

Former Wurtsmith AFB Virtual Restoration Advisory Board Meeting

Final Meeting Minutes
1 Oct 2020

Former Wurtsmith AFB
Virtual Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting
28 July 2020
GoToWebinar
5 – 7:36 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time

Final Meeting Minutes

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

Former Wurtsmith AFB Virtual Restoration Advisory Board Meeting

Final Meeting Minutes
1 Oct 2020

Meeting Video Link: <https://youtu.be/FCFp3bcM3os>

Attachment 1: Agenda

Attachment 2: Presentation

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 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 by Mr. McClendon. Opened with well wishes for the meeting.

Arnie Leriche, RAB community co-chair, introduced by Mr. McClendon. Opened with appreciation to Air Force for being proactive and improving virtual capabilities for meetings.

Aaron Weed, Oscoda Township Supervisor, introduced himself.

Jeff Moss, AuSable Township Trustee, introduced himself.

Beth Place, EGLE RRD, introduced herself.

Michael Munson, OWAA Airport and Redevelopment Authority, introduced himself.

Denise Bryan, Health Officer with DHD2, introduced herself.

Puneet Vij, Toxicologist with MDHHS, introduced himself.

Jessica Stuntebeck, USDA Forest Service, introduced herself.

Daniel Stock, Primary RAB Member, introduced himself.

Joe Maxwell, Primary RAB Member, introduced himself.

William Gaines, Primary RAB Member, introduced himself.

Cathy Wusterbarth, Primary RAB Member; NOW Member, introduced herself.

Ryan Mertz, Primary RAB Member, introduced himself.

Jerry Schmidt, Primary RAB Member, introduced himself.

Catherin Larive, Primary RAB Member, introduced herself.

David Winn, RAB Alternate, introduced himself.

Rex Vaughn, RAB Alternate, introduced himself.

Greg Schulz, RAB Alternate, introduced himself.

Jeff Gotlieb, RAB Alternate, introduced himself.

Mark Henry, RAB Alternate, introduced himself.

Dr. Steve TerMaath, BRAC Program Division Chief, introduced by Mr. McClendon.

Val de la Fuente, Execution Branch Chief, introduced by Mr. McClendon.

Mr. Jacob Bennett, Deputy District Director representing Congressman Kildee, introduced by Mr. McClendon.

Mr. Eric Keller, Regional Director representing Senator Peters, introduced by Mr. McClendon.

Congressman Kildee, introduced by Mr. McClendon.

Stakeholder Updates

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

U.S. Air Force (USAF)

Mr. David “Dave” Gibson provided the USAF update:

- Remedial Investigation/Interim Redial Action contract was awarded 14 Jul 20 and the detailed plan/schedule will be briefed at the Oct 2020 RAB.
- Fourth 5-Year Review is in work.
- Relative Risk Site Evaluation Worksheets will be released shortly. Once training with RAB members is complete, the public notice will be published and the worksheets will be loaded into the Administrative Record.

Community RAB Members

Cathy Wusterbarth provided an update:

- “NOW” and its Community RAB members have encouraged leadership in the RAB.
- Strengthen and solidified continued efforts of the “NOW” group.
- Meet on a weekly basis and meet with state agencies to discuss strategies on how to engage the state in an effective relationship with the Air Force to benefit area.
- Working with National PFAS Contamination Coalition to develop strategies nationally on dealing with DoD.
- Take all opportunities to discuss slow action at Wurtsmith AFB with media and news outlets.
- Partnerships with environmental groups, universities and legislators is growing and strengthening.
- Continue to have outreach and information sharing with local community online
- Award-winning documentary “No Defense” produced

Arnie Leriche provided an update:

- Continue to communicate with the agencies on a monthly basis to stay abreast of what is happening.

- Agencies will be providing written comments to the members on the stakeholder calls so that they can provide accurate details to the public community members and to community RAB members.
- Main focus is on interim remedial action discussed last meeting and have continued to discuss issues with the Air Force and EGLE to make sure community understands regulations and guidance.
- Important to communicate and understand what the agencies are doing and to communicate with the Air Force to ensure transparency and timeliness of receiving information.
- There were three planning sessions and practice sessions to improve virtual meeting format.
- Participating in National PFAS Coalition and attended DoD training and webinars to stay informed on what Air Force is doing for remedial investigation

Mr. Leriche invited other community RAB members to speak. Having heard none, Mr. Leriche concluded his update.

EGLE

Beth Place provided an update:

- EGLE will share PFAS data collected in the past with the Air Force and their contractor.
- Working on two PFAS reports, one on groundwater and soil and the other on surface water. This is from the data that was collected back in 2017 and 2018. The data has been shared with the RAB and community but was never compiled in the report. Expected to be released before the end of the summer.

Mike Neller provided an update:

- The dispute resolution reported before that all formal disputes that started almost three years ago between EGLE and the Air Force have been resolved. Copy of letter is available to RAB and posted on MPART website
- After the expanded site investigation was completed in December 2019 by the Air Force, EGLE sent a letter dated January 31st, 2020, where they requested the Air Force to take interim remedial actions to address PFAS contamination in the soil and groundwater.
 - Actions requested: expanding the capture zone and increasing the pumping rate of the FT002 pump and treat system, removal of PFAS from beach plumes at Van Etten Lake, removal of PFAS in contaminated soil, sediment and groundwater at Clarks Marsh and vicinity of former base wastewater treatment plant, concurred with ESI recommendations to extend the Mission Street groundwater treatment system.

- Request for actions was made with perspective that there is adequate information to proceed. Understand many remedial actions on contaminated sites have proven to be more costly or take longer because of inadequate site assessments. Understand that early actions, and specifically source removal, have shown to reduce the time and money spent cleaning up the sites.
- “While we acknowledge the friction between implementation of site cleanup actions, and fully characterizing the site we feel that the citizens of Michigan deserve to have a sense of urgency applied as we move forward with any and all interim response actions requested”.
- This year, the Air Force received additional funding specifically “earmarked” for PFAS cleanup actions at the former Wurtsmith Air Force Base. Air Force announced in June they would be undertaking two of the four remedial actions requested by EGLE.
- “Well, this is a start. We do not yet know what is planned, and ultimately how effective these measures will be. Clearly, this is not enough, and more resources will need to be authorized for continued and additional cleanup actions. Again, EGLE feels the nature and extent of the contamination has been largely determined, consequently, it is our opinion that most of the authorized funding should be spent implementing and optimizing the technologies used to clean up the site”.
- The Air Force has historically not provided timelines or milestones with expected completion dates associated with plans. EGLE is requesting that this practice change for the process moving forward, where EGLE can operate in good faith under co-operative agreement with the Air Force.
 - Requesting timeline or minimum of general plan with milestones be provided to the members of the RAB no later than September 30th, 2020.

Forest Service

No updates provided.

OWAA

Mike Munson provided an update:

- OWAA needs an action item charging the Air Force to disclose to the RAB their designed plans for new wells or modifications of existing wells to implement the next generation of PFAS cleanup stations.
 - The locations need to be known for the wells to allow the airport authority and/or township to implement any actions on their part to prevent any delays or surprises.

- Reason for needed action: The Air Force interpretation of the \$13 million of congressionally approved funding was to be used for further investigation when Congress specifically said the monies were to be used for immediate PFAS remediation
- It is imperative for Air Force to include what, when and how they place the wells to accelerate next phase of remedial action
- “This is needed to prevent an escape plan by the Air Force, to blame their non compliance on others because of additional, unknown actions unneeded to address well issues. The airport authority is working on further business actions, and it needs to know, as soon as possible, any new well locations, or modification to existing locations, to allow enough time to make changes to those plans, if needed.”

Charter Township of Au Sable

Jeff Moss provided an update:

- Townhall was informative but gave insight that the need is to beg Congressmen and Senators to assist in cleanup of surface water and drinking water.
- Need congress to instruct the Air Force as to what to do.
- “So I'm begging our congressmen and senators. Please give us more attention. Please give us more help.”

Michigan Department of Health Human Services

Puneet Vij provided an update:

- Currently in the first round of MDHHS sampling and plan to do this about two more rounds on a quarterly basis.
 - Projected timeline for the completion of round one is the end of this month as things got delayed due to COVID 19.
 - So far collected samples from 272 wells out of 427 wells that were previously tested by EGLE.
 - Currently have 92 non-detects and 83 detections, which are less than the comparison value. There are 15 detections that are higher than the MDHHS adjust comparison.

Oscoda Township

Aaron Weed provided an update:

- Waiting for Air Force timeline.
- Disappointed in amount of money being spent on interim action.

- Waiting to hear back from the Air Force regarding assessment of the Storm Water system and for them to be able to pay for using the system.

DHD2

Denise Bryan provided an update:

- Supports what community members express to the Air Force, state and legislators and implores state partners to effectively and expeditiously mobilize to provide the data to compel the Air Force to implement immediate PFAS remediation
- “Our health is in jeopardy, our way of life is in jeopardy and the values of protecting our family and our environment is eroded on a daily basis by bureaucracy.”

Final Comments:

Mr. Leriche asked for RAB members to state any desired new action items when they speak so that the Air Force can capture it.

Beth Place showed appreciation for Denise Bryan’s statement and informed listeners that EGLE shares several of the community’s viewpoints and that EGLE will be sharing a complete set of PFAS data which has been coordinated with Mr. Gibson.

Mr. Gibson thanked the public for their input and apologized to Aaron Weed for not including the status of the assessment in the initial slide; he had sent an email to Mr. Weed on 10 Jul 20 informing him of the contract being awarded and to confirm Mr. Weed is POC for contractor. Currently looking at timeline of September to share the assessment.

