U.S. AIR FORCE

Pease Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting
Monday, February 28, 2022 – 6:00-9:00 p.m.
Via webinar only, no in person meeting

Meeting Summary

Meeting in Brief

This RAB meeting focused on an update on the Remedial Investigation (RI) from the Air Force and Wood. The RAB welcomed four new members: Sam Beam, Matthew Casey, Bill McQuillen, and Russell McCann. At the request of the RAB, in order to provide additional time for technical content, this meeting had a new format with pre-recorded presentations from the Air Force and Wood team and other materials given in advance. Following the presentations, RAB members had an open discussion on the RI with the technical team. The meeting closed with a public comment period. The next RAB Meeting will be held in May. At the next RAB meeting, the team will present on soil, surface water, and sediment, shellfish, freshwater fish, and poultry eggs.

This summary was produced by the facilitation team from the Consensus Building Institute. A longer summary provided by Wood can be found in Appendix A. Participants are listed on page 3.

Meeting materials: Presentations slides and meeting materials can be found at: https://www.afcec.af.mil/Home/BRAC/Pease-Archives/
Video: Recordings of RAB meetings can be found at https://youtube.com/playlist?list=PLNWsoVwtYMQvuBBvoBKWTGoTjQzF7YHVb

Air Force Cleanup and Remedial Investigation (RI) Update

Before the meeting formally started, the RAB watched a pre-recorded presentation from Chris King, Air Force, and Hank Andolsek and Amy Quintin, Wood, on the work done in recent months on the Remedial Investigation (RI). Chris King shared updates regarding Department of Defense (DOD) guidance around private wells. Hank Andolsek summarized the groundwater data that has been validated up to this point, which included information on the geology of the Pease area as the geology influences the movement of water through the site. Amy Quintin presented data related to backyard produce. The data showed there was not any PFAS uptake from soil/water for fruits and vegetables. The data showed there was not any PFOS/PFOA uptake from hydric soils, which means there was no concern for eating beef cattle grazing on grass.

A video tour of the City of Portsmouth Water Treatment Facility at Pease was also shown at this time.

Key Takeaways from the Open Discussion on the RI

Following the presentations, RAB members discussed the RI data. Key takeaways from the discussion include:

- *Understanding the data* – Given the amount of data, RAB members really appreciated getting to see the presentation and slides in advance to help prepare for conversations during the RAB

meeting. Members asked about PFAS sample results, PFAS locations and concentrations. The Wood team and Air Force provided responses, including:

- PFAS chemicals are very similar in their structure and nature. City of Portsmouth data from the treatment plant for all compounds that they test for is all non-detect as well. Our treatment works on all compounds, though there are some small chains that could break through eventually at Site 8. They are watching for new technologies to treat these chemicals as advancements will be welcome and applied here when possible.
- 500 million gallons of groundwater have been pumped from the two systems, and roughly 30 -40 pounds of PFAS have been removed.
- Regarding sediment sampling and a correlation to groundwater sampling, there is contamination in some streams leaving Pease (surface water). Hydric soils and seep samples are contaminated. But the team haven't been able to make a link between any of these conditions and the plants. The only time there was a link was when plants were in the water.
- The project team has sampled outside the site boundary and are awaiting results. Their intent was to keep extending sampling outwards until they find clean water. In six weeks, they'll be doing groundwater sampling to look at distribution of contamination and look for clean and dirty zones and move out and fill data gaps.
- Members of the RAB requested information on the total PFAS results. [Note: Hank shared a summary table of PFAS data with the RAB on March 3rd, 2022. See Appendix B].

- *Disposal* – Several RAB members had questions about how the PFAS are disposed of once detected. A few people noted concerns about the incineration of PFAS. The Air Force team specified that the PFAS removed from the site will be sent to a Class C Hazardous Waste Lined Landfill starting in late March 2022, appropriate for this type of material. RAB members indicated their interest in staying informed on the disposal process as the clean up proceeds.
- *Prevention of Future Contamination*– RAB members feel that it is important to prevent future contamination at the former base and ensure that all drinking water is safe. NHDES and Air Force project team members specified that all activities on the site are managed under state and federal policies to ensure protection of human health and the environment. Businesses operating at the former base receive notification when they are near a location undergoing remediation. The Pease Development Authority holds training to ensure companies have all information needed to comply with environmental rules and regulations.
- *State and federal standards for the design of the clean-up* – Several RAB members said the updates regarding the guidance from DOD presented by Chris King was not clear and asked for more details. The Air Force clarified that they are still waiting for implementation guidance regarding state and federal standards. RAB members asked for more detail and a deeper dive into this topic in the future and asked to hear from NHDES.

