NAVAL AIR STATION JOINT RESERVE BASE (NAS JRB) WILLOW GROVE
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: March 16, 2023
Meeting Time: 6:00 p.m.
Meeting Place: Microsoft Teams and in-person at Horsham Community Center

	Name	Organization
Attendees	Dawn DeFreitas	Department of Navy (Navy) Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) Program Management Office (PMO) East
	Brian Helland	Navy BRAC PMO East
	Lee DePersia	Air National Guard (ANG)
	Bill Myer	ANG
	Keith Freihofer	ANG
	Larisa Lawrence	ANG
	Elaine Magdinec	ANG
	Timothy Runkle	Leidos (Consultant to ANG)
	Matt Machusick	Leidos
	Sarah Kloss	Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 3
	Deborah Goldblum	EPA Region 3
	Lisa Trakis	EPA Region 3
	Colin Wade	Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) Southeast Region
	Tim Cherry	PADEP Southeast Region
	Thomas Magee	PADEP Southeast Region
	Emily Adler	Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) Region 3
	Lisa Senior	United States Geological Survey (USGS)
	Tricia Moore	Tetra Tech (Consultant to the Navy)
	Rocco Mercuri	Tetra Tech
	Micah Forbes	Tetra Tech
	Sue Herbert	Tetra Tech
	Jackie Boltz	Tetra Tech
	Susan Wood	Pennsylvania Department of Health (PADOH)
	Tara Wilson	Blum-Moore Reporting Services
	Bill Walker	Horsham Township
	Thomas Ames	Horsham Land Redevelopment Authority (HLRA)
	Mike Magee	HLRA
	Michael Pickel	Horsham Water and Sewer Authority (HWSA)
	Hope Grosse	Member of the public

Toby Kessler	Gilmore and Associates
Martin Schy	Willow Grove Navy Caretaker Site Office
Joanne Stanton	Member of the public
Don Gleiter	Member of the public
Joe McGrath (R)	Member of the public
Laura Christ	Member of the public
Macrina Xavier	Member of the public
Leigh-Ann Fabianke	Member of the public
Kyle Schmeck	Member of the public
J. Memberg	Member of the public
Nicole Rinier	Member of the public
Patrick Kelly	Member of the public
Thuane Fielding	Director, BRAC PMO East
Carl Markovitz	Member of the public
Linda Brown	Member of the public
Margaret Patterson	Member of the public

Ms. Jackie Boltz opened the hybrid meeting by greeting the attendees. Ms. Boltz discusses Teams tools and features for the hybrid meeting, such as live captions, screen layout, view tool, and other adjustments. Ms. Boltz then turns the meeting over to Ms. Dawn DeFreitas, the Navy's BRAC Environmental Coordinator.

Ms. DeFreitas explained that this is a hybrid meeting with both in-person and virtual components. The virtual attendees will show the presentation and the presenters, and in-person attendees will be audio-only. Meeting minutes will be prepared and mailed to the mailing list and available on the administrative record. Public notices were published in the newspaper on March 1 and March 8, 2023, and posted to the Willow Grove website. Ms. DeFreitas noted that the outline and agenda for today's meeting are provided via e-mail and posted to the Navy's website. The meeting will begin with the Navy's environmental restoration presentation, followed by a RAB community co-chair discussion and vote. ANG will then present its environmental restoration presentation. Finally, EPA and PADEP will provide comments. Ms. DeFreitas noted that there would be an opportunity between each agency's presentations to ask questions. Members of the Navy, ANG, EPA, PADEP, health professionals, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) will be present at today's RAB meeting. Each organization's lead organizer or presenter will announce all members of their team prior to each presentation. All meeting attendees will be recorded in the meeting minutes.

Ms. DeFreitas informed the attendees that the Department of Defense (DoD) encourages community input at RAB meetings. Questions and comments are taken via e-mail and telephone, and in-person attendees should form a line at the microphone as soon as the Q&A session is announced. Questions will be answered in the order they were received. Ms. DeFreitas explains that Ms. Boltz will review how to ask questions via Teams chat and hand raise features. Ms. DeFreitas hands the meeting over to Ms. Boltz.