Technical Presentation

USAF PFOS/PFOA Treatment Status:

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

- Status of existing PFAS Treatment Systems (slide #10)
 - Mission Street Pump and Treat System (Mission PTS)
 - Operational since Dec 2019
 - Ion Exchange Resin System
 - Treated over 43 million gallons since start-up
 - Flow rate approx. 190 gallons per minute (gpm)
 - Operational run time >95%
 - PFOS, PFOA, and PFHxS effluent: < 4 nanograms/liter (ng/L)
 - Central Treatment System (Central TS) (slide #11)
 - Operational since Aug 2018
 - Granular Activated Carbon System

- Treated over 206 million gallons since start-up
- Flow rate approx. 250 gpm
- Operational run time >95%
- PFOS, PFOA effluent: < 4 ng/L
- Fire Training Area-02 (FT002) (slide #12)
 - Operational since April 2015
 - Granular Activated Carbon System
 - Treated over 619 million gallons since start-up
 - Flow rate approx. 250 gpm
 - Operational run time >95%
 - PFOS/PFOA effluent: < 4 ng/L
- FT002 History (slide #14 - 17)
 - Original goals
 - Effectiveness of plume control

Mr. Gibson asked for questions.

- Bill Gaines stated:

My understanding is that Mission Street and the Central Treatment System have been pumping from approximately those same well fields since the 1980s. They haven't had PFAS treatment in place, but they have been pumping to aerate Fluorocarbons. There's the heart of this dispute resolution with EGLE was continuing to operate those after the Air Force requested permission to turn off the fluorocarbon carbon scrubbers since that had been completed. So, for a time prior to our initiation of the RAB and this was briefed I believe at our initial RAB orientation that those were pumping to put PFAS out of the ground into the surface water, basically at EGLE request, the DEQ's request at that time. So, they've been pumping a long time and they really haven't, we haven't been told what effectiveness they've had in their pumping. I appreciate the fact that they've been treating relatively recently, but the pumping has been going on for a long time.

>>Mr. Gibson acknowledged statement

- Aaron Weed had a statement and question

I just wanted to make it clear, Mr. Gibson, that the issue is not that you guys haven't put treatment systems in, the issue is that you haven't put enough in and covered enough of the contaminated plumes within a reasonable amount of time. My other question is regarding the effectiveness of the current treatment systems. I would like to know how well they're handling PFHxS. So, I hope that kind of clears it up there about our concerns

of the treatment because you guys are utilizing old infrastructure when really new infrastructure should have been installed and covered a much larger mass.

>> Mr. Gibson replied, summarized as: The systems are deemed operational, it cannot be said that they've passed their lifetime of operation. Slide 10 shows the PFHxS results for the Mission PTS are below the detection limit of 4 ng/L.

>> Mr. Weed replied, summarized as: Ok, I see that the central does not address PFHxS and nor does FT002.

>> Mr. Gibson replied, summarized as: That's because the SRD does not require those to be reported, but the results for PFHxS for the effluent from the Central treatment system and FT002 are similar in magnitude.

>> Mr. Weed did not feel his question was addressed because he has not seen the data.

>> Mr. Gibson took an action item to provide Mr. Weed reports for all three plants since the start of 2020

- Matthew Siler had a question

I'm with water resource division for EGLE. And I just wanted to note that on the slides it gives flow rates in gallons per minute. And I just wanted to clarify those flow rates, just represent what flows we're running through there. It doesn't represent the maximum flows that you can push through there. Is that accurate? The Central treatment system is able to pump 1040 gallons per minute but you guys are only pumping 250 gallons per minute?

>>Mr. Gibson replied, summarized as: The Central Treatment System was designed to treat 500 gpm and is being operated at 250 gpm.

>>Mr. Siler replied, summarized as: Ok, so increasing the pumping rate could increase the removal.

>>Mr. Gibson replied, summarized as: Well increasing pumping rate should, yes, result in expanded capture zones or PFAS compounds removal, that's correct. [Supplemental information for minutes: That would likely require installing either new pumps in the existing wells or installing new extraction wells as the existing wells are pumping at their maximum capacity.]

>>Mr. Siler requested action item to discuss plans to increase the flow rates. Concerned about decrease in flow rates. Requested another action item to indicate maximum flow rates for Mission and Central Treatment Systems.

>>Mr. Gibson agreed to provide the maximum flow rates for Mission and Central Treatment Systems in the RAB minutes. The maximum treatment rates are 500 gpm for Central and 200 gpm for Mission.

- Arnie Leriche made a statement

Well one thing I just want to stay for a point of order for the RAB is that, when information is shared between the Air Force or any of the agencies and stakeholders, it should be shared, if it's brought up during the RAB meeting, it should be shared with the full RAB because it will inform us but more importantly it'll be part of the record, so that future RAB members will have the benefit of it, and it will move forward faster in getting these issues addressed, if we're sharing information.

>>Mr. Leriche requested that it be an action item

>> Mr. Gibson replied, summarized as: I will send out any information to full RAB team or including them in the minutes.

>>Mr. Leriche replied, summarized as: Ok, but assigning it as an AI then the co-chairs and the Community RAB get a chance to look at it before it becomes a final action item and it maybe answers that one question, but there's another one that's significantly related to it that you could answer at the same time and we'd have a much better view of what's going on.

>>Mr. Gibson confirmed with Mr. Leriche the action items as followed: 2020 effluent test results requested by Mr. Weed, design flow rates for each systems requested by Mr. Siler.

>>Mr. Leriche replied, summarized as: There's a lot of these detailed requests actually are so related that there should be one action item with sub bullets of these things and answers and so forth. At least we should have a way of communicating and sharing the information in a wider realm for requesters.

>>Mr. Gibson replied, summarized as: I suggested the minutes, and you've recommended action items. So, I'll be creating action items and you will see that in the minutes.

>>Mr. Leriche replied OK.

- Mark Henry asked a question

While I was sitting here, I received an e-mail from EGLE saying that seven PFAS compounds that they now have promulgated MCL for them. Is the effluent testing from the current treatment

systems analyzing for these compounds. And I'm sure EGLE has told you that these are coming down the pike. And is the current treatment system effective in removing these compounds?

>> Mr. Gibson replied, summarized as: I don't have the information in front of me. I will include the response in the minutes to the RAB meeting: [Supplemental information for minutes: Mission and Central Treatment Systems treat PFOS/PFOA contaminated groundwater to below EGLE's SRD discharge criteria. The analytical results also indicate effluent concentrations are below the new MCLs for all seven PFAS compounds except HFPO-CA as it is not included in the analytical suite; GenX (HFPO-DA) is not found in AFFF the Air Force used.]

FT002 Treatment Systems treats PFNA and PFHxS to below EGLE's new MCL for these compounds. PFOS and PFOA effluent concentrations consistently meet EGLE's SRD discharge criteria. PFOA effluent concentrations meet the new MCL 75% of the time; PFOS effluent concentrations meet the new MCL 90% of the time. PFHxA and PFBS are not detected in the influent at FT002.

Note that EGLE's MCLs apply to public drinking water sources, rather than surface water or groundwater discharges. EGLE has groundwater cleanup criteria for PFOA and PFOS that match the new MCLs; it has not promulgated groundwater cleanup criteria for the other five PFAS.

- Cathy Wusterbath asked a question

Since we're talking about the pump and treat systems, I'm curious because I've never asked a question directly, but was it ever a liability reduction strategy of the U.S. Air Force to pump the PFAS contaminants out of the ground and place them into area surface waters in order to reduce the volume of contamination on the base property? And if it wasn't, why were the contaminants or why were the pumps allowed to be pumped?

Dr. Stephen TerMaath replied, summarized as

This is a historical question, so let me help out here. First of all, it was never a strategy of the Air Force to intentionally pump PFAS out of the ground and into surface waters as a way of reducing liability. First of all, those systems were installed to control other contamination such as trichloroethylene (TCE). We were working under requirements to operate those systems to remove trichloroethylene from groundwater and meet the discharge criteria for TCE into surface water. When the state issued a new requirements in 2016 that included discharge criteria into surface waters for PFOS and PFOA, we built the Central Treatment System to treat PFOS and PFOA coming from the Arrow Street and Benzene Plant extraction wells. We also retrofitted the Mission Street treatment system to treat PFOS and PFOA being extracted by the Mission Street extraction wells in order to meet the EGLE r discharge criteria. So, we're responding to those requirements for surface water discharge using new treatment systems for

PFOS and PFOA. So, there is no truth to the suggestion it was a strategy to somehow reduce liability and ignore PFAS from the existing pump and treat systems.

>>Ms. Wusterbath replied: OK. Thank you.

>>Dr. TerMaath replied: You're welcome. Thank you for the question.

Rex Vaughn asked a question

About 17 minutes after the meeting started EGLE kicked out a press release about 5 17 announcing the formal adoption of the MCL for the seven PFAS compounds. And it looks like it'll be seven or there's a certain amount of time before they actually become law. But they've passed all the hurdles, and it's now going to be Michigan state law on maximum containment limits for those compounds, which means it's going to have a big impact on what's going on at Wurtsmith.

So my questions are, is, and since you've been knowing this is coming, what impact is this promulgation going to have on the Air Force's obligations to the Wurtsmith area? And like they did in New Hampshire, is the Air Force going to try to use the courts to delay the implementation of MCL in Michigan.

>>Mr. Gibson replied, summarized as: These MCLs now go to DoD to determine if they're going to be considered a potential ARAR. I don't know if I would describe it as litigation but there is a process that for every promulgation of criteria, goes to DoD to be approved as a potential ARAR.

These new MCLs will follow the same process, as other previous criteria that have come out.

>>Mr. Vaughn replied, summarized as: In New Hampshire, the Air Force ended up going to court to try to stop the implementation on some of the stuff around Pease, as I understand it.

I'm just wondering, is that the strategy of the Air Force to do the same to Wurtsmith now that a very stringent set of MCLs have become law?