Public Comment

Members of the public were invited to give up to three minutes of public comment:

- One commentor submitted the following questions:
  - Has USAF distributed their specific guidance?

- When will specific USAF guidance or instructions be available to RABs and the public? For example: USAF Instructions 32-7020, Implement DERP.
- You stated "all" states with promulgated state standards will be used. How will these be used? Will each branch and DoD compile the state standards?

Final Thoughts

Members of the RAB were given the opportunity to share final thoughts before the close of the meeting. Comments included:

- Members of the RAB shared their appreciation for the new format and requested the same format going forward.
- A member noted that the Air Force should take the RAB's advice in designing the project.
- A couple of members requested additional data formats for information to be more 'absorbable'. This includes finer detail on where people are currently living and sharing the data in three lenses (the base itself, the Newington Peninsula, and South Newington running into Greenland).
- Several members commented that they hope that the goal of restoring the aquifer is still the focus and that the decision makers understand what is important to the local communities.
- Several members are concerned about the levels of PFAS seen today and would like to understand how long treatment will take and how effective it is likely to be.
- Members of the RAB would like to have additional discussion about state and federal guidelines. Members cited a lack of clarity from the Air Force about what to expect in terms of how it will consider state guidance or what guidance it will follow.

Next Steps/Announcements

See action items list in attached spreadsheet for ongoing tracker.

Meeting Attendees

RAB Members Present: Andrea Amico (community member and co-chair), Sam Beam (community member), Matt Casey (appointed member: NHANG), Mike Daly (appointed member: US EPA), Mike Donahue (community member), Brian Goetz (appointed member: City of Portsmouth), Joan Hamblet (community member, NH state representative), Christopher King (appointed member: Air Force Civil Engineer Center, DoD Chair), Mark Mattson (community member), Russell McCann (community member), Kim McNamara (appointed member: City of Portsmouth), William McQuillen (community member), Peter Sandin (appointed member: NHDES) Gene Schrager (community member), Maria Stowell (appointed member: Pease Development Authority).

Meeting Support Staff Present: Hank Andolsek (Wood), Ona Ferguson (Consensus Building Institute, RAB Meeting Facilitator), Linda Geissinger (AFCEC Public Affairs), Dante Gulle, (AGEISS, Public Affairs Support), Cameron Hager (Consensus Building Institute Support), Amy Quintin (Wood), Rob Singer (Wood), Sharon Vriesenga (US Air Force).

Others Present: Scott Calkin, Cliff Chase (Absolute Resource Associates), Chris Cross (Newington resident), Val de la Fuente (US Air Force), Madison Dinsmore (Wood PLC), Kelsey Dumville (US EPA), Jean Firth, Frank Getchell (Weston & Sampson), Tim Green (City of Portsmouth), Kerry Holmes (Senator Maggie Hassan), Karen Johnson,

Arnie Leriche (Wurtsmith RAB Member), Elizabeth McKenna (Senator Jeanne Shaheen), Robin Mongeon (NHDES), Albert Pratt (City of Portsmouth), Kathryn Sarsfield (Wood PLC), Brandon Shaw (Wood PLC), Joe Tellez (AFCEC), Lauren Tierney (Wood PLC), Justin Troiano (US Senator Maggie Hassan).

Appendix A: More Detailed Meeting Summary

6:00 **Technical Check and Introduction of Presentations – Ona Ferguson, CBI**

6:05 – 7:00 **Pre-recorded Presentations –** At the start of the meeting, the RAB watched a pre-recorded presentation from Chris King, Air Force, and Hank Andolsek and Amy Quintin, Wood, on recent work performed on the Pease PFAS Remedial Investigation (RI).

7:05 – 9:00 Air Force Remedial Investigation (RI) Update

Chris King shared updates on Department of Defense (DOD) guidance regarding private wells. Mr. King provided a brief overview of the CERCLA process and the proposed schedule for the remainder of the Pease RI and future activities.

Hank Andolsek summarized the groundwater data validated to date, which included information on Pease's geology as this influences the movement of water through the site.