Ms. Boltz presented a brief overview of Teams features to the attendees to explain the commenting process during the presentations.

Ms. DeFreitas introduced herself, and the other attendees presenting for the Navy, including Mr. Brian Helland, the Remedial Project Manager for the Navy, Mr. Rocco Mercuri, Ms. Sue Herbert, Mr. Micah Forbes, and Ms. Boltz, of Tetra Tech. Ms. DeFreitas notes that Ms. Tricia Moore, of Tetra Tech, is attending virtually. Ms. DeFreitas informed the attendees that the Navy's presentation is available on the BRAC website and provided in paper format to those attending. Ms. DeFreitas explained that the RAB's focus is on environmental restoration issues only, and health-related issues are not addressed. The PADOH and RTI International are available for any health-related questions.

Ms. DeFreitas noted that Mr. Bill Walker has applied for the community co-chair position, and a vote will be taken during the meeting. Ms. DeFreitas also discussed the RAB meeting schedule. The plan is to have hybrid meetings and in-person locations closer to the RAB meeting.

Ms. DeFreitas introduced Mr. Helland, the Remedial Project Manager for the Navy, who commenced the Navy presentation.

Mr. Helland presented an overview of remedial actions and the backgrounds of the Site 3 and Site 12 landfills, where construction was completed in September and some minor erosion was corrected in November. Completed reports are being updated and submitted for regulatory review. Land use control (LUC) boundaries have been surveyed and LUC remedial designs are being drafted. Groundwater monitoring plans are also being drafted. Mr. Helland noted that the EPA requested additional groundwater sampling at Site 12. Mr. Helland explained that the Navy responded to the EPA's December comments last Friday.

Mr. Helland provided an update on Site 5. Site 5 is a former fire training area where an anaerobic bioremediation system is operating. The 2022 Annual Report was submitted in February, and a tech memo proposing a switch from LactOil to a new amendment is still being reviewed by EPA. Injections will resume after regulators have reviewed the proposal. The sampling plan is being updated. Mr. Helland turned the meeting over to Ms. DeFreitas.

Mr. DeFreitas presented a summary of the Navy's actions to address per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) to date. The Navy provided over $18 million to HWSA for drinking water connections and filtration systems and has sampled 580 private wells. Of the 580 private wells sampled, 103 wells were above 70 nanograms per liter (ng/L) for perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and perfluorooctane sulfonic acid (PFOS). Mr. DeFreitas noted that one private well has yet to be connected to municipal water.

Ms. DeFreitas explained that on January 14th, PADEP published maximum contaminant levels (i.e., PADEP MCLs) for PFOA and PFOS, of 14 and 18 ng/L, respectively. On March 14th, the EPA announced the proposed national primary drinking water regulation for six PFAS compounds, including PFAS and PFOS (i.e., EPA MCLs). The proposed EPA MCLs are four ng/L for both PFOA and PFOS individually. The Navy is reviewing existing data and conducting additional sampling to incorporate the EPA's final drinking water standard and the PADEP's MCLs into their cleanup process.

Ms. DeFreitas presented a map showing the NASJRB Willow Grove sampling area for private wells for PFAS, with the highest detection ever detected. Ms. DeFreitas provided contact information for Ms. Moore at Tetra Tech and then turned the meeting over to Mr. Mercuri, Senior Project Manager at Tetra Tech.

Mr. Mercuri introduced himself and explained that Tetra Tech is the Navy's consultant for the NASJRB Willow Grove. Mr. Mercuri provided a status update on the PFAS Phase 2 Remedial Investigation (RI) activities. The Navy completed 14 surface water and three sediment sampling events and received comments from EPA on Rounds 9, 10, and 11.