Dr. Stephen TerMaath replied, as summarized

The Air Force did not go to court over the New Hampshire requirements. That was done by a manufacturer.

With regard to the MCLs as David said, state regulations and legislation regarding PFAS undergo review in DOD for applicability. The review will determine if the state requirements will be a potential applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARAR) for use by the Army, Navy, and Air Force in Michigan. That ensures consistent application of state rules to DOD facilities.

>>Mr. Leriche replied, summarized as: Regarding the MCLs and the applicable rules and regulations that have to be done as part of the RI, that's a process that could take up to more than two years to finalize.

Earlier, we were talking about the interim mitigation actions. As a minimum, a request that the Air Force include as their design and interim mitigation efforts to design and agree to install, that you discuss in those designs, the capability to meet the groundwater impacts in new groundwater that will become state rules when these MCLs are effective so that you don't waste time with your contractors having to go back in two years, number one.

And number two, you may be able to commit in those interim mitigation actions, compliance with a new upcoming concentration and save all of us in our environment, good, better control.

So, that's an action item.

>>Mr. Gibson responded: Thank you for your comment. [Supplemental information for minutes: The Air Force is evaluating concentrations to delineate PFOS and PFOA for the RI as well as the clean up levels that will be identified in any RODs for remedies. The Air Force agrees the delineation should be sufficient to address clean up levels decided upon in the future.]

Dave Gibson (slide #14)

The FT002 pump and treat system was constructed in April 2015 as a time critical removal action. There was an existing USEPA provisional health advisory at that time of 200 parts per trillion of PFOS and 400 parts per trillion for PFOA. Seven extraction wells were installed and the system currently treats a total flow of 240 gpm. Effluent criteria were 40 and 20 ng/L for PFOS and PFOA, respectively. The effluent is discharged to infiltration galleries where the treated groundwater goes back into the groundwater.

Gibson next slide (slide #15):

This figure provides a little bit of background. If you look at the black dot, there, at the top of that, looks like, kind of like an eye. That's the fire training pit. And you go further down to those red square boxes, that's where the wells are installed to monitor the effectiveness of the system.

You've got the bright blue square that's the treatment plant. The red and white circles indicate the air sparging curtain wells there.

Then, you've got this pink line of 7 wells that are pumping out, going into one pipeline which goes into the plant, that's the main groundwater extraction zone there.

And then you've got the bright, green dashes at the bottom. Those are the infiltration trenches.

That's the overview of the above treatment system. That is still a reasonable technology reasonable approach to be used today.

Gibson next slide (slide #16):

You all may have seen this slide in the past. It may have been described as an avocado shape.

The main point for this slide is to show how the high concentration area as shown by the dark red shape at the heart of the avocado has been reduced due to the treatment system. Over the five-year period to 2019, that red area's almost disappeared.

And the plume portion down to the end has really been cut off as far as concentrations in the 10,000 to 100,000 ng/L liter.

So the system is working. The discharge requirements are being met with the system. This slide demonstrates the timeframe for that kind of technology to be effective in reducing the concentrations.

Gibson next slide (slide #17):

These pump and treat systems that are properly designed and installed are going to have an effect on plumes wherever they're installed and can cut off migration. They can be installed at the source and reduce that source concentration.

The system was installed in 2015, and there's a new health advisory of 70 ng/L. The ESI identified that the area with that concentration is a larger plume and recommended a remedial investigation to define the plume dimensions to allow the design of the final treatment system.

Are there any questions on the history of FT002?

Mark Henry asked a question:

I understand that with your interim remedial action that you're going to be expanding the pump and treat at the fire training area. Well, I think that's great; cutting off the head of the monster is always a good thing. But the fire training area has been discharging to Clark's Marsh for 50 or 60 years, and there is a significant amount of PFOS mass that is in the sediments in all of the ponds that comprise Clark's Marsh on its way as that water flows to the Au Sable River. And in fact, the surface water leaving that that sequence of ponds contains a considerable amount of PFOS and it's going, let me say 20 gallons, a minute, 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

And so, there is an ongoing flushing of the PFOS from Clark's Marsh to the Au Sable River. Are there any plans as part of an interim remedial action to set up something like a passive carbon system that the effluent from Clark's Marsh can pass through so that that contamination isn't dumping into the Au Sable and out to Lake Huron?

>>Mr. Gibson, responded, summarized as: The remedial investigation will provide the data necessary for a Feasibility Study to be done to determine if something like that would be beneficial. Because the remedial investigation is going to be examining sediment and surface water in that area as well as other areas of the base.

>>Mr. Henry responded, summarized as: But a passive system could be installed immediately. There's an infrastructure that would allow that right now. The Forest Service has a road all the way to where a passive system would be installed, so, I'm not sure how much testing needs to be done but when I was working for the DEQ, in 2010 through 2012 we tested the water and there was a considerable amount of PFOS leaving Clark's Marsh by that route.

I don't know if you have a program for monitoring the discharge from that marsh at the weir end. But it might be a good idea to do so, like, right now. By the time the RI comes about for that portion of the site, you will have a series of time data that will demonstrate that you have an ongoing discharge to the Au Sable River. And that should be then figured into the plans for an interim remedial action, in my opinion.

>>Mr. Gibson responded: Thank you for that input, Mr. Henry.

Aaron Weed made a statement:

Mr. Gibson and (Dr.) TerMaath: Now, what Mark Henry just brought up there was the big point that has been brought out for a long time in regards to the problem with the remediation you've done up to this point, and that is that it's not in the right locations, you're using old infrastructure.

That's where big swaths of contamination are not being taken care of, such as the effluent from the old effluent from the Air Force base from the wastewater treatment plant has zero remediation. It's leaching into that marsh area near Clark's Marsh.

Just like you said, Clark's Marsh is leaching at all into the Au Sable River. You have the central treatment plant, which ignores a huge swath of contamination that is downstream of those extraction curtains.

So, these are the areas that have got to be taken care of, instead of "cheaping" out on it by using infrastructure that was to start a long time ago for different contamination. Thank you.

>>Mr. Gibson responded, summarized as: I think you said that the Air Force contaminated the wastewater treatment plant or you're talking about the lagoons and the lagoons are continuing to be a source of contamination?

>>Mr. Weed responded, summarized as: No. I'm talking about the effluent that came off the drying beds from when the Air Force was using it.

>>Mr. Gibson responded, summarized as: So the problem was, whenever they were closed, there was effluent prior to that that went down into the creek.

>>Mr. Weed responded: Correct.

>>Mr. Gibson responded, summarized as: Again, the remedial investigation is going to define the boundaries of the PFOS/PFOA plume. That will help us with confirming the best locations for remedies to be placed. And if there's a benefit to putting an interim remedial action in place somewhere with new infrastructure, as well as progressing on toward final remedies. Any other questions?

Arnie Leriche made a statement

These last four or five issues that have been brought up, are right on target.

- And, I want to add an AI, an action item that will supplement one that was submitted by me two years ago.

What I'm asking for, is the Air Force and EGLE within two months prior to the next RAB, make a full list of all the potential and actually known either sources or plumes that have been, and have not been, investigated at the whole base because sometime in the 2 to 3 years ago, someone in the agencies decided that the ESI phase of CERCLA was not going to be a full base in all potential site and be investigated before finalizing it.

And that was done at other sites like Pease so that there are I start did not have the same issues that we just talked about that Aaron brought up and Mark and so forth.

So, let's just capture what the full list is, and have a list and a map that shows up so that we're moving forward.

Mr. Gibson replied

All right, we'll do that.

Mr. Gibson (slide #21):

So, for the next segment, we're going to get more into the RI (Remedial Investigation) contract that addresses the remedial investigation and interim remedial actions and talk about the funds. There's been interest in the funds that were allotted to Wurtsmith, how they're used. Then we'll go over the RI/IRA timeline.

The slide with the pie chart shows the breakdown of funds (slide #22).

The \$13.5 million dollars were allocated to Wurtsmith for FY20. 56% of the funds are toward the remedial investigation, and 41% are toward the two planned interim remedial actions.

A small portion of the funds were directed to disposal of the concrete pad and underground storage container at FT002. The removal of these fire training components are required in order for the non-PFAS remedy to be installed. That's not actually awarded yet, but should be within a month.

(Slide #23) Hopefully you have seen this information before. The RI is going to delineate PFAS across the facility, the whole base. Determine if it is in soil, groundwater, sediment, surface water. Assessment of the human and ecological risks; develop a comprehensive understanding of the fate and transport of PFAS. These four components of the RI go toward the final remedies, putting in the proper treatment with new facilities in the proper locations to clean up the PFAS.

The RI is going to be able to address any interim remedial actions when necessary.

(Slide #24) So the first part on the RI scoping is important for the remedial investigation - development of the data quality objectives. Because without having that firmly agreed to between the Air Force, and EGLE upfront, when you get the data at the end of the RI, they may not be trustworthy and acceptable. And therefore, any findings are not trustworthy and acceptable.

We've got to update the existing conceptual site model in order to support placement of new monitoring wells or placement of the additional groundwater extraction wells so that we're placing them properly.

And one of the steps of that conceptual site models is to update the groundwater model.

Those are early upfront activities that'll be happening here over the next month or so. Then we're going to get into the site characterization. The ESI was focused on assessing plume migration to drinking water wells from only a small subset of sites which were located upgradient of drinking water receptor. But, now, we're going to delineate the full extent of PFOS and PFOA in groundwater, soils, sediment and surface water basewide.

(Slide #25) The RI includes the human health and ecological risk assessments based upon the results of the sampling of various media.

(Slide #26) Finally, the RI includes the interim remedial actions themselves. First action is to address a plume that's impacting Van Etten Lake. This action will rely on existing data from the SI and ESI reports. The IRA design phase will determine the location of new extraction wells and installing additional treatment for that additional flow of extracted water. The second action is at the FT002. Again, using existing data, to identify locations for new extraction wells, installing additional treatment, and expanding the infiltration gallery there.