Amy Quintin presented data on backyard produce. The data showed no PFAS uptake from soil or water for fruits and vegetables. The data showed no PFOS/PFOA uptake from hydric soils, which means there is no concern for eating beef from cattle grazing on grass.

A video tour of the City of Portsmouth Drinking Water Facility at Pease was also shown at this time.

Welcome, Introductions, RAB Business – *Ona Ferguson, Consensus Building Institute*

- Cameron Hager of CBI reviewed Zoom technology.
- Ona Ferguson reviewed the agenda/scope of the meeting.
- Ona Ferguson introduced RAB members. New members included: Sam Beam, Russell McCann, Bill McQuillen and Matt Casey
- Poll was taken to find out who watched presentations in advance.
- Summary of the September 2021 RAB meeting was approved. RAB meeting recordings can be found at: https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLNWsoVwtYMQvuBBvoBKWTGoTjQzF7YHVb

Brian Goetz City of Portsmouth

- Video tour was shown prior to the RAB of Grafton Drive City of Portsmouth Drinking Water Treatment Plant. Since April 2021, the plant has been using Resins in addition to carbon. Prior to that wells have been treated since 2015 with Granular Activated Carbon. Dual system is now running with water filtered first through the Resin then through the Carbon. It was monitored weekly, initially. Now since we have data that shows the amount is "non-detect" we have shifted to monthly sampling. To date all results are non-detect. Haven Well was reactivated in August of 2021. Will assess when to "change out" the filters based on performance data.
- Reported this to the Safe Water Advisory Group earlier in the month and are preparing Water Quality Report. He will send it to the group with data summary for 2021.

RAB member comments and questions about the PFAS Remedial Investigation Data

Andrea Amico
Thanks for preparing info in advance.
Color coded Dot Maps are helpful. Elaborate on levels. Are red dots 10 times over the limit? Can you be more specific of highest detected levels found?
Did we test for 20 vs. 5 shown on the slides? She wants to know about all of the PFAS in the water?
A: Hank Andolsek said he can toggle over each dot and get values. He also has a table that summarizes 25 compounds we analyze for. Highest concentrations are highlighted in yellow and are associated with AGQS or RSL values. They need 3 more zeros for PPT, since they are shown in PPB. He agreed to send her the table. Most are in the trough in the extraction well collection system at Site 8. One is in the AIMS extraction well and some are in the landfill areas.

Kim McNamara
Appreciated Pre-recorded and detailed presentations.
Q: Bedrock is fine if not broken, but when cracked it acts like overburden, so how much of the condition of the bedrock at Pease will play into long term cleanup goals? Are we considering new construction on Pease?
A: Chris King: There are developmental restrictions on the property related to PDA activity. All new construction is factored into the cleanup and they must work with AF to do work.
Preconditions are explained and incorporated.
A: Maria Stowell: Since beginning of development at Pease the PDA has worked with the Air Force especially in contaminated areas, a plan is presented and approved before any work is conducted.
Q: PFOS, PFOA and PFHXs were at exceedances. Does it matter? Or is remediation for each compound the same?
A: Chris King: Chemicals are very similar in their structure and nature. City of Portsmouth data from the treatment plant for ALL compounds that they test for is all non-detect as well. Our treatment works on all compounds, though there are some small chains that could break through eventually at Site 8. So we are monitoring that. We are also watching for new technologies to treat these chemicals as advancements will be welcome and applied here when possible.

Mark Mattson
Appreciated GIS data and mapping. In best case scenario, he'd like to see an optimal portrayal of the data to show the volume of each contour, of each concentration level, of each 5 compounds and estimate a lump sum of pounds of each one in the top surface sediment layer. We know how many gallons of water is being treated and reinjected, but it would be great to know the volume of PFAS in those gallons. And link this back to the performance of the treatment plant to know if we are making a difference.
A: Hank: Yes, we can optimize the display of the data. This is not exact, it is a straightforward calculation, at least for the overburden (not the bedrock) and this will be in the RI report which must include fate and transport modeling. Most transport is occurring in the overburden.

Gene Schrager
Q: How many gallons since start of this project has been collected and pumped?
A: Peter: 500 million gallons of groundwater have been pumped from the two systems, and roughly 30 - 40 pounds of PFAS have been removed. The goal of remediation is hydraulic control of the PFAS and reinjection of treated water. Vast majority may remain in the ground, but is under hydraulic control with flushing clean water back into the ground.