Mr. Mercuri provided an update on the off-base investigation and a summary of future activities. The Navy conducted borehole geophysics and packer testing at 15 HWSA wells, including large-diameter municipal wells and small-diameter observation wells. Three PADEP well clusters were sampled for the first time in 2022 and were sampled again in January 2023 and will be sampled two more times in 2023. Mr. Mercuri provided an update on the on-base soil investigation. In April 2021, a draft Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP) was presented for regulatory review. Following the evaluation, the collection of roughly 900 soil samples was permitted throughout the entire base.

The agencies provided feedback on the SAP and the soil sample results, and in January 2023, response to comments (RTCs) were produced and filed. Lysimeters have recently received EPA approval for use in the soil-to-groundwater pathway investigation. Mr. Mercuri provided an update on the on-base groundwater investigation. The Navy and USGS conducted an on-base groundwater investigation in January 2021. A draft SAP was submitted for regulatory review and several rounds of comments were received. Technical meetings were held to discuss the preparation of cross-sections and data gap analysis. The Navy agreed to prepare a revised SAP containing cross-sections, a data gap analysis, and groundwater contours for a well-gauging event.

Mr. Mercuri provided an update on the Hangar 680 pilot test and the Site 5 pilot test. The Hangar 680 pilot test treated over 29 million gallons of water, with varying concentrations of influent PFOA and PFOS. EW-1S concentrations ranged between 17,000 and 87,000 ng/L, EW-1I concentrations ranged between 8,100 and 80,000 ng/L, and EW-2I concentrations ranged between 25,000 and 115,000 ng/L. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs) are prepared monthly for PADEP review. To date, there were no exceedances of the monitoring parameters. Mr. Mercuri noted that PFOA and PFOS has not been detected in the first IX resin vessel to date. Over 11 million gallons of water have been treated during the Site 5 pilot test. Regenerable IX resins were used for the Site 5 pilot test, and no PFOA or PFOS have been detected in the first single-use IX resin vessel to date.

Mr. Mercuri provided an update on the Non-Time Critical Removal Action (NTCRA). The Navy prepared an Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) for a 500 gallons per minute (gpm) groundwater extraction treatment system (GWETS). An initial EE/CA was submitted in May 2021, but was recently revised due to new information. A public comment period will follow, and an action memo will be prepared to document the selected removal action.

Mr. Mercuri provided an update on the five-year review. The draft Five-Year Review Report was submitted to EPA and PADEP on March 3rd, 2023, and will be completed by September 2023. Mr. Mercuri handed the meeting back to Ms. DeFreitas.

Ms. DeFreitas discussed the work completed since the previous RAB meeting. This work included submitting the 2022 Site 5 Annual Report for regulatory review, completing borehole geophysics and packer testing, and submitting the draft Five-Year Review Report and EE/CA for regulatory review. Ms. DeFreitas outlined the actions anticipated to be completed prior to the next RAB meeting, including submitting the draft Site 3 and Site 12 Remedial Action Reports, the LUC Remedial Designs (RDs), the Site 12 Groundwater Technical Memorandum, and the 2022 Site Management Plan (SMP).

Ms. DeFreitas noted that the NASJRB website, specifically the meeting material page, provides information related to RAB meetings, such as notice, agenda, presentation, and link to meeting minutes. Subscribers can sign up for e-mail updates for NASJRB Willow Grove and RAB meeting notices.

Ms. DeFreitas began the vote for the RAB community co-chair position by introducing Mr. Walker. Mr. Walker is the only applicant for the RAB community co-chair position. He is a resident of Horsham Township and has been active in the community for over 30 years. His position as a Township Manager would allow him to assist with disseminating information to the

public. Ms. DeFreitas asked the attendees to raise their hands to oppose Mr. Walker. No hands were raised. The vote concluded with no one opposing Mr. Walker. Ms. DeFreitas presented Mr. Walker as the new RAB community co-chair and turned the meeting over to him.

Mr. Walker discussed his goals as RAB community co-chair, including revitalizing the selection panel, educating the public, and bringing forth community concerns. Mr. Walker turned the meeting back over to Ms. DeFreitas.