(Slide #27) Hopefully, everybody understands there are many steps in the start up of the new treatment system. First, the contractor must gather the necessary information for the new treatment system designs. Then, we've got to go through the proposed plan and interim ROD stage with review by EGLE and the public. There's the design review period. And of course, there's the process to gain access to property that's no longer Air Force property, and then who knows what impacts COVID-19 will have, if it's still around at that time. A detailed schedule will be provided at the next RAB to demonstrate the activities and timeframes necessary.

Mark Henry made a statement

Dave, you had a pie chart that showed where expenditures are going. You had a little sliver there for removal of the concrete pad at FT002. Back when I did a lot of aerial photography analysis of Wurtsmith AFB because I was heavily involved with Wurtsmith back then. And it appears from aerial photographs the FT002 was used for about a decade prior to the concrete pad being placed there and the piping that ultimately went to the wastewater treatment plant. So, there is very likely a significant source underneath that concrete in the vadose zone that if you remove the concrete and do nothing with it, will be flushed into the aquifer and then you'll spend a lot more to remove it with activated carbon, then dig haul.

I would recommend that when you're allocating your budget, that you have a significant amount of funding available for removing that pad. It has been sort of neglected over the last two decades. Because of the belief that there is a significant source area, both VOCs and PFAS underneath that pad. So once again, I would recommend that you not just remove it, that you actually remove it and dig out any contaminated soil as soon as you can, once that concrete umbrella has been removed. Thank you.

Dave Gibson made a statement

Understood. The current contract with Bay West already includes implementation of the final remedial action selected via a Record of Decision at FT002 to address volatile organic compounds at the site. The work can't start until the concrete is removed. I think this is good news to be able to complete this remedy to address those chemicals before the Bay West's contract expires.

Mark Henry asked a question

What is that remedy place?

Dave Gibson responded

So what I'm going to do is take an action item to provide the details of that as part of the minutes. The Remedial Action at FT002 is for VOC impacted soil (see AR# 547636, Final ROD IRP

Site FT002) in situ anaerobic biodegradation. While POS and PFOA are not the target for the remedy, PFOS and PFOA are being captured by the existing groundwater treatment system.

Malcolm McClendon responded

Congressman (Dan) Kildee had asked to make a public comment at the end of the meeting, like everyone else. However, he needs to get off the meeting for a bit for a phone call. Is that OK if he makes his comments? Now, this is a question for the RAB members. Is that OK? We'll open it up to Congressman Kildee. The floor is yours for a few minutes.

Rep. Dan Kildee (D-Mich) made a statement summarized as:

Thank you, very much.

It was my intention to participate in the public comments section but my schedule is pretty tight today, and I know you've all been really working on this. So, let me just take a couple of minutes and again, tell you how much I appreciate the chance to make a few comments. I represent Oscoda. I'm proud to represent Oscoda. I love the community. It's part of my childhood, so I feel a real connection, and we know what happened there. Firefighting foam containing PFAS had an impact leaching into the groundwater, drinking water, groundwater wells. And I've been working really hard to deal with it.

Since I came to Congress, working with the people there and Oscoda, particularly the organization, Need Our Water. They deserve a lot of credit for being tireless in bringing this public health threat to the public's attention. Because it's made a difference, not only in terms of our ability to get things done in Oscoda, but it's made a difference for the whole country. And we do need to hold folks accountable.

One of the things I did was I co-founded the Congressional PFAS Task Force, which is a bipartisan task force to bring Republicans and Democrats together to address this health threat like my partner in forming the caucuses, a Republican from Pennsylvania, Congressman Brian Fitzpatrick. He also has problems in his district, and that's the way this has come to us. Three months ago, I spoke during a RAB meeting and expressed that I was disappointed that not much has changed for the people for Oscoda. The Air Force has not, I don't think, taken the urgency that we are insisting upon to deal with cleaning up these chemicals. I'm concerned that we do continue to focus more on studies and cleanup. And while the Air Force has announced plans to increase cleanup efforts around Clark's Marsh, obviously we support that, but that's not enough. Air Force Beach and Lake Van Etten is a public health threat, and it needs to be addressed. And we know enough, I think, to have it addressed.

The recently submitted expanded site inspection, it does call for more studies. I can't be against studies, but when I am there, fighting for money, to clean it up, I want to see more of that.

We know that a substantial endangerment exists. There's a health advisory for the foam on Van Etten where people swim, people fish. There are health advisories for deer, for fish, for small game in Clark's Marsh in the Au Sable River.

The letter, the Feb. 25, 2020, letter from Air Force Secretary (Barbara) Barrett indicates there are \$13.5 million reference for cleanup of the former base. The letter indicated it can be used for construction or expansion of additional treatment systems, if needed. So I asked, and this is just my two cents -- it's a lot more than two cents -- \$13.5 million. I asked that the majority of that money be used for cleanup. That was the Congressional intent. The facts show that there is an imminent and substantial danger.

Oscoda deserved that. So, I appreciate you adjusting your schedule to allow me to say those things. It's something I feel really strongly about. And thank you again. And people there in the community of Oscoda keep it up.

Dave Gibson made a statement summarized as:

I'll be reading into the minutes the paragraph from Secretary Barrett's letter is talking about the use of the funds. I'll wait until the Q&A period to do that.

Bill Gaines asked a question

The responses to some of our questions from the last RAB meeting said that Mr. Gibson was not aware of criteria for cleanup for things other than water. In other words, criteria for cleanup of fish, criteria for cleanup, venison, I don't understand how you're really going to do that ecological and human health risk, assumption assessment, effectively, without some kind of wildlife consumption criteria. We've shared some. I know that MDHHS has criteria. I discussed that criteria with them. I would make the point that the mean fish in the Au Sable, the mean Bluegill in the Au Sable is 250 parts per trillion. There's that do not eat advisory on that.

But if you ate an eight ounce serving of that fish, it would be the equivalent of drinking a liter and a half of water a day for a year and four months with 70 parts per trillion. That's based on the fact that one nanogram of PFAS is one part per trillion of a kilogram and liter on the identical things.

So, I would like to know what kind of criteria are going to be used for the human health risk assessment on wildlife consumption. MDHHS has some, so that would be the source.

Dave Gibson responded summarized as:

Thank you, Bill, for that input. The purpose of the RI is to examine those criteria and provide that back to EGLE for their review to confirm that the Air Force is using the proper data.

>>Bill Gaines responded: That would be good, thank you.

Arnie Leriche made a statement summarized as:

Just to supplement what Bill said. In the last meeting, I brought up that EPA provided the Pease Air Force Base in November of 2017: criteria for human health risk screening for fish. And there was a whole list, and I gave it to the Air Force in November of 2018, almost two years ago. And that was not understood, or, Dave, you said that you do not know of any other criteria like that. And I was wondering since then, are you looking into that criteria, and can it be brought into the discussion of at least combining, and compiling all the data that the state has taken on, uh, wildlife, at least do a screening. Then you'll do the assessment on the RI. So that's my suggestion, to finish the talk.

Dave Gibson replied summarized as:

I'll work on my responses. Even though I personally don't have the expertise or knowledge of the various things that have been talked about on the allowable limits for fish and deer, and what are the Pease or New Hampshire requirements for various things, the Air Force has hired a highly qualified contractor, Aerostar, whose team has the expertise required - hydrogeologist, geologist, toxicologist, chemists, etc. necessary for the RI.

Cathy Wusterbarth asked a question:

Because the remedial actions include, include the Van Etten Lake plume. I want to repeat, for those who may have not heard, making new people in the RAB meetings. Need Our Water top priority statement, which is, to have the Air Force stop the flow of Wurtsmith PFAS contamination into all Oscoda area surface water by no later than 2023, including remediation with the utmost speed and urgency of the PFAS plumes impacting Van Etten Lake.

Now with the description of the remedial actions here in the agenda, we don't think that this remedial action provides any assurance that the plume at the beach will be cleaned up. What assurance do we have that these measures will directly clean up the plumes?

Dave Gibson responded

There are two questions there. One you're saying NOW has a goal of achieving, stopping all migration from the base by 2023. So there's that aspect. You're saying you're not seeing that happening based on the timeline.

>>Cathy Wusterbath responded, summarized as: And now we did that at the last RAB meeting.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: And you added what assurances are there that the PFAS will be cleaned up. I'm not sure, if you're saying cleaned up by 2023 or cleaned up period.

>>Cathy Wusterbath responded: No addressing. Affecting the beach.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: You're saying what assurance does NOW have that the Air Force will be addressing the plume to Air Force Beach under this RI?

>>Cathy Wusterbath responded: That's right.

>>Dave Gibson responded: Well, that's the Air Force's stated purpose as described in the slides on the IRAs that we reviewed.

>>Cathy Wusterbath responded: Under the interim measures?

>>Dave Gibson responded: Yes. The Air Force wants to affect PFOS and PFOA migration to Air Force Beach, where the hotspot is on Van Etten Lake. The Air Force intends to install an interim remedial action under this current contract, based upon current data. We'll have to see after the remedy is installed the long term effect. But, again, the goal is to stop migration of PFOS and PFOA off base.

>>Cathy Wusterbath asked a question, summarized as: And that going to happen as an interim measure?

>>Dave Gibson responded: Yes.

>>Cathy Wusterbath responded: OK.

1:57:00

Mike Munson made a statement summarized as:

Basically, looking at the slides, I see in the Air Force they are looking at something other than water. As fires contamination, i.e. the pad and that ground, which is great. I think they're being proactive. However, we were involved here about a year ago doing a runway resurface. And what we did is we took material that was after the Air Force left, took it off and moved it off site. You would not believe the questions we got there. We were taking away contaminants and putting it into somebody's backyard. Well, here's a case where we are taking contaminants and removing it someplace. I can tell you right now, that's going to be a PR nightmare, because no one wants it in their backyard.