Q: Are there any dewatering construction projects at Pease and are they required to test it?
A: Yes, that is required of new construction or digging if it is in an area of concern, then the work must pass certain requirements. Groundwater filtering would be managed by the State.
Q: Brian, where is removed PFAS sent?
A: Previous spent carbon filters were incinerated. We are still deciding what to do with spent Resins. Brian said he reports that 170 million Gallons to date have been put through the Portsmouth systems.

Brian Goetz
Q: Regarding the Groundwater Management Zone will a new map be issued for PFOS?
A: Peter Sandin: Yes. A new zone will be established as part of the RI.
Q: Regarding sediment sampling is there a correlation to groundwater sampling?
A: Hank: Streams leaving Pease are contaminated, so surface water is contaminated. Hydric soils and seep samples are contaminated. But we haven't be able to make a link between any of these conditions and the plants. The only time there was a link was when plants were in the water.

Kim McNamara
Q: Regarding state standards for remediation, is that a choice that the RAB can make?
A: State standards are considered when federal standard is first exceeded. One triggers the other. The EPA sets the cleanup levels (the goal) in the Record of Decision. All of that will be established in a few steps down the road.
Sharon Vriesenga: This is decided in the Record of Decision stage. It is not a RAB decision. It comes down to what the law requires us to look at. If a state standard is more stringent, then that would undergo a detailed analysis to determine if a promulgated standard is appropriate and applicable and relevant.
Mike Daly: Part of the RI is to collect the data and assess it through a formal risk assessment. Once you determine you have a risk with groundwater then you look at appropriate risk based standards at both State and federal level. If you determine there is an unacceptable risk then you look at a variety of federal and state criteria. We are all looking at the data through the lense of the more strict standards during the RI process.

Kim: If we get to point where lower standards are not chosen, I want to argue against that at that time.
Q: What is being done to protect Haven well from all contamination now and in the future since it is in the middle of the flightline?
A: Hank: Now we have an extraction system and treatment system in place. Also a series of extraction wells that captures groundwater for treatment in the AIMS Plant and then the treated, clean water is injected to flush clean water back into the ground. We also have Interim Mitigation System to create a clean water shadow on the down gradient side and flush clean, treated water near Harrison and Smith wells further down gradient.
Chris: Future contamination will be prevented by the management and oversight of the Tradeport, not the Air Force. They have their own pollution controls and monitoring in place.
Maria: Airport and tenants are very aware of need to prevent future contamination. We have measures and spill plans and stormwater protection plans in place to protect Haven Well.
Peter: We have a very extensive long-term monitoring plan for the area all around Haven Well to be sure we know what is in the water years before it ever reaches Haven well.

Q: What you are removing is destroyed through incineration?
A: Hank: Yes.

Mark Mattson
Q: First GIS layer of overburden, is entire area floored by bedrock? And in some areas marine silt and clay is impervious to groundwater from overburden, how does groundwater get down to fractured bedrock if it has to go through the clay?
A: The fractured zone is in top 10 – 20 feet of bedrock. The Marine Clay Silt between upper and lower sand. Flightline area and Site 8 are "recharge areas" so water moves in 3 dimensions down and out and up and into Bay. That is how it gets into the rock.

Sam Beam
Q: Some samples are outside of PDA boundary, are we planning to sample further away?
A: We have sampled outside of the boundary and we are awaiting their results. Our intent was to keep moving out until we hit clean. Next groundwater sampling phase in 6 weeks is to look at distribution of contamination and look for clean and dirty zones and move out and fill data gaps.
Q: Is this study enough time to give us mobility rate?
A: Yes, fate and transport section is part of the RI and we will model this. For reference, the Fire Fighting Foam was used 45 years ago, and has not moved very far away, so it is not moving fast.

Andrea Amico
Q: Incineration had a temporary moratorium, what is AF and City of Portsmouth plan to handle the PFAS?
A: PFAS will go to a Class C hazardous waste landfill site. Class C is lined and high protection. We are investigating the best location for disposal and will stockpile until the disposal location is finalized. Once a new rule regarding PFAS waste disposal is made by the EPA, we will make any necessary adjustments to waste disposal methods. [Note: The Air Force had not started the landfilling at the time of the RAB. The Air Force started sending this waste to landfill in April. March was about stockpiling.]