Ms. DeFreitas explained that RAB is currently accepting applications for community members. To apply, complete the form and send it back via e-mail or regular mail. An electronic version of the form will be available on the BRAC website. Ms. DeFreitas noted that RAB members are expected to attend quarterly RAB meetings, review and comment on technical documents, and share information with other local community members and groups interested in specific cleanup issues. They are expected to serve a two-year term and the goal is to have a diverse RAB group that represents each community and stakeholder. Ms. DeFreitas explained that the Navy portion of the presentation was over and that the floor would now be open for a question-and-answer session. Ms. DeFreitas handed the meeting over to Ms. Boltz.

Ms. Boltz explained the procedure for asking questions. There are two ways to ask a question: written and verbal. Written questions can be submitted using the chat box. Verbal questions will be answered using the hand-raise icon on the toolbar. Ms. Boltz turns the meeting back over to Ms. DeFreitas.

Ms. DeFreitas acknowledged the first question, asked by Mr. Tom Ames, the Executive Director of the HLRA. Mr. Ames asked Ms. DeFreitas to describe the need for a focused investigation at the Northern Ponding Area (NPA). Ms. DeFreitas deferred to Mr. Mercuri to answer the question. Mr. Mercuri explained that after discussion with regulators, it was agreed that additional hydrogeologic characterization is needed to define a more site-specific conceptual site model (CSM) of the NPA. Mr. Ames did not fully understand the response. Mr. Helland clarified that further investigation of the NPA is important to comprehend the movement of the groundwater and whether it travels entirely over land or flows under the road to reach Park Creek. Mr. Helland also clarified that monitoring wells will be installed in the NPA.

Mr. Ames noted that references to tech documents and submissions to the regulators, including responses to remarks, were made several times during the Navy's presentation. Mr. Ames asked if these documents can be uploaded to the administrative record or the BRAC PMO website after they are presented to the regulators. Mr. Helland explained that the final tech memos are posted to the administrative record around the same time that they are submitted to the regulators. Draft documents are not posted to the administrative record. Mr. Ames explained that the proposed RAB members will be able to review technical memos and provide input, but without being able to see a draft, it feels like they have already finalized the tech memo. This process is not correct if the RAB wants to participate in the input and decision-making process. Ms. DeFreitas acknowledged that Mr. Ames made a good point and turns the floor over to Ms. Joanne Stanton with Buxmont, to ask a question.

Ms. Stanton asked whether anyone would be available to assist with a technical understanding of the tech memo documents, to give the public an opportunity to understand and comment on the

tech memos. Ms. DeFreitas answered that she believes there are available programs, and she will investigate them further.

Ms. Stanton continued with a question for Mr. Mercuri. The pilot test areas for PFAS were extremely high, but all of them met the PADEP's effluent discharge permits. Ms. Stanton wondered whether the permitted discharge level is still 70 ng/L. Mr. Mercuri responded that he believes the level is still at 70 ng/L. Ms. Stanton noted that the EPA's new drinking water regulations have raised questions about whether they will filter down to other states and affect discharge permit levels. Mr. Helland asks Ms. DeFreitas to defer to Mr. Colin Wade, an Environmental Protection Specialist with PADEP. Mr. Wade explained that the proposed federal or EPA MCL will have to be looked at, but discharge standards for point discharge in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania are reviewed on a five-year cycle. If new standards come out, they are put into place when the permit or permit equivalency is renewed. Ms. Sarah Kloss, the EPA's Remedial Project Manager for NASJRB, asked for someone to clarify what levels are being seen. Ms. Moore, of Tetra Tech, clarified that PFAS has not been detected in the first of four resin vessels over the discharge limit of 70 ng/L, as such, the discharge is considered non-detect. Ms. Stanton asked what someone would do if they wanted to have their private well tested again. Ms. DeFreitas answered that community members can be directed to her.