So my point being, we need to think about processing this stuff on site. Now, maybe we got to go hire some scientist to figure this out, but I can tell you right now, if you're going to take that stuff out, whether it be concrete or dirt, and move it someplace else, other than the base, you're going to have a problem. And if you put it on the base, what have you done? You haven't done anything, So that's something you need to think about.

>>Dave Gibson asked a question, summarized as: Mr. Munson, if we are able to legally dispose of the concrete at a regulated site, are you saying we're not free to do that?

>>Mike Munson replied, summarized as: I'm not saying you're not free, it's just, if you start driving stuff around off the base, you're going to get people concerned. I can tell you that right now, because we had a kind of a PR nightmare when we moved just some asphalt material to an area that they reprocessed it. There was no PFAS in it because it was the runway resurface was done after the Air Force left, and it was above all that stuff, But just a PR nightmare you're going to have is that is going to be something you need to think about.

>>Dave Gibson replied, summarized as: I'd like to hear more from you after the RAB. Could you could send me some kind of information about what the PR nightmares are, because I haven't heard of following the law for disposal of anything, is a problem.

>>Mike Munson replied, summarized as: OK, well, it's about three or four RABs ago. I got attacked by local people saying we're removing PFAS material off the airport. It was a verbal consultation, and I'm just saying that you'd better make sure you got all your ducks in a row. And, you know, maybe you guys have it in line, but I know we had an issue.

Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: We are following all of Michigan and EPA requirements for disposal of materials.

Mike Munson replied, summarized as: OK. Maybe it wouldn't be an issue, but I just don't know, you know, reverting to what we had.

Dr. Stephen TerMaath replied, summarized as:

I'm going to add onto that. Not only are we following the law, but by policy, within the Department of Defense, in the Air Force, we are treating anything like that, as a minimum, as a hazardous waste. And right now, most regulations do not consider that a hazardous waste. But we are, by policy, treating it as a hazardous waste, and making sure that we go a step above and beyond to make sure that, wherever we take it, we're not creating a problem or a legacy problem that's just going to surface in the future.

>>Mike Munson responded, summarized as: OK, I'm sorry. It sounds like you got your ducks in a row, and I'm glad for that, OK?

>>Stephen TerMaath responded: Thank you

David Winn asked a question

My question is relative to the RI investigation. I noticed you mentioned in here that the investigation was part of Wurtsmith. My question is, and this has come up in many, many previous meetings before, and it's been a bone of contention, is that we are under the understanding that the remedial investigation will not only take good care of the base, but also areas such as, like the east side of Van Etten Lake, which has never been looked at before. So my question is, how far does the remedial investigation span out to? Does it include the east

side of Van Etten Lake? Does it include Cedar Lake? Does it include areas over by Lake Huron? What does it include?

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: Well, the generic answer would be if the Air Force is responsible for a plume, then we have to take care of that plume. I believe last night, during the briefing from EGLE, it was stated and clarified, presented, that the PFAS existence on the east side of Van Etten Lake and Cedar Lake is not related to any operations associated with Wurtsmith Air Force Base. So, while there may be PFAS in that area, it's not been shown to be resulting for the Air Force. And, therefore, we would not be addressing it.

>>David Winn responded, summarized as: OK, so I have a problem with that. My problem is that we have been told by EGLE, many, many times. And I think people on this call, EGLE knows, we've been told, we've been asking about the remedial investigation. We were told by EGLE is that the remedial investigation would cover those areas. So, I'm being told now that they're not, so that is the problem. In EGLE, you guys know exactly what I'm talking about.

>>Beth Place responded summarized as: During the remedial investigation, EGLE will be asking the Air Force to determine the nature and the extent. So, how far the PFAS compounds have traveled from the base.

And so that is where we may get into that eastern side of the lake. We've also, so it depends on how far the PFAS traveled, and to what level that we agree and we are looking at. So Air Force through the RI, will have to determine that extent of contamination down to the agreed upon level. Then, also, we've also talked about, you've heard our CSM presentations from last night. Now some of that near shore, contamination, on the Southeastern side of Van Etten Lake, we're not sure exactly where that's from, from our transducer study. It's possible it's from some back and forth action from Van Etten Lake and contamination from the base is venting into Van Etten Lake, and then that near shore action on the Eastern side, may be contributing to some contamination. But there's still some gaps that that we're not quite sure where that near shore contamination is coming from. Does that help clear it up, Dave Winn.

>>Mike Munson responded, summarized as: Yes. I think again, they wouldn't expect an action item for someone to sit down, determine what extent of that investigation is going to occur, because right now, I'm not comfortable that it's going to cover anything except the base. So I would like an action list. I would like Arnie, as far as community RAB, you guys like you list an action assignment that determines what is the extent of the RI investigations along with EGLE. Because I'm hearing two different things right now.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: That's fine to have an action item, and there will be an RI work plan that will describe the extent of the RI and that will be reviewed by EGLE and made available to the RAB.

Rex Vaughn asked a question summarized as:

Wanting to know the name of who was a successful bidder for the RI contracts?

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: Aerostar. They're the current prime contractor that installed the Mission Street resin treatment system.

Bill Gaines made a statement summarized as:

I made a comment. You can just address that comment. Beth actually covered the same thing when she said that there was a lot of ambiguity on the southeast corner of Van Etten Lake.

Beth Place made a statement summarized as:

One thing I should have mentioned from our transducer study that we did not see based on the information that we collected. And there are a few data gaps in our study, but we did not see that flow from the western side of Van Etten Lake was flowing beneath Van Etten Lake and coming out on the other side in groundwater. So that's a main point that we wanted to get across with our CSM presentation. It's that kind of near-shore interaction that we're not quite sure about over there on the southeastern side.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: Yes I think the briefing actually pointed out that Cedar Lake is topographically higher than Van Etten Lake.

>>Beth Place responded, summarized as: Yes, Cedar Lake. Yep, that's correct.

Arnie Leriche made a statement summarized as:

I believe we have already you have your questions just for the record. Regarding the conversation, it's not the Air Force's responsibilities in their conceptual model to investigate including that east side, right?

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: Again, I believe the answer to that was if there's data which shows that contamination on the east side of Van Etten Lake is attributable to Air Force mission related activities, then we would investigate it. To date, all the data shows that groundwater does not flow under the lake, and in fact, groundwater on the east side of the lake flows west, towards the lake.

>>Leriche responded, summarized as: Well even Mr. Gillespie, your hydrologist, he admitted to me a year ago in the RAB meeting that, that throat of soil in the southeast corner of the lake, historically over a few thousand years, and EGLE even showed on their map last night that there was a river delta, right at the shoreline of the southeast, 20-30 feet down, that hasn't been evaluated by EGLE nor the Air Force, so that's a concern of ours and it's the Air Force's responsibility as the site CERCLA party to investigate.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: Let's see what the CSM says, the groundwater modeling and let the investigation occur, and everyone will see exactly where we intend to look. But as far as the eastern side of the Van Etten Lake, the RI is not focused on that side of the lake at this time.

>>Arnie Leriche responded, summarized as: We'll know that in a timeline, that we can go with the final decision on whether or not an investigation in that area we'll be done. We'll have time.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: The RAB will have an opportunity to know what the Air Force is doing, yes

>>Leriche responded, summarized as: OK, all right. Dave Winn in his statement asked if it would be an action item, so I suggested that to Dave.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: What is the extent of the RI, that's correct.

>>Arnie Leriche responded, summarized as: For the southeast?

Malcolm McClendon responded: We have to move on, we have one more question, then we have to move on to the next section just because we're pressing up against that one hour for the Q&A section. Because that one hour for the Q&A section. But we all want to keep the questions going and answers. Jeff, you had a question or a comment?

Martha Gottlieb made a statement summarized as:

Hi this is Martha Gottlieb. I'm sitting in for Jeff, who had to step away while we are waiting here. When somebody who is responding to Cathy's (Wusterbath) remarks and I don't know who it was, but they said, that's our plan -- Stop the flow, and to all extent possible under contract. So Jeff's comment is, when they said that's our plan, what are the details of that plan that says that's our plan to stop the flow? We'd like to see the details and that was one of our number one priorities like 10 years ago. So to hear, again, that's our plan is really disconcerting to hear. So I would like you to share the details of your plan, to stop the flow like dates, details, who's doing it, who's on that, who's a dedicated project manager?

And then when they said to all extent possible under this contract, can you share a copy of that contract? That actually makes us a little bit nervous to the extent possible. So we have a flow of toxins into our rivers and Van Etten Creek. As you're saying to the extent possible. That is just not acceptable. This is an ethics issue in my eyes.

Again, if it was a private company and you are flowing toxins and knowingly that would end. So, when you say, stopping the flow, to all the extent possible, that is not acceptable. It is we need to stop the flow. That's our number one priority. Stop the bleeding. That is my comment, thank you.

{Please note that non-community RAB members must hold their questions until the public comment period}

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: Thank you for your comment.

>>Martha Gottlieb responded, summarized as: You're going to respond when, I'm sorry?

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: Ma'am, you said that's your comment, and so I thought that you were just making a statement.

>>Martha Gottlieb responded, summarized as: I am making a statement, and in that statement, was what are you going to do? So you have that in your notes, are you going to provide the contract and the plan you have?

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: The Air Force is following the CERCLA process. The process has been outlined in several RAB meetings. The current contract is for the Remedial Investigation phase of the process. The scope of the RI and timeline has been provided in the slides we went over. The interim remedial action at AF Beach is not the long term solution as we have not completed the RI necessary to fully delineate the plumes and to conduct the risk assessments to propose a remedy. The end result of the CERCLA process will be a ROD to clean up areas with unacceptable risks due to PFOS and PFOA.