Q: State Standards are we going to comply in NH or not for the private wells?
A: Chris King. We are waiting for Air Force Implementation Guidance. It has conditions. So far at Pease, the LHAs have been exceeded and that is being considered.
Sharon: The new policy doesn't mean we will immediately treat every well that exceeds the state standards. The policy said if there are wells that exceed the LHAs, and if there are other wells around them that are hydrogeologically connected to the wells that exceed the LHAs, and the AF has a reason to believe that those wells would eventually exceed the LHAs, then we can address those wells also and when we do address them, we are allowed (not required) to use State promulgated standards to set a level that we would cleanup to.
The Lifetime Health Advisory is 70 parts per trillion, set by EPA for PFOA and PFOS added together. Maximum Contaminant Levels are state's safe drinking water levels set for some contaminants.
Q: Wells above the LHA were intervened on before the State's MCLs. So why could we do that then, but not now?
A: *Air Force position is that if there is an exceedance of the LHA, then the AF will take action to provide alternate water. New policy is saying can we take action on wells that are below LHAs and determines when we can do that. MCLs are longer term and are relevant to the cleanup levels, not necessarily the imminent risk that an LHA is used to indicate wells requiring immediate action.*
Q: Andrea interpreted that the Air Force was not going to intervene. Andrea wants to revisit this issue in future.
A: *For those 5 wells, no decision has been made. Keep in mind an MCL is a safe drinking water standard that applies at the tap, meaning water must meet that MCL. We are talking about water coming from the ground or a private drinking water well, which is not required to meet state MCLs. MCLs do not apply*

to private wells. So they are used in a different way, often when we get to the point where we are cleaning up a groundwater source, we consider MCLs. They have a different function than LHAs.
Peter: No one is drinking contaminated water. And wells are connected hydrogeologically.
Mike: Residential wells are in bedrock so we are more confident that we know what is going on with these wells.
Q: Detection limits for fruits and vegetable, what are they?
A: *They are appropriate and lowest that lab can achieve. The process we use to set the limits considers what amount is safe, then we take 10 percent of that amount and set that as the limit we are looking for. We then confirmed that the lab could detect screening levels at this small level. There is nothing hiding in the levels that could be a risk driver. So we are confident that the detected amounts are within safe levels.*
Q: Is it possible there is PFAS in produce, but lab was not able to detect them?
A: *Never going to be a zero, always possible something could be there below detection limits. What can say is that the level we measured is not a risk to human health.*
Q: Pasture grass detected some PFAS, why?
A: Uptake factors play a role. Plants don't transfer PFAS into their tissue with same efficiency as grass. Leaves have higher transfer factor than fruits.
Peter: Backyard gardens are not irrigated by surface water that is contaminated.

Kim McNamara
I am not satisfied with legal answers, wants more details about the legalities of MCLs vs LHAs.

Mike Donahue
Q: How did we identify areas for gardens and farms? There are significant areas in Newington with high water table surface water. People don't even need to water their gardens. Are you looking at surface water in contact with growing medium than you won't find contact with PFAS.
A: Shallow groundwater is a factor, but we didn't look at them as conducive to gardening. So we asked if they had flooded areas then we wanted to know. Impacted gardens were requested to let us know. Air Force will pick this up after the meeting.

Ona
Shared that the only public comment was on how DOD guidance is applied and this was answered. Chris King is waiting for the Implementation Guidance and will share with RAB once he receives it.

Themes Ona picked up included:
- Understanding data collected, movement, quantity, disposal of contaminants.
- Protecting places now
- Discussing how standards will be chosen for the ROD

Next Steps:
- Meeting summary and Action Items spreadsheet to be sent via email
- Zoom recording will be posted
- New RAB contact list will be sent out
- Table to show levels will be sent out
- Garden question for Mr Donahue will be followed up.
- Chris King noted we are looking for Maple Syrup tapping on properties nearby.
- Next meeting will be sharing more data on sediment, fish shellfish, etc.

RAB Member Closing Thoughts

Mike Daly
Good meeting. Recording presentations was appreciated. Immense number of data points within this study. One of the most studied areas in NH. GIS is helpful lots to consider and takes time to figure out next steps. Continue to work through more data in future to figure out the remedy.

Mike Donahue
Thank you for presenting the information in advance. For future, the data would be more absorbable if you optimally could present the data in three levels: it would be perfect to see data of the base, data of North Newington peninsula and data of south Newington running into Greenland.

Brian Goetz
Would be interested to see data of concentrations displayed over time.

Joan Hamblet
Likes the format and would like to see the presentation in 3 areas.

