

Former Wurtsmith AFB  
**Virtual Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting**  
 15 April 2020  
**GoToWebinar**  
 5 – 7:20 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time

**Final Meeting Minutes**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Authority/Affiliation</b>	<b>Attendance</b>
<b>RAB Co-Chairs</b>		
David Gibson	AFCEC, Co-Chair	Present
Arnie Leriche	Community RAB Member, Co-Chair	Present
<b>Public Seats</b>		
Tim Cummings	Oscoda Township	Present
Jeffrey Moss	AuSable Township	Present
Beth Place	EGLE	Present
Mike Munson	OWAA	Present
Denise Bryan	DHD2	Present
Abiy Mussa	MDHHS	Present
Jessica Stuntebeck	USDA Forest Service	Present
<b>RAB Primary Members</b>		
Daniel Stock	Community RAB Member	Present
Robert Tasiar	Community RAB Member	Present
Joe Maxwell	Community RAB Member	Present
William Gaines	Community RAB Member	Present
Cathy Wusterbarth	Community RAB Member	Present
Ryan Mertz	Community RAB Member	Present
Jerry Schmidt	Community RAB Member	Present
Catherine Larive	Community RAB Member	Present
<b>RAB Alternate Members</b>		
David Winn	Community RAB Member	Present
Rex Vaughn	Community RAB Member	Present
Greg Schulz	Community RAB Member	Present
Jeff Gottlieb	Community RAB Member	Not Present
Scott Lingo	Community RAB Member	Not Present
Mark Henry	Community RAB Member	Not Present
Aaron Weed	Oscoda Township	Present
John Nordeen	Oscoda Township	Not Present
Leisa Sutton	AuSable Township	Not Present
<b>RAB Support</b>		
Malcolm McClendon	AFIMSC/PA	Present
Natausha Bly	AFIMSC/PA Contractor CNMC	Present

**Meeting Video Link:** <https://youtu.be/RwA9N6ddSHY>

Attachment 1: Agenda

Attachment 2: Presentation

Attachment 3: PFOS PFOA Tracker

Attachment 4: AI Tracker

RAB Documents: <https://www.afcec.af.mil/Home/BRAC/Wurtsmith/RAB.aspx>

### Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Malcolm McClendon, facilitator, began the Wurtsmith Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting at 5:00EDT, explained how to use the GoToWebinar program being used to livestream the meeting, and facilitated RAB member introductions and asked co-chairs for opening remarks.

Mr. David “Dave” Gibson, Air Force RAB co-chair and Project Manager with the Air Force Civil Engineer Center, introduced himself.

### Stakeholder Updates

RAB members provided updates on some of the actions which have occurred since the last quarterly meeting.

#### **U.S. Air Force (USAF) (0h:8m:36s)**

Mr. Gibson provided the USAF update:

- USAF installed in-situ anaerobic biodegradation at SS057.
- USAF completed two rounds of quarterly drinking water monitoring.
- USAF installed an ion exchange treatment system at the Mission Street plant.
- The final ESI report was released. EGLE provided comments; responses to comments are expected in about one week.
- The Five-Year Review report is coming out soon.

Mr. Gibson asked for questions. After receiving one about the in-situ biodegradation at SS057, he proposed discussing it as a topic at the next RAB meeting. Arnie Leriche, community RAB member and co-chair, approved.

#### **EGLE (0h:13m:55s)**

Mr. McClendon called for updates from EGLE.

Beth Place said EGLE continues to review documents. She said the long-term monitoring report and pump-and-treat system report are with the Air Force; they are waiting for responses to comments submitted in the previous month.

The Bay CityRe office will continue to conduct quarterly sampling at select monitoring wells in the area. EGLE will continue to share results.

EGLE is still running monthly PFAS coordination calls w/ stakeholders, having smaller meetings with the NOW community group, and organizing a community meeting with the RAB member president.

Mike Neller said that after reviewing ESI, EGLE submitted a request for interim actions to move forward in parallel with RI. They include:

- 1.) Expansion of the capture field at FT02.
- 2.) Take actions to prevent migration of Van Etten Lake beach plume

- 3.) Remove the source: a waste pond by former wastewater treatment plant
- 4.) ESI proposal to expand Mission Street pump-and-treat system

Mr. Neller said that after reviewing ESI, all disputes are answered. He will be issuing a letter to the AF saying that EGLE feels that all disputes have been resolved.

#### **Community RAB Members (0h:18m:54s)**

Mr. Leriche gave an update. Audio unclear due to technical issues (0h:18m:59s). They have attended conferences and seminars on remediation technologies; CERCLA process and schedules; and health and human risk assessments and screenings being done at other bases. They've also attended seminars on ecological risk assessments and PFAS transformation. There have been no personnel changes.

Future issues include needing training for new members and for technology, and to keep up with CERCLA.

Significant projects include the timing of interim mitigation action; Mr. Leriche suggested the AF Snapshot recognizes interim mitigation actions after the SI but before the remedial investigation process.

Mr. Leriche said there have not been any human health risk assessments at Wurtsmith.

#### **NOW (0h:22m:20s)**

Cathy Wusterbarth read a priority statement from NOW, summarized as follows:

*It is Need Our Water's top priority to have the Air Force stop the flow of PFAS contaminations into all Oscoda-area surface waters by no later than 2023, including remediation with the utmost speed and urgency of the PFAS plumes impacting Van Etten Lake.*

Ms. Wusterbarth urged consideration for any and all actions that could clean up PFAS contamination.

#### **Robert Tasior (0h:27m:20s)**

Robert Tasior expressed his thanks for the remediation efforts. He expressed his disappointment in the Air Force and state agencies for excluding his community from decisions that affect the community, stating that they have never been asked to vote on Air Force remediation efforts.

Mr. Tasior said the Air Force is not following the procedures it agreed to. He said section 2.2 "Frequency" states the Air Force will hold public RAB meetings at least once every three months or as deemed necessary by the majority of the RAB members. He asked if this rule has ever been followed and stated that he has never had a vote on changing that rule.

Mr. Tasior stated that the Air Force has been meeting monthly with EGLE. He asked why they are meeting without someone from his community in attendance for remediation planning input. He objected to procedure violations by the Air Force.

#### **OWAA (0h:31m:32s)**

## Former Wurtsmith AFB Restoration Advisory Board Meeting

Final Meeting Minutes

15 April 2020

Mike Munson gave an update on the community build operations in and around Clark's Marsh, stating that there would be no building in that area. He said there was no action item created to address Clark's Marsh contamination and that the Air Force should be charged to do so.

