifer.

The next alternative is identical with the exception that treating it, the previous alternative we were treating it on site using an air stripping technology. In this case we would use Carbon Adsorption.

Number 6, Thermal Treatment. Again, after extracting the groundwater using pumping wells, we would pretreat it on site. Then we would treat it using a liquid injection incinerator. This alternative, like the others, would include groundwater monitoring. There would be no discharge. Once you incinerate it, you would not have a discharge.

Finally, the last alternative, the RCRA Facility, in this case after you extract the groundwater with pumping wells, you would basically put the groundwater in trucks, take the trucks to a RCRA facility where they would treat it at the facility, and again you would monitor the groundwater and we would place restrictions on the use of the aquifer.

Very quickly I'm going to go over the cost of these alternatives along with the time to implement. The least expensive alternative is the No Action alternative. There is really virtually no cost to that alternative other than some miscellaneous administrative costs.

The second least expensive alternative is the No Action with Institutional Controls and that is just under \$1 million of the present worth cost. Those costs are primarily associated with analytical costs that you would have when you monitor the groundwater because you would have to monitor the groundwater quarterly, at least for the first five years, and then possibly annually after that.

The preferred alternative, number 3--Biological Treatment, has a present worth cost of just under \$7 million. The time to implement, we will show it here as 5 to 30 years, and I'll explain that in the next slide when I talk a little bit more about this alternative. The design and construction time would be approximately 15 months.

The next two alternatives, Air Stripping and Carbon Adsorption, are pretty much the same in costs. They are roughly \$7.6 million present worth. Again, the time to implement is roughly 5 to 30 years. Design and construction time is 15 months each.

The Thermal Treatment alternative is almost, well, almost double the cost. Incineration is costly and that is the primary reason.

Finally, the last alternative, the RCRA Facility, is very expensive. It's just under \$69 million. It's very costly to transport waste in trucks to a facility which will then treat it.

I'd like to talk a little bit more about the preferred alternative. This alternative would be effective in containing the migration of contaminated groundwater. The pumping wells would act to contain the flow of groundwater. We believe this alternative would eventually clean up the aquifer over time so that the aquifer would be cleaned up to meet both federal and state water quality criteria.

We plan to extract or install the pumping wells in phases. Initially our plans are to install four wells in each plume. We will run that operation for approximately one year. During that year we will be taking groundwater samples and we will be measuring the groundwater, the elevation of the groundwater, to see if we're containing it, and also to see if we need to install additional pumping wells.

If the groundwater is not being contained, and we don't see a reduction in contaminant levels, we will install additional pumping wells. And what we might do after the first year, at that time we will have enough information where we may decide to model the groundwater so we can get a better idea where to place the pumping wells, how many wells we might need, and at what rate the wells will be pumping.

I didn't mention before, each well would be pumping at approximately 5 gallons per minute. So from the upper plume, the one near the 900 Building Area, we would be

extracting groundwater at a rate of 20 gallons per minute. And the bottom plume, again with four wells, you would be extracting groundwater at 20 gallons per minute.

As I mentioned before, after the water is extracted, it will be pretreated and sent through the sanitary sewer system, the sewer system will be modified or upgraded. There may be some leakage in the sewer lines. It will then be sent to the sewage treatment plant where it will be biologically treated, discharged at the permitted outfall, and the permit to that outfall will need to be modified.

This alternative will involve long-term monitoring of the groundwater to assess how well the alternative is working. It would help us determine whether we needed, as I said before, to add additional wells and possibly where we might need to have the wells. Finally, there would be aquifer use restrictions.

The upcoming activities, right now this is the public comment period. It runs from May 14 through June 14. The agency plans to sign a Record of Decision by the end of September of this year. Following that, the next step would be to design the alternative. Following the design there would be the actual construction of the alternative, and of course, the start up and operation of that alternative.

As I mentioned before, during this whole process or this cleanup process, there would be long-term monitoring.

And every five years you must assess any remedial action that does not involve removal of contaminants. In this case, every five years you have to look at the information that we gather, and basically, assess whether you need to continue operating the alternative.

Now tonight's meeting is focused on the shallow aquifer at Hadnot Point. There will be additional studies that will be conducted this year and into next year. One thing that we want to look at, there will be soil investigations near the underground storage tanks where solvents may have been stored. That may be a problem area that we want to take a look at.

As I mentioned before, there are two other sites that are part of this operable unit, Site 21 and Site 24. We would also do soil investigations at those sites along with looking at the shallow aquifer at those two sites. Nothing has been done with respect to Site 24 to date.

The deep groundwater needs to be studied, so we plan on doing an investigation of the deep groundwater aquifer. That is the drinking water aquifer. Surface water and sediments, there are a few intermittent streams that lead their way to, eventually lead their way to the New River. Nothing to date has been done on surface water and sediment.

Finally, ecological assessment of the entire operable unit. The impact on wildlife, aquatic life, mammals, that

has to be assessed.

I'd like to turn it over once again to George Radford. He can tell you a little bit about the public involvement in selecting alternatives.

GAIL GODFREY, ATSDR: In planning to do air monitoring at the waste treatment plant, what would determine what kind of models are being used?

RAY WATTRAS: We conducted, we used an EPA air model which is a very conservative model. It's not real-time monitoring. This is using theoretical concentrations on what could be discharged at sewage treatment plant, and the results of the model basically, the emissions coming up would be under any type of state or federal criteria.