Mr. Joe McGrath, a resident of 132 Barbara Road in Hatboro, asked the next question. Mr. McGrath wanted a status update on the site located at the ballpark on Blair Mill Road. Mr. Michael Pickel, of HWSA, identified the two wells serving Hatboro on that site as belonging to Aqua Pennsylvania. Mr. McGrath asked for clarification regarding which well serves his property. Ms. DeFreitas directs Mr. McGrath to ask his question directly to Aqua Pennsylvania.

Ms. Hope Grosse, of Buxmont, asked the next question. Ms. Grosse asked which agency handles the fish advisory for streams and waterways in township areas. Ms. Kloss answered that this falls under a PADEP health advisory. Ms. Grosse expressed concern for children playing in these areas, the potential of water entering their mouths, and other dermal issues with PFAS that have been observed in the area. Mr. Wade explained that the fish consumption advisory issued by Pennsylvania is for consumption of the fish, with screening values based on surface water contact and incidental ingestion. Ms. Kloss added that there have been 14 surface water sampling events at this point, and now that numbers have changed in EPA tables and PADEP numbers, we need to evaluate how we're screening those areas. Ms. Linda Watson, a toxicologist for EPA, is involved with that, and no advisories are in place on any water in the area at this point.

Ms. DeFreitas asked for more questions in the room. No more hands are raised in the room. Ms. DeFreitas then announced that online questions would be answered. No one raised their hand online or unmuted their microphones to ask a question. Ms. DeFreitas explained that with no more questions, the Navy's update is now concluded. Ms. DeFreitas then turns the meeting over to the ANG.

Mr. Bill Myer, the Restoration Program Manager for Biddle ANG, took the floor. Mr. Myer presented his team attending the meeting – Mr. Lee DePersia, an Environmental Manager for ANG, Mr. Tim Runkle, of Leidos, and Mr. Matt Machusick of Leidos. Mr. Myer provided an update since the last RAB meeting, including the five-year review process for Site 1, the awarding of a contract for EA, the record of decision and long-term monitoring for Privet Road, and the

transition from the Safe Drinking Water Act to the Navy Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA). Mr. Myer continued his update and noted the draft Uniform Federal Policy for Quality Assurance Project Plans (UFP QAPP) for the RI was submitted. He noted that his team provided responses for Rounds 11, 12, and 13 for quarterly water sampling, and developed final tech memorandums for Rounds 11, 12, 13, and 14. They also had a scoping section with the regulators on the 23rd of February. Mr. Myer then provided the three-month forecast of activities for the state, including staffing the FFA, completing a Water Response Action Memorandum, and finalizing the UFP QAPP addenda for the RI and pilot study. Additionally, there will be one final round of surface water sampling and surface water treatments at the system. Mr. Myer then handed the meeting over to Mr. Runkle, RI Liedos Deputy Project Manager for the ANG at Biddle.

Mr. Runkle began the presentation with an overview of the project objectives. The project objectives of the RI include delineating the nature and extent of PFAS related to Biddle ANG, collecting samples of several media, conducting baseline risk assessment, investigating the link between groundwater and the unnamed tributary to Park Creek, collecting data for future feasibility studies, and conducting quarterly surface water sampling in coordination with the Navy. Mr. Runkle then discussed the progress of the RI, which was structured to advance in three phases. Data from Phase 1 would inform Phase 2, and data from Phase 2 would inform Phase 3. All data would then be released through a tech memo. Phase 1 activities have been completed and Phase 2 activities are about to resume. By September 2024, the report is due to be delivered. Mr. Runkle then moved on to an update of current work, including work done with the EPA and PADEP to develop a path forward for the RI move from Phase 1 into Phase 2 activities. After adjusting well installation methods and characterization activities, UFP and QAPP addenda were submitted to the EPA. Work is anticipated to continue in May 2023, after agency comments are addressed.