### MDHHS (0h:32m:55s)

Abiy Mussa provided updates.

- A public health advisory was issued in March for all residents, aquatic, and semi-aquatic wildlife from Clark's Marsh.
- MDHHS mailed over 400 letters to residents in the Oscoda area to resample their well water. Resampling includes drinking water waste previously tested for PFAS. They've also called residents to make appointments to collect water samples. Sampling is on hold due to the COVID-19 emergency.
- A core team was formed for the Oscoda project. They plan to hold a listening session in Oscoda to get input from residents and to form a stakeholder group. A date wasn't finalized yet.

### AuSable Township (0h:35m:30s)

Jeffrey Moss asked to increase and expand testing as there are elevated PFAS levels in the river. He urged action to determine the contamination source and to monitor the distance it has spread.

### Oscoda Township (0h:37m:17s)

Tim Cummings supported Mr. Leriche's call for interim actions before remedial investigation, stating the RI wouldn't be completed until 2022. He asked to know if EGLE will push for interim action with urgency.

### Department of Health (0h:38m:55s)

DH urged a united approach, recognizing efforts in both scientific progress and legislation. She expressed urgency in seeing interim action at the same level as response efforts for COVID-19. She thanked attendees for listening.

### US Forest Service (0h:41m:39s)

<Audio Issues> Ben Wiese introduced himself and expressed the USFS's readiness to help.

### EGLE Transducer Study Results (0h:43m:52s)

Jeremiah Morse presented the transducer study update.

- **Objectives**  
Mr. Morse presented an area map of the high PFAS concentrations found by off-base sampling.
- **Scope of Study**  
Mr. Morse explained how pressure transducers installed in 20 EGLE monitoring wells and one at the Van Etten Lake dam gathered data for the study.
- **Results**  
Mr. Morse presented a groundwater topography map that details the direction of groundwater flow. He provided context examples of groundwater paths discovered in the study and compared multiple maps to demonstrate seasonal differences in groundwater flow.

Mr. Morse stated the results, transcribed below:

*In conclusion of this study, groundwater conditions east of Van Etten Lake are similar to previous studies. The groundwater flows south of Cedar Lake South and divides either east in Lake Huron*

*or west in Van Etten Lake. Based on the current set of data from this and previous studies combined with the current hydrogeologic understanding of this area, it is unlikely PFAS-impacted groundwater from the former base is migrating beneath the lake, impacting groundwater north and east of Van Etten Lake.*

*However, there is influence of near-shore groundwater levels around the southeastern end of Van Etten Lake due to the seasonal and artificial raising and lowering of the lake level as shown in this figure. This lake level influence may have implications for understanding detections of PFAS in groundwater within a few hundred feet of Van Etten Lake shore.*

*Three of these possibilities are:*

- 1.) Elevated near-shore detections of PFAS may be from the undetermined sources up groundwater gradients;*
- 2.) PFAS-impacted groundwater discharging from the former base into Van Etten Lake could be impacting the surface water and then surface water is infiltrating into near-shore groundwater along the southeastern end of the lake; or*
- 3.) It could be a combination of either of these two processes. However, more data is needed focusing on that southeastern near-shore area before the exact mechanism impacting your shore groundwater is understood.*

- **Next Steps**

Beth Place said that EGLE will be asking the Air Force to determine how far the PFAS is moving off of the base and how it is moving off of the base.

Mr. McClendon called for RAB member comments and questions:

- Mr. Leriche stated at 0h:59m:55s  
*Regarding the remedial investigation including a conceptual site model and the fate transport that [Beth Place] just said, I want to make clear that the Air Force is going to be doing their own independent conceptual site model and flow and characterization of PFAS off the base to include the same area that we were just briefed on.*  
>>Mr. Leriche was asked if he has a question or a statement.
- Mr. Leriche asked at 1h:00m:37s  
*Am I correct? Is the Air Force going to include in their CSM and fate transport this particular area or is that a done deal because of what we were just briefed on by EGLE?*  
>>Mr. Leriche was asked which particular area he was referring to; he replied that it was southeast of Van Etten Lake toward Lake Huron. Air Force Co-Chair Mr. Gibson asked Mr. Leriche to submit a written statement to be more specific.
- Mr. Leriche asked at 1h:01m:12s  
*So you had no intention to do any further investigation in your RI?*  
>>Gibson said: On the east side of Van Etten Lake.
- Mr. Leriche asked at 1h:01m:21s  
*And there's a determination in the ESI to say that? So there's no data gap on this issue?*  
>>Mr. Leriche was asked to submit the question in writing with more specifics at a later time to get a more accurate answer. He confirmed the time period to submit additional questions.
- Bill Gaines stated at 1h:02m:13s  
*I might make the point that the USGS survey also has a big question mark in the same area, and*

*CERCLA requires not absolute proof but just the possibility of base-related contamination in order to require remedial action.*

- Beth Place stated at 1h:03m:06s

*I just wanted to say that in no way is this meant to replace the CSM for the remedial investigation. We're demonstrating the information that we've collected so far and this is what we have so far based on EGLE investigations and so that's what we're trying to convey here. Thank you.*

#### **USAF Expanded Site Inspection Findings (1h:03m:38s)**

Mr. Gibson presented with a PowerPoint presentation, briefly summarized below:

- **CERCLA Investigation Progress**  
Explained where the Air Force is in the CERCLA process (Expanded Site Inspections completed; Remedial Investigation upcoming).
- **CERCLA Investigation History**  
Explained how the Air Force followed each step in the CERCLA investigation process.
- **ESI Overview**  
Explained the Priority Areas, Purpose, and five Objectives of the ESI.
- **Objective 1 (Areas 1 and 15; Areas 2 and 7; Areas 4 and 6)**  
Presented three figures on "Approximate Extent of PFOS/PFOA Concentration" at varying depths. Presented one figure on modeled particle tracks. Explained Area findings.
- **Objective 2 and 3**  
Gave further detail on AFFF Area 12 for Objective 2. Completion of Objective 3 was confirmed.
- **Objective 4**  
Presented findings for the different Areas.
- **Objective 5**  
Presented two ESI Recommendations.
- **Final ESI Findings (1h:12m:39s)**  
Explained the three possible responses following a Site Inspection Phase. *Based upon the ESI, where we are is conducting the continuation of the remedial investigation approach.* Mr. Gibson explained the reasoning for the decision.

Mr. Gibson asked for questions.