>>Martha Gottlieb asked a question, summarized as: OK, can I ask one more question? I said we'll see how much of this can be addressed at this time. What's the gating factor? Is it money, what is it?

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: We haven't completed the RI and baseline risk assessment so we have limited information. I know that people think we have all the information we need, but the wells have to go a particular depth. Is it 20 feet or 30 feet or 35 feet? That makes a difference. How much water can be pumped out?

>>Martha Gottlieb responded, summarized as: OK. So, after these 10 years, what have we been doing? How come that information isn't available? I'm just curious. I just don't get it. I don't understand why. I'm just nervous because it's like while we're formulating our plan, we don't have all the information. It's continued to flow for years, and it's not stopped. What's going to stop it? What can we do? How can we help you be successful? We just want to work together as a team. I just don't get it.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: Well, the big thing is to understand the CERCLA process that was implemented by Congress, and then defined and developed by US EPA. The intent is to provide transparency, the intent is to allow public participation, to move on through the CERCLA phases with well-defined information, to make sure that the federal government and DoD are being good stewards of resources.

And if you're not familiar with the phases of CERCLA, then we can hold a training on the CERCLA process.

>>Martha Gottlieb responded, summarized as: No, I don't want any training, I just want action. I'm sorry, I sound frustrated, but you can imagine what this is like. Is Van Etten Lake, is it supposed to be interim? Not final.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: The interim remedial action at Air Force Beach is considered interim because we have not completed the remedial investigation and a feasibility study. It will be great news, if we guess right, and it turns out that the RI and the feasibility study prove that the current action is complete. That'd be wonderful, but we have not completed the RI. We've not gone through a feasibility study. Therefore, I cannot say it's the final answer.

Dave Gibson introduced the next slide, Relative Risk Site Evaluation (slide #30)

These are topics that will be addressed in the presentation. I'm not going through them right now, but this briefing provides all the information needed to understand the worksheets that have been developed so they can provide comments on those worksheets. Slide.

(Slide #31) The plan right now is to present the slides to the BCT first. I proposed to Arnie that we look at next week, or we can go on the first week of August to set up another GoToMeeting to provide the slides to the RAB. Arnie can you agree that AFCEC can set up a GoToMeeting for the RAB to receive the briefing. And then once that's done, then we can post the worksheet and information from the RRSE to the AR and then put out a public notice.

So I guess in the interest of time, let's just go ahead and add an action item to establish a date and time for that RRSE briefing.

>>Arnie Leriche responded, summarized as: Yes, I sent an e-mail to the community RAB a week ago and asked for input on that. I've only received a couple, so I suggest that we do add this as an action item and unless there's severe opposition for this training on this important issue, that we do go ahead and schedule as you suggested.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: OK, we'll send out a doodle poll soon after probably by early next week just so we can get it worked out.

Dave Gibson introduced a slide #33 summarized as:

These dates are for key milestones, for the interim remedial actions and the remedial investigation. Are there any questions on these? By the next RAB in October, there's going to be the detailed schedule showing all components the RI and the IRAs. But, they're going to fall within these timeframes shown here.

>>Arnie Leriche responded, summarized as: I'd like to set up an AI, an action item, to ask EGLE and the Air Force to help the community RAB know of a more detailed schedule that you're making decisions, and to share communication back and forth.

So, that very important phase that we're moving into for interim, remedial actions, that the community route has more timely tracking and knowledge, so that we can answer more of these questions that have been coming up at this meeting and give the opportunity to do so.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: If you could send an e-mail to us, and put in that e-mail what your question just was or what the actual item is. Mr Leriche emailed the following on 1 Oct 20: Request the Air Force and EGLE help the community RAB understand and share their processes and schedule of significant tasks, commitments, schedules for developing the RI/IRA Scoping Workplan. This will not be made into an Action Item as there is not a task with an end point. The Air Force is endeavoring to help the community understand the remedial program and RI/IRA schedule.

>>Arnie Leriche responded: OK.

Jeff Moss asked a question:

I pushed the button, I guess it didn't work. But I guess my question is this: You have around \$5.5 million of the \$13.5 million slated for remedial action of this particular projects in the Clark's Marsh area, FT002, or the Ratliff Beach in and the Van Etten Lake area. My question is this: Was there any consultation with EGLE as to what projects were priorities of theirs, along with priorities of yours, to generate remedial actions, utilizing the same \$5.5 million or maybe utilizing \$7 to \$10 million and taking the RI into the fourth quarter of 2022. In other words, maybe the remedial investigation a little longer to satisfy some of the primary remedial actions that EGLE may have focused on their agendas of finding different areas. Or different priorities than the Air Force's?

Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: These two interim remedial actions are on the list of four that came from EGLE.

>>Jeff Moss responded: OK

>>Dave Gibson responded: So we're on the same page. This remedial investigation contract allows for additional interim remedial actions, as deemed necessary, and that EGLE is going to be a partner with us.

>>Jeff Moss responded: OK.

But what it sounds like, is that they're being told what you're willing to do, and they agree that these things need to be taken care of. So, I guess, Mike, I know you're listening, so my question is going to direct to you, Mike. Were you consulted, or have you been able to put forth your

priorities on what you'd like to see cleaned up at the Wurtsmith Air Force Base or surrounding areas, along with the Air Force to take some of this \$13.5 million and come together as a team and project this for remedial action inside the RI?

Mike Neller made a statement summarized as:

Yeah, this is Mike. No, weren't consulted before that they announced the two that the Air Force's said they're going to undertake initially. Dave, is right in that when we saw that, it was two of the four, we indicated/we requested that they be undertaken.

I mean, whether or not these were the top two, I mean, we can't really argue with whether what they chose to do. You know, we wouldn't say, Oh, we would have picked this one, and we didn't list them in any sort of priority.

I would tell you that, you know, in our estimation, the removal of the beds up by the wastewater treatment plant is the most costly of the actions that we requested be undertaken. And so, I understand why that one didn't necessarily, given the resources they have at this time, didn't get picked. But, I mean, there wasn't a back and forth about what they were going to do.

>>Jeff Moss asked a question, summarized as: So is there within this CERCLA process, Dave, a way to instead of communicate inside of the disputes and the issues that we have, Is there a way inside of the CERCLA process that the two major league parties that are involved in this can be more coordinated, so that, as a community, we're seeing the actions of the two parties be more teamwork, like then adversarial against each other, on these particular issues? I mean, we're just looking for some interim action, OK? And what you're choosing are clearly these things we've been looking for, but they clearly have primary sites that they'd like to do, also. Am I out of bounds on what I'm asking, or, I mean, is it something that may further the community that the two of you guys, are, in tighter communication, to picking the actions that would benefit our community?

Aaron Weed asked a question summarized as:

In other words, are you going to work with the communities, who are one of the primary stakeholders in this, or are we going to be left out again?

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: There's really two questions that Mr. Weed and Mrs. Moss asked about AFCEC working with EGLE and then AFCEC sharing with the community what the plans are.

So I can't speak for the past, I know going forward CERCLA and the process does allow for that to happen, because there's going to be work plans developed whether they're for the designs of the IRA, or if it's going to be the placement of the remedial investigation wells, and those

documents are going to be made available and reviewed. So, there will be communication happen.

>>Jeff Moss responded, summarized as: I think that there's communication that does occur, OK? For me, know, we're getting these, that, 10 o'clock this morning, or 11 o'clock this morning to be able to review it, and I understand that you have a lot of things to coordinate, but I'm trying to determine, after three years, of looking at these things, and being on monthly calls with everybody, and trying to understand what's going on, everybody is clear that the communities are extremely frustrated with what's going on. And, we have the state of Michigan, and we have the Air Force DoD, we hear a particular amount of money that's allocated by our Congress to do remedial actions, and you've allocated some of this money towards that, and you've allocated more of the money towards the investigation.

Which is exactly what you said would happen, and it has. I guess my question is how do we have more input to allow this funding from the taxpayers to go towards the remedial action that we're looking for to take place here? I don't think the \$5.5 million isn't enough money out of the budget.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: You're getting into the statement that Mr. Kildee made, I'd like to combine my response to you and him during the comments.

>>Jeff Moss responded: Yeah, I just wanted it to be heard about it. Thank you for your time.

Cathy Wusterbath made a statement summarized as:

So under the interim, remedial action timeline. I believe, maybe Arnie may have said this or clarified it. But we'd like to see those Van Etten Lake plumes, remedial actions, timelines specified inside of that. Please.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: You're asking when will the additional treatment be installed for Air Force Beach, is that you're saying?

>>Cathy Wusterbath responded, summarized as: Right. Those remedial actions were specified for Van Etten Lake. And then you have some. There were two items that were going to be addressed under remedial actions, and so we'd like to have those broken out, of course. So, you can see the timeline for Van Etten Lake.

>>Dave Gibson responded: Yes. The detailed schedule for the RI and the IRAs will be briefed at the next RAB meeting in October.

>>Cathy Wusterbath responded: All right. Thanks.

Arnie Leriche asked a question summarized as:

Will that schedule be at the same time you send it to Mike Neller at the remediation division in October?

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: The process would be to work with EGLE first and then share with the public, but that will happen by the October RAB.

>>Arnie Leriche responded, summarized as: I understand. But we need to have better understanding to minimize these repeated questions about this issue and they're good questions. So, I'll be talking with you about an action item, then talk to Mike about how we may share some of this with a community RAB, so that we can help and do our task where the RAB is to communicate with the communities. We can't do that if we have no information on technical decisions by your two agencies. So, it's an action item with a co-chair should talk about that very soon.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: I believe the schedule that you'll be getting in October will answer these questions.