Mr. Runkle then provided a status update for the Phase 2 RI. The Phase 2 RI is designed to address six data gaps identified during the process of review. It includes four shallow wells, twelve intermediate to deep wells, geophysical testing, and packer testing and sampling to identify preferential flow zones and contaminant flow zones. The EPA and DEP will be working in real-time to ensure monitoring points are placed at an appropriate depth. At the conclusion of the investigation, a Phase 2 memorandum will be prepared to draw conclusions and guide future work. Mr. Runkle discussed additional work completed since the last RAB update, including Round 14 surface water sampling and comprehensive annual monitoring. Final sampling memorandums for Rounds 11, 12, and 13, have been submitted, and memos for Rounds 14 and 15 are being prepared.

Mr. Runkle then discussed the pilot testing. ANG has contacted Leidos to complete a groundwater pilot test to inform plans for subsequent interim groundwater action. The study will include design, construction, and operation of a pump system that will operate for 30 days and evaluate the feasibility of hydraulic containment of a groundwater plume located near Building 201. The pilot test study will consist of three extraction wells that will pump with a combined capacity of 50 to 75 gpm and will target unique depths and zones of the aquifer. The results, conclusions, and recommendations will be presented in a technical memorandum. Mr. Runkle noted that the actions planned over the next three months are to submit the final UFP QAPP addendum for the RI, draft the pilot test study addendum, complete surface water sampling, and memorandums, and begin Phase 2 of the RI in May. Mr. Runkle completed his portion of the presentation and handed the meeting over to Mr. DePersia, an environmental engineer for ANG.

Mr. DePersia provided an update on the surface water treatment plant at Biddle. The surface water treatment plant at Biddle was constructed in 2021 to treat groundwater PFAS contaminated groundwater and discharge it off-base through an unnamed tributary to Park Creek. Since then, the plant has treated 182 million gallons of water and had its first media changeout in late 2022. It has two treatment trains, each capable of treating 250 gpm, and is sampling operational samples from both trains, influent samples, mid-resin vessel samples, and then an effluent sample twice a month. It also collects a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit sample once a month from the effluent of the treatment plant combined. Mr. DePersia noted that the treatment system is designed to treat 300,000 to 400,000 gallons per day, but the plant is trying to get the treatment rate up a little bit more. Additionally, the North Wales Water Authority has installed granular activated carbon (GAC) treatment for five wells, but four of the wells have high total dissolved solids. PADEP is working with North Wales to figure out how to work through the problem and get those wells back online. Mr. DePersia then handed the meeting back to Mr. Myer.

Mr. Myer provided an update on home well sampling and noted that private well sampling has been conducted since 2016, with Horsham and Warrington having the highest number of wells sampled. Mr. Bob Wagner, a contractor with Weston, will coordinate the sampling of any well within the area of responsibility. Contact information for Mr. Wagner was presented. Mr. Myer noted that later in the year, another contract would be established to continue providing drinking water response for residential wells. Mr. Myer encouraged community members to connect to the water supply system, where possible. Mr. Myer presented a slide showing the area of responsibility for the base, then opened the meeting for questions.

Mr. Walker, the Horsham Township Manager, asked for more information about the GAC system being used. Mr. Walker expressed concern about the used GAC stored at the Biddle ANG. Mr. Walker asked for clarification on where the used GAC is being stored, the quantities being stored, and whether Calgon could take it off-site. Mr. Myer explained that the 2022 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) put a moratorium on DoD not incinerating PFOS-related waste, so the bag filters and GAC are being stored and regenerated thermally. EPA is waiting to come up with a rule or policy on how to handle these materials rather than incinerating them. Mr. DePersia noted that the GAC is stored in Building 606, a former warehouse, in super sacks. Calgon has a lengthy requirement of what they want to see before they'll accept the GAC for regeneration. The lab results will determine whether they will accept it or not. Surface water treatment is unusual, so if the GAC comes back fouled with sediment, it may have to be sent to a hazardous waste landfill. Mr. DePersia noted that the GAC from the treatment system was generated at the base and that no GAC from other locations is being stored on the base.