- Mr. Leriche asked at 1h:14m:10s  
*Has the Air Force done any evaluation or determination for the ESI with the data EGLE has provided since 2012 regarding "Do not eat the fish" in Clark's Marsh and AuSable, and recently in 2018 "Do not eat the deer" to make the determination that there is no imminent hazard to human health?*  
>>Mr. Gibson replied, summarized as: *I cannot speak directly to the knowledge that the DoD or the Air Force is actually examining EGLE's data, though I am aware that DOD does have a PFAS working group of scientists that are working with various organizations such as ATSDR. They are looking at this information on toxicology and evaluating with them what that might lead to as far as decision-making for DoD and the Air Force. At this point, I don't know any definitive criteria beyond the lifetime health advisory that would be in line to be considered by DOD or a regulatory agency to cause determination of an imminent health hazard.*
- Mr. Leriche stated at 1h:16m:00s  
*Okay, but I'd just like to repeat what I shared with the Air Force a year and a half ago, and that it is that at Pease Air Force base, EPA provided criteria for doing human health risk assessments*

## Former Wurtsmith AFB Restoration Advisory Board Meeting

Final Meeting Minutes

15 April 2020

*and one of them was the flesh of animals. For screening criteria, it was lower than the "Do Not Eat" that EGLE has set, which was 300 parts per billion, so they've blown that by three or four times over the EPA criteria that was set in 2017. [It's] something that I would ask the Air Force to look into.*

*>>Mr. Mussa replied, summarized as: We have a "Do Not Eat Fish" advisory on Clark's Marsh since 2012 and the amount of PFAS that has been found in the fish is in the thousands range. Also, we have a "Do Not Eat Deer" advisory from Clark's Marsh due to PFOS being found at two times the "Do Not Eat" level. We also have a surface water concentration in the thousands. We have a "Do Not Eat" public health advisory particularly for resident wildlife at Clark's Marsh, so we have all those health evaluations and advisories in the area. Also, we have the foam advisory from Van Etten Lake. Since 2011, we have a couple public health advisories that are in place based on the data.*

*>>Mr Gibson replied, summarized as: I think the imminent health hazard would be similar to an Air Force base where they found through the ESI for PFAS that the actual water supply contained PFOS/PFOA above the lifetime health advisory. The municipal water supply contained PFOS/PFOA above the lifetime health advisory for people to use daily. That's an imminent health hazard, which is immediate action criteria.*

Mr. McClendon reminded participants of time constraints and requested further questions and discussions be addressed at the end of the presentations.

<<BREAK (Skipped, 1h:20m:05s)>>

### Presentation

#### USAF Remedial Investigation Plan (1h:20m:14s)

Mr. Gibson presented a PowerPoint presentation, briefly summarized as:

- **Remedial Investigation**  
Explained that funds were received one year early, which means the contract will proceed one year early.
- **RI/FS Process**  
Explained Scoping and Site Characterization for Remedial Investigations. Contract should be awarded by Sept. 2020. Explained roles and duties in the RI/FS process.
- **Projected RI Schedule**  
Presented and explained a timeline from Sept. 2020 to Aug. 2022

Mr. Moss asked if FY2020 funds being awarded were for interim action; Mr. Gibson clarified that they are for conducting the remedial investigation.

Mr. Moss asked if funding wasn't assigned previously for the RI and if the RI would have been put on contract if Congress didn't provide funds this year; Mr. Gibson confirmed the work to get the RI on contract could not be done if Congress didn't provide funds this year because AFCEC uses funds from Congress to execute work.

Mr. Moss contested that:

- 1.) It appeared that the FY2020 funds were for remediation action, not investigation; and
- 2.) Wurtsmith meets criteria for interim action.

**Audience Questions (1h:37m:00s)**

Mr. McClendon called for questions and read those from the video broadcast chat log, summarized as follows:

- Mr. Tasiar asked at 1h:37m:05s  
*When are we going to get to remediation?*  
>>Mr. Gibson explained that remediation happens after getting a Record of Decision and provided further details. He provided a second statement at 1h:40m:30s to further explain.
- Mr. Leriche stated at 1:39m:05s  
*In the Air Force instructional manual I referenced before it says, "Interim Remedial Action: Conduct short term actions to address immediate threats to the environment or to prevent further contaminant migration". The second bullet is "Remedial actions taken during the RI that are not complete or final remedial action." That's the definition of an interim mitigation action and there's evidence at Wurtsmith that the Air Force took one at FT02 long before the RI stage. We've got a definitional problem that we've had for years.*
- Daniel Stock asked at 1h:42m:30s  
*Will any of the RI money be used to determine what needs to be done for Clark's Marsh?*  
>>Mr. Gibson said yes.
- M. McClendon asked at 1h:42m:52s  
*The community schools have two-thirds of the population of economic level requiring free reduced lunch. This means there are public health issues not covered by drinking water. Will the Air Force not recognize Deer and fish in the Clarks Marsh area as a human health hazard?*  
>>Question Unanswered
- Aaron Weed asked at 1h:43m:50s  
*Based on slide 45, does this timeline mean that the earliest we will see remediation infrastructure to be installed is 2024?*  
>>Mr. Gibson confirmed that is possible.
- Mr. Weed asked at 1h:44m:44s  
*How is the EGLE data that already exists and all the data gathered from the Air Force not enough data?*  
>>Mr. Gibson explained that the data collected on groundwater will be used but further data is needed for drinking water pathways.
- Mr. Moss asked at 1h:45m:58s  
*Is it my understanding now that based on this particular conversation, drinking water was the primary focus of the Air Force but now that we're starting the RI portion of this investigation, we can start bringing forth the surface water issues that we've been talking about the last couple of years that have not been the focus of this panel?*  
>>Mr. Gibson said yes.
- Mr. Cummings stated at 1h:46m:56s  
*After nearly thirty years, we're still talking about an RI needing to be completed. As I pointed out to the Air Force at a BRAC meeting in Fall 2016, mother nature is outpacing the Air Force as it documents and analyzes. In the meantime, the contamination spreads further off your old base.*
- Ms. Wusterbarth asked at 1h:47m:28s  
*Will the Air Force address the NOW priority statement for stopping flow of the plume by 2023? We considered this generous and we are telling you we want that \$13.5 million or a portion of it to address the priority.*  
>>Mr. Gibson said that he can't commit to that and explained.