But that has already been looked at and we used a very conservative model. I can't remember the name of the model right now. There is a report that is in the Administrative Record. It's right now-- The title of that report is Supplement Document to the Feasibility Study. It goes into great detail about the model.

MICHELLE GLENN: Just for clarification, I think that's a draft report.

RAY WATTRAS: That is a draft report.

GAIL GODFREY: You said you would be upgrading the treatment facility before this-- (Didn't finish question before Mr. Wattras answered)



RAY WATTRAS: No, we would be upgrading the sanitary sewer line that we plan on using. We believe it is leaking. So we don't want to discharge contaminated groundwater into that sewer line. It would be upgraded.

GAIL GODFREY: And you think that the treatment facility will be able to handle-- (Didn't finish question before Mr. Wattras answered)

RAY WATTRAS: We do believe it will be able to treat the groundwater to acceptable levels. We, again, the draft Supplement Document goes into greater detail.

MICHELLE GLENN: For clarification again, that Supplemental Document is similar to what we call the Predesign Report. It's a conceptual design.

BYRON BRANT: It will be re-titled Predesign Report.

GEORGE RADFORD: Additionally, part of that Supplemental Report also discusses doing bench scale tests prior to actually using that treatment scheme and that will be accomplished at a meeting (inaudible) the EPA and state agree that that was a good idea the bench scale will be done. And that will be the final phase when we go into the actual finals for the treatment scheme.

I want to talk a little bit more about public involvement. I want to stress again there is a public comment period from May 14 to June 14. The documents that have been discussed tonight as well as all the other

documents that pertain to the Hadnot Point shallow aquifer, the IR program for the Marine Corps Base, basically any document related to the Installation Restoration Program for Marine Corps Base is at the two libraries that you see up here: The Base Library and the Onslow County Library.

We will be updating those at least quarterly as we move forward with this program with new documents, documents moved from draft final to final, they will be updated. Correspondence is in there. All that will be updated. There's a transcript being prepared of this meeting tonight. That transcript will become a part of the Administrative Record as well as the sign-in sheet that documents who attended.

Any responses or questions that we get through the public comment period will be addressed with what's called the Responsiveness Summary. That, too, will go in the Administrative Record and will become part of the legal record, the upcoming record that is scheduled to be signed in September of this year.

If you have any further questions or any need for additional information after tonight and through the next 30 days and even after that, as it says up here, contact Byron Brant who's with Atlantic Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command or myself, Installation Restoration Program manager for the base. I'm in Building 1. It's not

a hard building to find. We can answer your questions over the phone. You can come by or we'll be glad to get with you to answer any questions.

The libraries have both been informed, too, if people have questions that can't be answered by the librarian, or they get into more detail other than just the specifics about an Administrative Record is, they have our number and have been notified to please call us and we'll make arrangements to get those questions answered.

Is there anyone else that has any questions? Michelle.

MICHELLE GLENN: Yes, I'd like to just make a few comments for the record so they are available in the transcript. My name is Michelle Glenn. I'm with the Environmental Protection Agency in Region IV. That's in Atlanta. My responsibilities are oversight and partnership with the Navy and the state in conducting environmental work on the Installation Restoration Program sites.

I'd like to point out a number of documents that would be especially useful for anyone reading this transcript that would like to get specific information to help them in overseeing what's being done. A Site Management Plan is available in the Administrative Record that lays out a schedule. It's updated periodically and would give anyone reading it an opportunity to know exactly what was anticipated in the next few months.

The documents that today's presentation were based on are approved now and those documents are available for review and comment, as George said, through June 14. EPA in Atlanta will be glad to answer any questions as well, but I would reiterate that your direct contacts for commenting on the Proposed Plan in the Administrative Record would be with the Navy and the Marine Corps.

An additional document that may be of interest is the Community Relations Plan. It's a plan developed to determine how the facility can best meet the needs of the public. That document is going to be reevaluated at the conclusion of this particular stage, and it's an opportunity for the public to ask for additional involvement if they feel that that would be helpful to them.

Another item that would be of help was the different alternatives that Ray went through and described in Table 1 in the fact sheet and that may be very, very helpful because it's even more detailed than what he gave us tonight.

The only other comment I'd like to make was a distinction between an interim record decision and what's going to happen with the initial work that we're doing. The interim record decision is something that we can do right now without having every last detailed information, and it allows us to get started doing something, where we get to go out and actually start cleaning something up.

What we're hoping to do is at the end of all the other work that was described at the Hadnot Point Industrial Area is to have another decision document that ties all those loose ends together. It will give us the final decision on the shallow aquifer as well as taking care of all of the source areas and the deeper aquifer, if that's at all possible. We may have to reevaluate and break it down further, but that's our plan right now. That was all I really wanted to add.

GEORGE RADFORD: I'd also like to recognize Gail Godfrey. I think she mentioned the acronym, but it's the Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease Registry. They are also in Atlanta. She was here earlier this week for a meeting with us and stayed over.

Does anyone else have any questions?

MICHELLE GLENN: ATSDR can also be reached in Atlanta and they would like to make themselves available if you have questions.

GEORGE RADFORD: If there are no further questions, I would just like to conclude and I appreciate everyone's attendance. There will be more of these type meetings in the future addressing several other units for sites that have been identified on the base. There will be another one for this site when a complete study has been done, there will be a full Record of Decision. Thank you.