Mark Mattson
Liked the format and for next meeting with shellfish he'd like to have look at data in advance.

Kim McNamara
Goal is simple RAB is about restoration of the aquifer vs. details. People should accept RAB's advice.

Peter Sandin
Appreciates input and concerns. Welcomed new members

Maria Stowell
Questions about operations at Pease. We are very aware of impact at and near Haven.

Bill McQuillen
Interested in first meeting. Looked at historical mission statement of RAB.

Russell McCaan
Site 8 amount of water changes in concentrations, he is interested to see this. PFAS has not been assigned Tox data. How will AF say what concentrations are lethal w/o studies to back it up?

Sam Beam
Enjoyed and learned lots. Would like a site visit. Love access to as much data as possible on all compounds.

Matt Casey
Good meeting and format. Timeline of draft RI would be good.

Andrea Amico
Welcome to new members. Thank you for new format. Coded maps are great. Levels are concerning. How is treatment in place helping with the levels? Can you predict how long treatment will take? Discussions about State guidelines are disconcerting and frustrating.

Chris King
Glad the new format was appreciated. Lots of work went into it and appreciated the work by Hank and Amy to make the new format a success.

Ona
RAB members please contact us with topics for future meetings.
Next meeting advance information will be sent via email.

***

Appendix B: PFAS Table from Wood PLC

Location		NCOORD	ECOORD	ReportingAnalyte	RESULT (UG/L)	Qualifier
08-5133	Site 8	217556	1207838	Perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (PFOS)	140	
08-5133	Site 8	217556	1207838	6:2 Fluorotelomer sulfonate (6:2 FTS)	93.8	J
EXT-6033	Site 8	217757.5	1207662.3	Perfluorohexanesulfonic acid (PFHxS)	40	
EXT-6033	Site 8	217757.5	1207662.3	Perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA)	36	
08-5133	Site 8	217556	1207838	Perfluorohexanoic acid (PFHxA)	13	
08-5133	Site 8	217556	1207838	Perfluoropentanoic acid (PFPeA)	9.4	
08-5133	Site 8	217556	1207838	8:2 Fluorotelomer sulfonate (8:2 FTS)	6.3	
08-5133	Site 8	217556	1207838	Perfluoroheptanesulfonic acid (PFHpS)	4.27	
08-5133	Site 8	217556	1207838	Perfluoroheptanoic acid (PFHpA)	3.5	
08-6025	Site 8	218699.1	1207981.6	Perfluorobutanesulfonic acid (PFBS)	2.7	J
08-5133	Site 8	217556	1207838	Perfluorobutanoic acid (PFBA)	2.5	
05-6003	Site 8	218977.4	1213144	Perfluoropentanesulfonic acid (PFPeS)	1.22	
08-514	Site 8	217882.5	1208139.6	Perfluorooctane sulfonamide (PFOSA)	0.58	
177-5042	AIMS Cut off Extraction	213698.8	1210840.8	Perfluorononanoic acid (PFNA)	0.357	
05-5007	Landfill 5	217971.4	1211884.5	Perfluorotetradecanoic acid (PFTeDA)	0.24	J
05-625	Landfill 5	218068	1211710	Perfluorononanesulfonic acid (PFNS)	0.17	
177-4033	Site 8	217826.8	1208056.7	Perfluorodecanoic acid (PFDA)	0.088	J
05-625	Landfill 5	218068	1211710	4:2 Fluorotelomer sulfonate (4:2 FTS)	0.0521	
177-4029	Site 8	217772.9	1207940.9	Perfluorodecane sulfonate (PFDS)	0.052	J
6084	Zone 3, near Site 34	211084	1211756	Perfluoroundecanoic acid (PFUnA)	0.007	J
73-5816	Site 73 (near AIMS)	213770	1211400	Perfluorododecanoic acid (PFDoA)	0.0065	J
73-5816	Site 73 (near AIMS)	213770	1211400	Perfluorotridecanoic acid (PFTrDA)	0.0056	J
All Locations	-			N-Ethyl perfluorooctanesulfonamidoacetic acid (N-EtFOSAA)	ND	
All Locations	-			N-Methyl Perfluorooctane Sulfonamide (N-MeFOSA)	ND	
All Locations	-			N-Methyl perfluorooctanesulfonamidoacetic acid (N-MeFOSAA)	ND	

Highligted: Compound has AGQS or RSL value