## Former Wurtsmith AFB Restoration Advisory Board Meeting

Final Meeting Minutes

15 April 2020

- Ms. Wusterbarth asked at 1h:49m00s  
*Is the technology not established to address PFAS plumes? We need more filtration systems.*  
>>Mr. Gibson explained that there are various technologies available to treat PFOS/PFOA.
- Rex Vaughn asked at 1h:50m:07s  
*CERLCA requires natural resource injury integration and imminent substantial endangerment evaluations yet the Air Force is only focused on drinking water vectors. Michigan has identified several other vectors for human and wildlife ingestion of PFOS around Wurtsmith Air Force Base and has issued several "Do Not Eat" orders. These health risks are particularly significant in a community where some parts of the population rely on hunting and fishing to meet their regular nutrition needs. Why has the Air Force ignored human and wildlife health risks?*  
>>Mr. Gibson explained that limited funding affected the decision to test drinking water over wildlife, resulting in the Air Force applying funds towards testing drinking water (the biggest hazard with the greatest impact). Funding for the RI allows the Air Force to expand investigations from just the immediate concern (drinking water) to include all contamination pathways.

### RAB Business (1h:52m:39s)

Mr. Leriche asked if there were any applicants who would like to participate in the co-chair election.

Mr. McClendon postponed the co-chair election until the next RAB meeting in order to move forward with public comments.

### Public Comment

Public may provide three-minute verbal comments.

- Congressman Dan Kildee commented at 1h:57m:09s  
*I'm sure many of you know I've been involved in this issue in Oscoda for some time. It was first brought to me by the citizens there and I've been working on it ever since. We've had some success in terms of getting some additional dollars through a number of federal sources regarding drinking water, getting Oscoda residents on municipal water, getting Oscoda schools on municipal water, the health study, and passing legislation to look for additional sites. We did have some success in the Defense Authorization Act; this last year, we're working on it again. We passed the PFAS Action Act in Congress. There's been some dramatic change in the way that Congress looks at this. A year or so ago, I co-founded the bipartisan Congressional PFAS Caucus; hardly anybody was speaking about it. Now, it's common conversation in Congress, particularly for those people who represent either current or BRAC sites. I want to zero in on what obviously seems to be a point of contention. As a person who pushed repeatedly and will continue to push for additional resources, I'm concerned that the Air Force is continuing with a bias on additional study and not on cleanup when Congress pushed this through. The entire debate was about getting the cleanup done. The recently submitted ESI calls for additional studies for more data and I understand that there is always going to be a need to gather more information. However, it is clear under the law that interim measures are called for, not just allowable, when this is an imminent substantial endangerment of the public health or the environment. It doesn't have to be a narrow definition. We know that there is substantial endangerment; there's a health advisory for foam on Van Etten Lake where people live, swim, and fish. There are health advisories for deer, fish, and small game in Clark's Marsh, and in the AuSable River where people live and recreate. In the legislation, it was intended that we take an aggressive approach, and when we see imminent substantial endangerment to public health or environment, the intention*

## Former Wurtsmith AFB Restoration Advisory Board Meeting

Final Meeting Minutes

15 April 2020

*of the law was that there would be interim measures taken to mitigate against those threats. According to the letter from Secretary Barrett, the \$13.5 million earmarked for the cleanup of the former base mentions that money can be used to fund construction or expansion of additional treatment systems if needed. My comment is simply this: I know what the congressional intent was, I'm the member of Congress that helped push this through with my colleague, so I'm asking the Air Force to use the majority of this money that we intended to be used for mitigation efforts for the purposes that they were intended for. This community's waited a long time and I don't want to go through the litany of frustration that I've heard from them but in the forty minutes that I've been listening on this call, I've come to have a much better understanding of the source of their frustration. If it takes additional action by Congress, believe me, this has been an informative conversation for me and I will make sure that we take additional action. I simply ask that as a person who was a witness to the intent of Congress and has been working with members of the House and the Senate on both sides of that aisle, when there is an imminent and substantial danger, Congress has appropriated that money to clean up the danger, and that needs to be the focus. I appreciate the opportunity to participate; thank you all.*

- Paul Rekowski asked at 2h:03m:03s

*I would like to know the status of the PFOS plume investigation from the Oscoda township dump going into Van Etten Lake and the status of mitigating the PFOS from discharging into the ground from Oscoda township sewer plant that eventually goes into the AuSable River. The WWTP discharge is concurrent with an Air Force PFOS site.*

>>Amanda Armbruster said EGLE has no reason to believe there is contamination reaching Van Etten Lake from the Oscoda township dump.

- Mr. Rekowski asked at 2h:04m:26s

*And the status of mitigating the PFAS from discharging into the ground from the township sewer plant that goes into AuSable River?*

- Mr. Leriche stated at 2h:05m:15s

*The Air Force has already said tonight and earlier that Clark's Marsh and the water treatment plume migrates towards Clarks marsh and that they will investigate this during the RI for their responsibilities, so they are party in answering the question that was just raised.*

>>Mr. Weed said the township is seeking additional funds to do further testing in that area to determine actions for remediation and explained the reasoning. He continued to make a statement, summarized as follows: *Regarding the PFAS that's coming out of the sewer system, it has been shown that the Air Force dumped PFAS directly into those drying beds, so the PFAS that exists there is from the Air Force having dumped AFFF in there by routing what was coming off of the fire training site into an oil-separating lagoon and then into the sewer system that they were operating at the time. The mass pollution coming off of there is something for the Air Force to address. So far, the Air Force has said nothing about addressing that other than that they are going to take a look at it.*

- Greg Truesdell asked at 2h:07m:38s

*Has there been any studies of other area lakes like Cedar Lake?*

>>Ms. Armbruster said there were tests at Cedar Lake and that there were detections of PFAS but not above applicable GSI criteria. They were also at significantly lower levels than Van Etten Lake.