>>Arnie Leriche responded: Yes, but that's when you're throwing it out to the public is what you said.

>>Dave Gibson responded: Yes.

>>Arnie Leriche responded, summarized as: We're not just the public. We're here to help the public understand, so we need to understand a little bit before the official public (knows), so we'll chat and see if we can come up with an understanding.

>>Dave Gibson responded: OK

Dave Gibson presents a slide #34 summarized as:

We've got to verify the design parameters, so we're not at this point able to start next week with drilling wells. You've seen some of the things that had to be done in order to actually drill wells and install wells.

And we're going to continue to evaluate if there's additional interim remedial actions that need to be done now under this contract as we gather more information. We're going to be working with EGLE to do that, to finalize those plans. Any questions on the conclusion or timeline? Can we move on to the RAB business?

Martha Gottlieb asked a question summarized as:

Jeff and I had a question. Just real quick, here. You mentioned something about the CERCLA training process. And again, I went on the flowchart on the site. And I see that there's a decision tree, you know, it's the fifth block down, it says "Is an immediate or short-term response necessary?"

And it goes, yes or no.

>>Dave Gibson responded: Yes.

>>Martha Gottlieb responded: I'm curious, is this an immediate short term response. When you have known toxins that are created by the Air Force, we know that is flowing wouldn't that classify as an immediate short-term response and that then would initiate Superfund emergency response program? I mean, I'm just saying like toxins flowing into our water. I can't think of anything more immediate needed.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: We will attach to the minutes to the RAB, portions of the details of what is a yes or no. If that does not answer the question we can plan a separate online training. [Supplemental information for minutes: There is not an imminent threat at Wurtsmith. The drinking water supply does not have PFOS or PFOA above the Health Advisory of 70 ng/L. 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 deer, based upon PFOS exceeding screening criteria of 300 part per billion (ppb), exceeding a screening criteria does not mean there is unacceptable risk.]

>>Martha Gottlieb responded: OK, that's fine. Thank you.

Arnie Leriche asked a question:

When you're doing that last RAB meeting, I asked you to help us understand how you decide in accordance with your Air Force Instruction (AFI), 32-7020, which gives criteria, to make that decision of interim controls, decisions before they are or even start, as Martha was alluding to. So please, will you answer that reference in that instructional manual that you have, to guide your teams? Thank you.

[Supplemental information for minutes: Removal or Interim Remedial Action a short term action to address any immediate threats to human health and the environment or to prevent further contaminant migration. The first cause does not apply to WAFB as there is no imminent threat. However, the Air Force has determined to take action to prevent further contaminant migration.]

Malcolm McClendon introduced slide #37 summarized as:

OK, coming up on, we have Mr. Robert Tasiar, who was with us for several years, the RAB member. He has gone on to other things and will not be serving as a member any longer and we appreciate his time and dedication to the RAB.

That leaves a vacancy, one of our alternates, Mark (Henry), has stepped up and I think is up for the vote. So at this moment, let's go ahead and have a vote for Mr. Mark. There's some

instructions there. This is for primary RAB member Mark Henry. Please cast your vote and let us know if you have any questions, as you're doing so.

Arnie Leriche asked a question to Natausha Bly summarized as:

I can't find that the voting document

>>Natausha Bly responded: What do you mean, voting document? You put it in the questions box.

>>Arnie Leriche responded: I got it. Showed up.

>>Natausha Bly responded: OK, great

Aaron Weed asked a question summarized as:

Why is there an abstain option?

>>Malcolm McClendon responded, summarized as: I don't think there's a real reason for just thrown on there.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: Are you saying that there is no either vote yes or no, or abstain is not appropriate for the, based upon the plan or no?

>>Aaron Weed responded, summarized as: I don't think abstain is appropriate, unless it's going to be some sort of personal financial benefit.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: Well, let's try and see if we can get the nine or so yes and Nos, OK?

>>Malcolm McClendon responded, summarized as: So for the sake of this vote, then please refrain from using abstain. It's either yes or no. It was that.

Jerry Schmidt asked a question summarized as:

I have to ask, my voting box here does not seem to allow me to type in.

>>Natausha Bly responded, summarized as: What voting box do you mean?

>>Jerry Schmidt responded, summarized as: Well, OK, I have a voting box with an arrow pointing here and it says, type into the questions. How do I guess I don't know how they held a vote here.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: You should have a sidebar, a red arrow on the side of the screen there, that red arrow, on the left, press it, and that'll open up the sidebar, OK? Now go down, you will see audio, handouts and questions. And in the questions drop-down, there's space for you to enter information. And that's where you say yes or no.

>>Jerry Schmidt responded, summarized as: All right? That's where you want me to put my vote? OK. I got it. Thank you. Sorry about that problem, and say Send, OK? I'm 37 years old, so I don't know how to do all this stuff.

>>Dave Gibson responded: OK, Natausha. How are we doing on the count?

>>Natausha Bly responded: We have one more or left. We're waiting.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: And so this is anonymous, so we're not going to be doing any querying or anything like that.

Cathy Wusterbath asked a question summarized as:

Does the person need prompting time to do this?

>>Natausha Bly responded: They just responded. We're doing the tally now.

>>Cathy Wusterbath responded: OK, thank you.

Malcolm McClendon made a statement summarized as:

All right, so. The results are eight yes? I believe that confirms it.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: Welcome aboard.

>>Malcolm McClendon responded: Perfect. Yes, welcome. Thank you.

Malcolm McClendon made a statement summarized as:

The next election now is for co-chair. Co-chair is up for re-election, and so that that it opens up the position to any primary members of the community RAB. In this round, we have Mr. Arnie Leriche, who has asked to continue. He threw his hat in. We also have Mark Henry, who also wants to be considered for the community co-chair position. So at this moment, we're going to get both a couple of minutes to speak and let the RAB members know why they should be your next community co-chair. So, we'll start with Mr. Mark Henry:

Mark Henry made a statement

I've been involved with Wurtsmith Air Base since about 1998, almost continuously. I have a great love for the surface waters of the State of Michigan. I have worked towards cleanup of those during my whole career with the state.

I have a particular love of Clark's Marsh. The fire training area and Clark's Marsh, I know intimately. As such, I feel that a lot more attention needs to be paid to cleaning up those. That is a much more difficult task than cleaning up the plume that is going to Van Etten Lake, which is simply a pump and treat operation in all likelihood, unless some new technology comes

about. So during my time as co-chair, I will be pushing towards not only the cleanup event at Van Etten Lake, or at least the groundwater impacted by Wurtsmith going into Van Etten Lake, but I will be pushing very hard to keep the ball rolling towards the cleanup of Clark's Marsh.

Towards that, the RAB is a perfect opportunity to input into the process, and I know the process very well, so I guess that's about it.

Arnie Leriche made a statement:

Three to four years ago, I went to the township and I requested that they put in a request to establish a community RAB and submit it to the Air Force. There was significant opposition at the board at that time, so it took me about four months.

Aaron approached me and he agreed that something needed to change. So, I drafted a letter, and I gave it to him, and he got it passed by the board. So that's the start of the RAB.

The RAB is special, in that, the way it's set up is, for a technical review and to hold the party's state and Air Force to the CERCLA and state rules. It is technical review.

We have to be careful not to spend a lot of time talking about health issues and things like that. But activism is great and it's helpful to bring attention, but we have to make sure that we do the work behind the scenes, so that we know the science and the decisions of how it's being made.

There was one other thing, at the beginning of the training is very important to bring up, and that is, the facilitator told us that we are individuals in the community RAB. We do not represent other organizations, so we vote, so that we can communicate with the community.

My heart is in this, and I welcome the other candidate, and I will work with, whoever becomes the co-chair. And, I just wanted to end with that.

Malcolm McClendon made a statement summarized as:

OK, thank you, so we'll move on to the voting for community co-chair, and correct me if I'm wrong, Natausha, but it's going to be the same?

>Natausha Bly responded: Yes, everybody knows.

>>Malcolm McClendon responded, summarized as: Disregard the word abstain, you got two choices. Let us know who should be the next co-chair. Thank you.

>>Natausha Bly responded: We just have two more, and then we'll have the results.

>>Malcolm McClendon responded, summarized as: OK, there, so now you're seeing in front of you the voting results. Dave just is this the word that you like to use quorum for the way ahead?

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: Yes as we have a quorum we have 51% or more. Welcome aboard, Mark.

>>Mark Henry responded: Thank you very much.

>>Arnie Leriche responded: Congratulations Mark. Looking forward to working with you.

>>Mark Henry responded: Thanks Arnie.

Malcolm McClendon made a statement summarized as:

(Slide #38) Let's move forward please. We're moving on now to the public comments section. We originally had set aside about an hour for this, but, again, we have some good dialogue, some good questions throughout the meeting. So I think that was very well worth it to sit and to answer those as they came in. So now, we're if we could open it up to the public so they could get their questions or comments in. So, I'll go ahead and start with the first one. Because of time, if you ask more questions than one, I'm only going to use one. And the other questions will be answered in the minutes. So, we won't we're not going to forget about your questions or comments. We'll still get to it, but for the sake of time, we're going to do one for each.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: I want to address Mr. Moss's comments about the disappointment that all the funds are not going to the remedial investigation. I go back to the 25 February 2020 letter, from Secretary of the Air Force, and it's Paragraph 1, 2, 3.

It states these funds, the \$13.5 million, will allow the Air Force to expedite the remedial investigation by one year, which is the next step in the CERCLA process.

AFCEC is complying with Secretary of the Air Force's direction. The remedial investigation provides critical information on the nature and extent of contamination to conduct interim remedial actions, if needed.

Dave Gibson responded to Jeff Moss summarized as:

I responded to your comment before. Rep. Kildee made a statement. I would have responded, then. I would like for you to add another comment.

>>Jeff Moss responded: No problem I'll be happy to put it in the comments.