## Former Wurtsmith AFB Restoration Advisory Board Meeting

Final Meeting Minutes

15 April 2020

- Phil Farina asked at 2h:08m:53s  
*Is there any plan to evaluate technologies that can improve the pump-and-treat system installed currently that uses only carbon treatment? Will better technology be explored?*  
>>Mr. Gibson explained that while he hasn't anything that would apply to the situation today, there is currently research being done for new PFOS/PFOA technologies.
- Shannon Abbot asked at 2h:11m:06s  
*Will there be a recording of this meeting shared with the attendees?*  
>>Mr. McClendon confirmed that it will be. The video/audio is available at the link listed at the beginning of this document.
- Anthony Spaniola commented at 2h:13m:02s  
*What I'm hearing is the Air Force needs to take months, perhaps years, to determine if there is an imminent and substantial threat of endangerment to health for the public environment. It's ridiculous to say you need that amount of time to determine if something is imminent. "Imminent" means "imminent"; it means "now". We know and have known for years that there are imminent and substantial problems at Van Etten Lake, at Clark's Marsh, and in the AuSable River. The Air Force has chosen – its hands have not been tied – to disregard the work that's been done by MDHHS, by local officials who have carefully documented that we have public health risks at these locations. The Air Force can walk and chew gum at the same time; you've known that all along. There's nothing in CERLCA that ties your hands to do that. This was simply an arbitrary decision made by the Department of Defense without regard to the public health and safety of people in Oscoda. The Air Force has chosen to disregard studies and results that have been the result of expenditures by the state of Michigan. Now it's attempting to redo those, wasting federal funds, wasting time, and harming human health. We demand expect that action needs to be taken now. The Van Etten Lake Association, the Oscoda township, and the Anglers of the AuSable all came out in 2017 and asked for this imminent action to be taken. It has been ignored by the Air Force and the Air Force blames Congress because it doesn't have the money but the Air Force has failed to ask Congress for appropriate funds. The Air Force now has the money to do this; it should expend the funds now. It should address the plumes on Van Etten Lake, particularly at the Air Force beach where we have health hazard quotients up from 6 to 38, where anything over 1 is unacceptable. It should do so as well for the youth camp and it should do so for those that are impacting Clark's Marsh and the AuSable River. The time to act is now.*

### Closing Statements (2h:16m:00s)

Michigan DNR provided a status update.

- Muscle samples were taken from eighteen deer outside of the Clark's Marsh area; all were non-detect for PFAS.
- Labs are closed; PFAS testing is unavailable. Testing will resume as soon as the labs open again.

Mr. Leriche asked to create an action item for a written clarification on the term "interim mitigation action." He also suggested creating additional action items based on comments and questions to be addressed at future RAB meetings.

Mr. Tasior suggested making Congressman Kildee's statement about the \$13.5 million into an action item. Mr. Gibson approved.

### Conclusion

There was continued discussion about procedures, RAB scheduling, and audio/video suggestions.

The RAB meeting adjourned at approximately 7:20 p.m.

Q & A

The following questions were posed in this meeting's virtual chat logs.

*Paul Rekowski*

I would like to know the status of the PFAS plume investigation from Oscoda township dump going into VE Lake and the status of mitigating the PFAS from discharging into the ground from Oscoda Township Sewer Plant that eventually goes into the AuSable River. The WWTP discharge is concurrent with an AF PFOS site.

- Answer: Amanda Armbruster (EGLE- RRD – Bay City) said EGLE has no reason to believe there is contamination reaching Van Etten Lake from the Oscoda township dump.

*Greg Truesdell*

Have there been any studies of other area lakes, like Cedar Lake?

- Answer: AFCEC is not aware of any surface water sampling for either characterization or research purposes beyond Clark's Marsh and Van Etten Lake (VEL).

*William Gaines*

1989 USGS reports would have been derived nearly a decade after pumping started on Wurtsmith. How much was ground water elevation changed from prior levels? Wouldn't this have an effect on overall ground water topography and possibly flow direction and pressure?

- Answer: While water levels will fluctuate within the shallow sand and gravel aquifer in the area of the former Wurtsmith AFB due to seasonal variations in recharge associated with precipitation, groundwater flow directions have in general remained consistent since the USGS first mapped them in 1980.

*Rex Vaughn asked*

CERCLA requires "natural resource injury integration" and "imminent substantial endangerment" evaluations, yet the AF has only focused on drinking water vectors. Michigan has identified several other vectors for human and wildlife ingestion of PFAS around WAFB, and has issued several "Do Not Eat" orders. These health risks are particularly significant in a community where some parts of the population rely on hunting and fishing to meet their regular nutrition needs. Why has the Air Force ignored the human and wildlife health risks?

- Answer: Per Air Force guidance, the Air Force addressed the most direct exposure pathway which is the drinking water pathway. As part of the Remedial Investigation (RI), the Air Force will complete a human health and ecological risk assessment to evaluate whether or not an unacceptable risk from other routes of exposure exists. Note that while the MDHHS has issued "Do Not Eat" advisories, for fish and wildlife from Clarke's Marsh, and for select species of fish in Van Etten Lake and the Au Sable River downstream of Foote Dam, based upon PFOS exceeding screening criteria of 300 part per billion (ppb), exceeding a screening criteria does not mean there is unacceptable risk. Also, even in the absence of PFOS or PFOA, there would still be "Eat Safe Fish" consumption guidelines in place for fish caught in Van Etten Lake due to mercury and PCBs, and Au Sable River downstream of Foote Dam due to PCBs and dioxins. These contaminants are not attributable to past AF activities.

*Phil Farina*

Is there any plan to evaluate technologies that can improve the pump and treat system installed currently that uses only carbon treatment? Will better technology be explored?

- Answer: The treatment technologies in place at Wurtsmith are those currently used in the remediation industry to treat PFOS and PFOA. However, AFCEC routinely evaluates remedial systems and will upgrade or replace them as necessary to continue to comply with remediation objectives.

*Rex Vaughn*

On the slide titled "Final ESI Findings", the AF states "The Final ESI documents exceedances of one or more screening levels for PFOS or PFOA, but not at levels warranting immediate action". In fact, the ESI documents several areas where PFAS compounds are not being properly contained by the present pump and treat systems. How bad does it need to get before the AF would initiate immediate action to stop the documented contamination of Van Etten Lake, Clark's Marsh, the Au Sable River, and eventually Lake Huron with PFAS? Why not act today to stem the identified and known flows instead of wasting time and tax payer money on yet another investigation? CERCLA does allow for interim remedial actions.

- Answer: The ESI evaluated the drinking water pathway associated with PFOS/PFOA from select AFFF release areas located up gradient of drinking water wells. Because there were no drinking water exposures, i.e., no one is drinking water containing PFOS or PFOA above the Environmental Protection Agency's Lifetime Health Advisories' (HA) level of 70 parts per trillion (ppt), the ESI did not identify the need for an immediate response action. Note that this finding was limited to the drinking water exposure pathway. As part of the RI, a human health and ecological risk assessment will be completed which will evaluate whether or not an unacceptable risk from other routes of exposure exists. The overall scope of the RI includes funds and requirements for the evaluation and implementation of interim actions.

*Shannon Abbott*

Will a recording of this meeting be shared with the attendees?

- Answer: Mr. McClendon confirmed that it will be. The video/audio is available at the link listed at the beginning of this document.

*Robert Tasiar*

When are we going to get to remediation?

- Answer: The Air Force has undertaken four response actions to date related to PFOS/PFOA: (1) In 2015, the Air Force installed granular activated carbon treatment at FT002 to control PFOS/PFOA migration to Clark's Marsh; (2) in 2016, the Air Force provided bottled water to one resident due to drinking water well containing PFOS/PFOA above the USEPA Preliminary HA, and then connected the resident to the municipal water supply; (3) in 2018, the Air Force constructed the new Central Treatment System to treat PFOS/PFOA in groundwater recovered by the Arrow Street and Benzene Plant extraction wells to meet EGLE SRD discharge criteria; and (4) in 2019, the Air Force upgraded the existing Mission Street Pump and Treat system with ionizing resin to treat PFOS/PFOA in recovered groundwater to meet EGLE SRD discharge criteria.

The information gathered in the RI will enable the Air Force to conduct any needed interim remedial actions, including the construction of additional treatment systems or expansion of current treatment systems. Specific interim remedial actions that the Air Force is considering at this time include the expansion of the capture fields and treatment plants to better control

migration of PFOS and PFOA at the former fire training area FT002 site by Clark's Marsh and expanding the Central Treatment System and adding additional extractions wells and treatment capacity to address the PFOS/PFOA plume migrating towards Van Etten Lake and Air Force Beach. Early in the RI, data will be collected to verify work plans for these actions and, in consultation with EGLE, the design and installation of these interim actions. The current funding for the RI includes these interim actions. Additional interim actions may be identified as a result of the RI as well.

*Daniel Stock*

Will any of the RI money be used to determine what needs to be done for Clark's Marsh?

- Answer: Yes. Specific interim remedial actions that the Air Force is considering at this time include expansion of the capture fields to better control migration of PFOS and PFOA at the former fire training area FT002 site by Clark's Marsh. Early in the RI, data will be collected to verify work plans for these actions and, in consultation with EGLE, the design and installation of these interim actions.

*Arnie Leriche*

(Slide 39 & 40) and Snapshot CERCLA schedule): Why isn't Wurtsmith's Interim Mitigation Action defined IAW AFI 32-7020 Table A2.1 Description "Conduct short-term actions to address any immediate threats to . . . Environment or to prevent further contaminant migration". E.g. plumes A15 & 1to VEL.

- Answer: As part of the RI, the Air Force will complete a human health and ecological risk assessment to evaluate whether or not an unacceptable risk from other routes of exposure exists. Note that while the MDHHS has issued "Do Not Eat" advisories, for fish and wildlife from Clarkes' Marsh and for select species of fish in Van Etten Lake and the Au Sable River downstream of Foote Dam, based upon PFOS exceeding screening criteria of 300 ppb, exceeding a screening criteria does not mean there is unacceptable risk. Also, even in the absence of PFOS, there would still be "Eat Safe Fish" consumption guidelines in place for fish caught in Van Etten Lake due to mercury and PCBs, and Au Sable River downstream of Foote Dam due to PCBs and dioxins. These contaminants are not attributable to past AF activities. The Air Force has undertaken four response actions to date related to PFOS/PFOA: (1) in 2015, the Air Force installed granular activated carbon treatment at FT002 to mitigate PFOS/PFOA migration to Clark's Marsh; (2) in 2016, the Air Force provided bottled water to one resident due to drinking water well containing PFOS/PFOA above the USEPA Preliminary HA , and then connected the resident to the municipal water supply; (3) in 2018, the Air Force constructed the new Central Treatment System to treat PFOS/PFOA in groundwater recovered by the Arrow Street and Benzene Plant extraction wells to meet EGLE SRD discharge criteria; and (4) in 2019, the Air Force upgraded the existing Mission Street Pump and Treat system with ionizing resin to treat PFOS/PFOA in recovered groundwater to meet EGLE SRD discharge criteria. The information gathered in the RI will enable the Air Force to conduct any needed interim remedial actions, including the construction of additional treatment systems or expansion of current treatment systems. Specific interim remedial actions that the Air Force is considering at this time include expansion of the capture fields and treatment capacity to better control migration of PFOS and PFOA at the former fire training area FT002 site by Clark's Marsh and expanding the Central Treatment System and adding additional extractions wells and treatment capacity to address the PFOS/PFOA plume migrating towards Van Etten Lake and Air Force Beach. Early in the RI, data will be collected to verify work plans for these actions and, in consultation with EGLE, the

design and installation of these interim actions. The current funding for the RI includes these interim actions. Additional interim actions may be identified as a result of the RI as well.

*Nicholas Occhipinti*

Can you share EGLE's proposed intermediate actions, and what is the process for the Air Force accepting these proposed actions?

- Answer: In a letter dated January 31 2020, EGLE requested that the Air Force perform actions concurrently with Remedial Investigation planning and implementation to address PFAS in groundwater and soil. These could take the form of early actions, interim remedial actions or time critical or non-time critical removal actions. EGLE requests these actions include the following, but are not limited to 1) extending the capture zone of PFAS contaminated groundwater and increasing the pumping rate at FT-02 groundwater pump and treat system, 2) removal of PFAS from the beach plumes along Van Etten Lake, and 3) removal of PFAS contaminated soil, sediment, and groundwater up gradient of Clarks Marsh, in vicinity of the former wastewater treatment plant (WWTP). Additionally, EGLE supports the expansion of the Mission Street Groundwater Treatment System as proposed in the Expanded Site Investigation (ESI).

Air Force responded to this request on March 3, 2020. Both letters are available on the Wurtsmith MPART page under All Wurtsmith documents.

[https://www.michigan.gov/pfasresponse/0,9038,7-365-86511\\_82704\\_83952-455897--,00.html](https://www.michigan.gov/pfasresponse/0,9038,7-365-86511_82704_83952-455897--,00.html)

*William Gaines*

This community's schools have 2/3 of the population at an economic level requiring free and reduced lunch. These people require venison and fish for sustenance. This means there are public health issues not covered by drinking water. Why will Air Force not recognize that as a human health hazard?

- Answer: As part of the RI, the Air Force will complete a human health and ecological risk assessment to evaluate whether or not an unacceptable risk from other routes of exposure exists. Note that while the MDHHS has issued "Do Not Eat" advisories, for fish and wildlife from Clarke's Marsh and for select species of fish in Van Etten Lake and the Au Sable River downstream of Foote Dam, based upon PFOS exceeding screening criteria of 300 ppb, exceeding a screening criteria does not mean there is unacceptable risk. Also, even in the absence of PFOS, there would still be "Eat Safe Fish" consumption guidelines in place for fish caught in Van Etten Lake due to mercury and PCBs, and Au Sable River downstream of Foote Dam due to PCBs and dioxins. These contaminants are not attributable to past AF activities.