>>Dave Gibson responded: Let's get other folks to get their questions, and thank you.

Malcolm McClendon read the first question summarized as

The first question we have here is from Tess Nelke. Forgive me if I mispronounce that. The question is, we don't know the impact of PFAS contamination in the health of the aquatic environment and all of the possible hazards associated with consuming fish harvested from contaminated waters. The AuSable River and nearby Lake Huron provide an important

recreational commercial fishery to residents and visitors. It is likely that the fish consumption is an important route of PFAS exposure for many people. What is being done to stop not slow the contamination flow into the Au Sable River into Lake Huron from the former Wurtsmith Air Force Base?

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: The pump and treat system previously constructed at FT002 is a direct response to PFOS and PFOA at Clark's Marsh. The upgrade of the Mission pump and treat system and construction of the Central Treatment System were a direct response to PFOS and PFOA. The two interim remedial actions at AF Beach and FT002 are a direct response to stop PFOS and PFOA migration. The RI is the next necessary step to delineate PFOS and PFOA in groundwater as well as soil and surface water and to complete the baseline human health and environmental risk assessment to establish the requirement for any other remedies.

>>Malcolm McClendon responded: OK, All right, thank you.

Malcolm McClendon read the second question:

The next question we had that came in was from Daniel O'Conner. He asked can you please show us somehow that the effluent PFAS concentrations at FT002 and Arrows Street have decreased over the time they have been functional. Thank you.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: We will address this at the next RAB.

Malcolm McClendon made a statement:

Next in line, it was Mr. Anthony Spaniola, who wishes to speak. So I'll flip the floor over to you.

Anthony Spaniola made a statement:

So, I would like to just make a few points. I think there are some misconceptions here tonight. There's been some backsliding and some statements that I think needs to be clarified.

First of all, the CERCLA process does not tie the Air Force's hands. We don't need a training on the CERCLA process to know, as Congressman Kildee stated quite clearly, that CERCLA mandates immediate action where there are imminent and substantial threats to public health and the environment, we clearly have that at Van Etten Lake Beach, the former Air Force Beach. And the statements that were made tonight, there was a lot of backsliding back and forth about, we need to move further through the RI. No, we need to take action now. There's been 10 years of studies that have been done.

Interim means immediate, I mean, imminent means immediate, and we need to see action now, not two years down the road. And there should be sufficient money set aside to do that.

Secondly, it is not accurate to say that EGLE has determined that the East Side of Van Etten Lake is not the Air Force's responsibility. EGLE's study was inconclusive and more work needs to be done, particularly on the surface water contamination on the southeast side of the lake.

And, finally, I would just say that the information sharing between the Air Force and the RAB and the public is grossly inadequate. When we receive slides, minutes, or hours before the meeting, first of all, there should be actual input gotten from the public before these decisions are made through the RAB and otherwise. This type of conduct has gone on repeatedly, year after year, after year, and it results in poor management on the part of the Air Force, which has us in a position of 10 years with no real, meaningful plan in place. And it leaves the public in the dark.

And so, rather than just dumping information at the last minute and avoiding accountability for actions, provide the partner with the RAB Board, partner with EGLE, partner with the public, because this has gone on far too long. And the comments that were made tonight do not seem to signal a new direction here. And that is not acceptable. Thank you.

Malcolm McClendon read the third question

Next, we have a question from Mr. Bill Gaines, and he brings up a good question. What happened to the action item review? Is that something that we want to begin to address right now, Dave?

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: I would like to push that to the next RAB, unless we're done with all of the questions.

>>Malcolm McClendon responded, summarized as: We have one more question that has come in, I could do that one, and then take it from there I guess.

Malcolm McClendon read the fourth question:

The next one is from Jeff Moss. Are the contamination of Clark's Marsh and Van Etten Lake an immediate concern?

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: There is not an imminent hazard associated with PFOS and PFOA at Wurtsmith. The primary concern is the drinking water pathway and no one is drinking water with PFOS and PFOA in excess of the USEPA Health Advisory of 70 ng/L. The Air Force is going to perform an interim action to prevent further migration of PFOS and PFOA in groundwater.

Arnie Leriche made a statement summarized as:

The answer that Dave gave on the money and everything I want to have to submit a statement that the budgeting process between when Henderson told us that the RI would start in FY21,

which is only 45 days away. The planning for that money should have been in the FY21 president's budget, not spending the additional Congressional money that was added, which became the \$13 million. We lost, by my estimation, about \$6 million to do an RI. We're taking it out of the \$13 million rather than a budget that should have been in the President's FY21 budget.

There's a little bit of swapping monies around that we don't know about that has been hampering Wurtsmith.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: You'll see that that is addressed in the Secretary Air Force letter of 25 January in the third paragraph.

>>Arnie Leriche replied: I'll review it, but I doubt it read it a few times, but I'll put it in and pass it through the new co-chair,

Malcolm McClendon read the fifth question summarized as:

We have one from Mr. Eric Keller. He's referring to the decision tree and what is the timeline being provided?

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: The decision tree wasn't a timeline. There's a yes or no. [Supplemental information for minutes: There is not an imminent hazard associated with PFOS and PFOA at Wurtsmith. The primary concern is the drinking water pathway and no one is drinking water with PFAS in excess of the USEPA Health Advisory of 70 ng/L.]

>>Malcolm McClendon responded, summarized as: Mr. Keller, is that what you were asking? OK, I got a yes.

Malcolm McClendon made a statement summarized as:

That's all the questions and comments we've gotten for the requests. Let me scroll through all this and make sure we're getting everybody.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: Can you show the action item list? There was a question about reviewing all the action items with a question about reviewing the action items from this RAB.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: Mr. Gaines, do you want to go confirm the action items from today's call? Or do you want to start back to all the action items from?

>>Bill Gaines responded, summarized as: All I was saying was that somehow we take the time of the meeting, the action item note I thought I saw on the agenda an action item review. We went right on past task, and I'm three hours into a meeting, not sure that I am totally capable of reviewing the action items. I just want to make the point that this is about 18 months of RAB when we've had things on the agenda, and we really haven't reviewed the action items. That's

one of the reasons why we need a quarterly RAB or more frequent is so that we don't have so much so many things we have to share that we can actually take care around business. And I think that, at this point in time, it's appropriate to postpone that action, right, to be reviewed at the next meeting, but we need to understand that we are simply doing that without taking actions that need to be done to make us effective.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: And I can see your concern, and what I'd like to do is provide the action item list to the RAB members along with the minutes of the meeting. And correct me if I'm wrong Malcolm or Natausha? What I'd like to have happen is the RAB members review the actual item list.

Cathy Wusterbath made a comment summarized as:

Thanks. Now just one more thing. I'd like to thank Arnie for his dedication and tireless service to the RAB, his efforts to create a RAB at Wurtsmith AFB. He exemplifies the Rotary model of service above self. And I'm proud that he's been a member and will continue to be a member of this RAB.

>>Arnie Leriche responded: Thank you, Cathy.

Arnie Leriche made a statement summarized as:

Bill makes a good point on the action item. And I will work hard with Mark, because we're about two thirds of the way through trying to recapture over a year's worth of action items, because the system changed on us, and lost track of it in the communications. So, thank you, David, for your focus on this and helping the co-chairs handle this in the future. So, Bill and I will be transferring that off to Mark, so that he understands and can start with that information we've been working on the last three months.

Bill Gaines made a statement summarized as:

Action Item three, as proposed. I believe Matthew Siler's question was "what is the gallons per minute capability of the groundwater at the plant". We briefed what the current was and he wanted to know what the capability was. So you need to make that clear.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: So what is the Design GPM? Insert the word "Design" before GPM.

Mike Munson made a statement summarized as:

I didn't see an action item that I asked at the meeting that we charge the Air Force to release their plans for well locations. Now, I realize we're early here, but I want that as an action item, so that doesn't get lost in the shuffle.

>>Malcolm McClendon responded, summarized as: The previous thing that was previously added? Yeah, we'll get it.

>>Mike Munson responded: I appreciate it.

Arnie Leriche made a statement summarized as:

Number seven. It's good for what we talked about tonight, but add in the description, reference the original action item that was submitted. I think it was February of 2018. So there's been some work on that, so let's just combine the two, so we don't duplicate them.

>>Malcolm McClendon responded, summarized as: OK, so take the old Action item from February 18 you said?

>>Arnie Leriche responded, summarized as: Right now, just reference in the description in February of 18.

>>Dave Gibson responded: It's a repeat question.

>>Arnie Leriche responded, summarized as: It really is. It was never finished by the Board. Maybe that's my fault for not describing it, as well. But I gave an example at another base where they were doing it. We'll work on it. Thank you.

Malcolm McClendon made a statement summarized as:

Well, I think we're up. There is no further public comments or questions. I think nobody else, RAB members, if you have anything, unless they raise your hands, if not, then we'll move forward with the final comments.

>>Dave Gibson responded, summarized as: From my standpoint, the election is done, I've got to track everybody's due dates for the next election. The next RAB will be October, we should be shooting for something around mid-October at this point. We'll get the doodle poll out for the RRSE briefing over the next two weeks. We have our contractor on board. You're going to be seeing work plans and designs. You're going to be hearing about meetings to discuss and coordinate.

Mark Henry made a statement

I'm looking forward to working with the RAB and getting through this process.

Malcolm McClendon made a statement summarized as:

With that, I will conclude the RAB. Thank you so much. I hope that we were able to get to everybody's questions or comments. If for some reason you feel we didn't, we have a log and a way to record all this stuff. So, we'll be answering it in the minutes, either way, And it gives us feedback to help us to get better at this. So have a good night. Everybody. Thanks.

Former Wurtsmith AFB Virtual Restoration Advisory Board Meeting

Final Meeting Minutes
1 Oct 2020