*Aaron Weed*

Based on slide 45, does this timeline mean that the earliest we will see remediation infrastructure to be installed is 2024?

- Answer: The Air Force anticipates that the construction will begin in 2021 and operation of the interim remedial actions associated with expanding the FT002 and the Central Treatment systems will be accomplished by 2022.

*Aaron Weed*

How is the EGLE data that already exists and all the data gathered from the AF not enough data?

- Answer: There is sufficient data to know that the PFOS/PFOA plumes are not being fully captured by existing extraction well systems. However, as the EGLE's comments on the ESI point

out, there are data gaps that must be addressed prior to completing the design of final remedial actions. The RI will provide the necessary data to design the remedial actions, including interim remedial actions. All available data will be utilized in scoping the RI work plan, and the AF will coordinate with EGLE in the development of the work plan. The information gathered in the RI will enable the Air Force to conduct any needed interim remedial actions, including the construction of additional treatment systems or expansion of current treatment systems. Specific interim remedial actions that the Air Force is considering at this time include expansion of the capture fields to better control migration of PFOS and PFOA at the former fire training area FT002 site by Clark's Marsh and expanding the Central Treatment System and adding additional extractions wells to address the PFOS/PFOA plume migrating towards Van Etten Lake and Air Force Beach. Early in the RI, data will be collected to verify work plans for these actions and, in consultation with EGLE, the design and installation of these interim actions. The current funding for the RI includes these interim actions. Additional interim actions may be identified as a result of the RI as well.

*Cathy Wusterbarth*

Will AF address the NOW priority statement for stopping flow of plume by 2023? We considered this generous and we are telling you we want the \$13.5 or a portion of it to address the priority.

- Answer: There is sufficient data to know that the PFOS/PFOA plumes are not being fully captured by existing extraction well systems. However, as the EGLE's comments on the ESI point out, there are data gaps that must be addressed prior to completing the design of final remedial actions. The RI will provide the necessary data to design the remedial actions, including interim remedial actions. The information gathered in the RI will enable the Air Force to conduct any needed interim remedial actions, including the construction of additional treatment systems or expansion of current treatment systems. Specific interim remedial actions that the Air Force is considering at this time include expansion of the capture fields to better control migration of PFOS and PFOA at the former fire training area FT002 site by Clark's Marsh and expanding the Central Treatment System and adding additional extractions wells to address the PFOS/PFOA plume migrating towards Van Etten Lake and Air Force Beach. Early in the RI, data will be collected to verify work plans for these actions and, in consultation with EGLE, the design and installation of these interim actions. The current funding for the RI includes these interim actions. The Air Force anticipates that the construction will begin in 2021 and operation of the interim remedial actions associated with expanding the FT002 and the Central Treatment systems will be accomplished by 2022. Groundwater monitoring data will be collected to evaluate the effectiveness of these interim remedial actions and these data will be shared with the RAB.

*Cathy Wusterbarth*

Is the technology not established to address PFAS Plumes? We need more filtration systems.

- Answer: The current technology for addressing PFOS/PFOA in GW is to extract the GW and treat the GW via granular activated carbon or ionizing resins treatment systems. Specific interim remedial actions that the Air Force is considering at this time include expansion of the capture fields to better control migration of PFOS and PFOA at the former fire training area FT002 site by Clark's Marsh and the Central Treatment System to address PFOS/PFOA migration towards Van Etten Lake and Air Force Beach.

*Rex Vaughn*

Are the current pump and treat systems considered “Essential Services” under the current COVID-19 executive orders from the Michigan Governor? Are these critical CERCLA control devices being staffed, operated and monitored/sampled in accordance with EGLE SRD’s, permits and agreements?

- Answer: Yes. Operation and maintenance of the current treatment systems are considered essential services and there have been no interruptions.

*A.J. Birkbeck*

Will the Air Force reconsider implementation of an interim action if there are either new federal PFAS standards, or state MCLs as ARARS, prior to 2022?

- Answer: CERCLA – specifically, 42 USC section 9621 -- sets out the requirements for evaluating which federal and state statutes and regulations qualify as applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARS). The Air Force will not speculate on potential state statutes or regulations. As required by CERCLA, the Air Force and EGLE will identify potential ARARS during the RI phase of the CERCLA process.

*Lynn McIntosh*

I live outside of this community and have been watching the DOD continually stall in their response to these people in Oscoda. Is it really a matter of just funding?

- Answer: The Air Force must follow the process that Congress established in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). That process involves several discrete steps that must be followed before a federal agency is authorized to spend taxpayer dollars on a final remedial action. While we understand the Oscoda community is focused upon the former Wurtsmith AFB, the Air Force must be focused on all of our installations nation-wide. The Air Force conducted preliminary assessments at approximately 200 installations, and determined that site inspections were needed at 189 installations. The Air Force priority has been on identifying and responding to drinking water impacted by PFOS/PFOA above the EPA’s Lifetime HA as determined by completed site inspections. The Air Force is required to follow CERCLA to investigate the extent of the contamination, evaluate risk, and determine appropriate response actions. To date, the Air Force has undertaken four response actions related to PFOA/PFAS: (1) in 2015, the Air Force installed granular activated carbon treatment at FT002 to mitigate PFOS/PFOA migration to Clark’s Marsh; (2) in 2016, the Air Force provided bottled water to one resident due to drinking water well containing PFOS/PFOA above the USEPA Lifetime HA , and then connected the resident to the municipal water supply; (3) in 2018, the Air Force constructed the new Central Treatment System to treat PFOS/PFOA in groundwater recovered by the Arrow Street and Benzene Plant extraction wells to meet EGLE surface water discharge criteria; and (4) in 2019, the Air Force upgraded the existing Mission Street Pump and Treat system with ionizing resin to treat PFOS/PFOA in recovered groundwater to meet EGLE surface water discharge criteria. The information gathered in the RI will enable the Air Force to conduct any needed interim remedial actions, including the construction of additional treatment systems or expansion of current treatment systems. Specific interim remedial actions that the Air Force is considering at this time include expansion of the capture fields to better control migration of PFOS and PFOA at the former fire training area FT002 site by Clark’s Marsh and expanding the Central Treatment System and adding additional extractions wells to address the PFOS/PFOA plume migrating towards Van Etten Lake and Air Force Beach. Early in the RI, data will be collected to verify work plans for these actions and, in consultation with EGLE, the design and installation of these interim actions. The current funding for the RI includes these interim actions.

*Aaron Weed*

Are you going to have the elections as required?

- Answer: The Community RAB Co-Chair informed the Air Force RAB Co-Chair elections will be held at the next RAB meeting tentatively scheduled for July 2020 RAB.

*Nicholas Occhipinti*

By the Air Force's own estimate, the Wurtsmith cleanup will cost more than \$200 million. What is the plan for allocating funds to clean up this toxic contamination and protect the health of surrounding communities?

- Answer: The Air Force does not know how much funding it will take to complete cleanup at former Wurtsmith AFB, however, at this time the Air Force has budget estimates for completing each of the steps that Congress established in CERCLA. The CERCLA process involves several discrete steps that must be followed before a federal agency is authorized to spend taxpayer dollars on a final remedial action. The Air Force is on the third of seven steps in the CERCLA process, the Remedial Investigation (RI), and has allocated \$13.5M in FY20 towards the RI. Additional funds will be programmed for feasibility studies to design final remedies, developing Proposed Plans (PP), signing approved decision documents (e.g., Records of Decision), remedial design (RD), Remedial Action Construction/Remedial Action Operation (RA-O), and the long-term management (LTM) of the remedy. When annual funding is received, it will be allocated as necessary to accomplish the CERCLA steps.

We have a responsibility to protect those who serve our country. What is the air force doing to protect veterans who were exposed to PFAS while stationed at Wurtsmith?

- Answer: PFOS/PFOA contamination is a nationwide issue that requires a whole-of-government approach to resolve. All U.S. military services have used AFFF foam containing PFOS/PFOA, and the Department of Defense initiated a task force to address PFOS/PFOA issues. For more information on what DoD is doing, please visit:  
<https://media.defense.gov/2020/Mar/13/2002264440/-1/-1/1/PFAS-TASK-FORCE-PROGRESS-REPORT-MARCH-2020.PDF>  
Any veteran concerned with exposure to PFAS can contact the Department of Veterans Affairs, and their healthcare provider. More information can be found here:  
<https://www.publichealth.va.gov/exposures/pfas.asp>

*Rex Vaughn*

The Department of Defense is sponsoring an ongoing PFAS Enriched Lake Foam Study by Dr. Jennifer Fields from Oregon State University (and others from MSU). Her efforts have resulted in published reports on lake foam enrichment that are worthy of consideration during the investigation(s) at WAFB. Furthermore, the local health department has posted signage highlighting the dangers for children of ingesting foam and/or having it on their skin. That highlights significant health hazards for a recognized vulnerable population not related to the AF's cited drinking water priority. Has the Air Force utilized any information from that study? If not, then why not?

- Answer: AFCEC is aware of all SERDP/ESTCP-funded research and participates on the technical selection and oversight committee. In general, research results are incorporated into the Air Force's remediation work through the commercialization of new technologies and/or SOPs. Specifically in regard to ER19-1205, the primary objectives are to 1) determine factors that impact PFAS stratification in water; 2) systematically evaluate bias from field materials and sampling procedures; and 3) quantify the impact of laboratory sample hold times.

*Ryan Mertz*

Is PFAS treatment for the LF 30/31 discharge included in the plans for the \$13m funds for remediation?

- Answer: LF30/31 was evaluated during the 2018 SI, and a sample collected from the effluent was below the USEPA Lifetime HA for PFOS and PFOA. LF30/31 will be further investigated during the RI. If the risk assessment determines there are levels of PFOS and PFOA present at the site that pose an unacceptable risks to human or ecological receptors, then the Air Force will develop remedial action alternatives during the feasibility study portion of the CERCLA process.

*Garret Ellison*

Can David Gibson please explain what exactly is the problem with using state data to develop an interim remedial action?

- Answer: The Air Force is the lead agent for the remediation efforts at the Former Wurtsmith AFB and must ensure data meet Department of Defense data quality objectives (DQOs). The data collected by EGLE will be evaluated during scoping of the RI; however, both EGLE and MDHHS analyze PFAS samples via an analytical method (EPA Method 537.1) developed for analyzing select PFAS in finished, disinfected, chlorinated drinking water supplies. The method has been modified by individual laboratories for the analysis of media for which the method was not developed. The Air Force, on the other hand, requires contract laboratories to analyze samples following the Department of Defense/Department of Energy Quality Systems Manual for Environmental Laboratories, Table B-15 for PFAS in matrices other than finished drinking water. The analytical approach used by Air Force contract laboratories is more rigorous and provides more defensible data. As such, EGLE's data may not meet the Air Force's DQOs, and may only be useful from a qualitative standpoint.

*Arnie Leriche*

(A. Leriche) (Proposed Action Item): Regarding the Surface Water Foam on Van Etten Lake, is the Wurtsmith AF team aware of DoD's SERDP study ER19-1205 (originated in Oct,2018) where Oregon State Univ. started sampling on VEL for investigating foam & SW concentrations, "enrichments" or significant increase by Factors of 400 to 4,000 timed increased? Preliminary data will be sent to AF for RAB mtg record.

- Answer: AFCEC is aware of all SERDP/ESTCP-funded research and participates on the technical selection and oversight committee. In general, research results are incorporated into the Air Force's remediation work through the commercialization of new technologies and/or SOPs. Specifically in regard to ER19-1205, the primary objectives are to 1) determine factors that impact PFAS stratification in water; 2) systematically evaluate bias from field materials and sampling procedures; and 3) quantify the impact of laboratory sample hold times.

*Anthony Spaniola*

A number of people submitted questions or asked to speak who were ignored. Why?

- Answer: The Air Force apologizes if we missed any questions or requests to speak. In order to provide a safe meeting environment consistent with social distancing guidelines in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Air Force used a web-based platform provided by the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes and Energy. While this platform made the RAB proceedings available to a potentially wider audience, we did have some technical issues that may have resulted in missed questions and requests to speak. Also, as with any RAB, we may not be able to respond to all questions due to time restrictions. However, we record and will answer

**Former Wurtsmith AFB Restoration Advisory Board Meeting**

Final Meeting Minutes

15 April 2020

all questions in our meeting minutes, published online at:

<https://www.afcec.af.mil/Home/BRAC/Wurtsmith/RAB.aspx>. Your feedback will help us improve our on-line process for future meetings.

*Robert Tasiar*

When is the next RAB?

- Answer: The Air Force is tentatively planning on holding the next RAB on either July 15 or 22, 2020.