Mr. Myer moved on to the next question, submitted by Mr. Ames in written format. Mr. Myer noted that the Navy sent an e-mail to the Willow Grove website subscriber list to notify them of the proposed amendment of the NASJRB Willow Grove FFA. Mr. Ames asked whether ANG took any other steps to reach out to the members of the RAB and other community members. Mr. Myer answered that the state and PADEP took the lead on the public comment period for the FFA, with the state providing the 111th Attack Wings website and the EPA gathering and responding to comments. Mr. Ames commented that he felt that it could have been better publicized through the RAB, as they only had a couple of days to look at it.

Mr. Myer moved on to the next question submitted by Mr. Ames. The proposed amendment to the FFA proposes an organizational structure of the RAB that is inconsistent with the requirements of 32 CFR Part 202. Mr. Ames wondered why it is not compliant. Mr. Walker answered Mr. Ames and explained that the RAB should have a military co-chair and a civilian community co-chair, and the proposed amendment to the Willow Grove FFA does not include a community member. Mr. Myer explained that the committee elected a community member to serve as the co-chair of the joint committee between the Navy and ANG. The committee will be composed of three co-chairs: the Navy, ANG, and Mr. Walker, who was elected during this meeting. Mr. Ames noted that the proposed amendment should reference the community co-chair, and Mr. Myer agreed to make that revision. Mr. Wade added that the 2005 FFA lists the Navy as the co-chair but does not exclude ANG as a community co-chair. Mr. Ames clarified that his issue was with the review timeframe amounting to only a few hours. Mr. Myer commented that this wasn't the intent and moved on to the third question submitted by Mr. Ames.

Mr. Myer read Mr. Ames's question to the attendees, which asked for examples of, and the process for, real-time decision-making and data review between EPA and PADEP. Mr. Myer described the collaboration and comment process between the regulators and technical experts. He described the scope of work for drilling a well, which included drilling down to the depth, conducting downhole geophysics, selecting intervals for packer tests, collecting samples, sending them to the lab, and working with EPA and PADEP on which intervals should be included. Mr. Myer noted that real-time collaboration is used to review data and processes with regulators. Mr. Myer cited the collaborative efforts between the USGS, PADEP, ANG, and other stakeholders to collect analytical and geophysical data. This data is then used to select the well screens and conduct a 30-day pilot test. As the data changes, the regulators will be consulted to make decisions in real-time.

Mr. Ames continued with his next question, stating that the highest concentrations are closer to the fence line than Building 201, raising the question of why the study area is focused on Building 201. Mr. Myer explained that the EPA wanted an interim action completed at one of ANG's release sites and Building 201 was chosen for a pilot test. Mr. Myer also noted that the PFAS plumes from the Navy property, and ANG property, are commingled.

Mr. Ames continued with his final question, asking what steps had been taken to improve the timeliness of posting documents. Mr. Myer explained that there is currently a document backlog. The backlog is being addressed by their contractor, BB&E. Mr. Ames commented that the more access the community is given to these documents, the better they can assess what's going on. Ms. Grosse asked whether there is a deadline or timeframe for uploading documents. Mr. Myer responded that the timeframe is a couple of months.

Ms. Grosse continued with another question, asking why the 2016 health advisory is being used. Mr. Myer responded that they are going through the same process as the Navy to consider the state MCLs for applicable and relevant requirements (ARARs). The EPA's new draft rule is coming out, but it must go through a public rulemaking process. The interim of 70 ng/L is approved, but OSD (Office of the Secretary of Defense) still needs to evaluate it. Mr. Myer noted that everyone within the sampling area that had results of over 70 ng/L has been hooked up to the water supply system.

Ms. Grosse then asked when retesting of private wells would resume. Mr. Myer responded that ANG is looking at data to determine how many wells have been tested in the past and how many

are hooked up to the water supply system. They have identified 15 locations and are working with North Wales to review those locations. They also have a contractor onboard to continue private well sampling throughout the year. If any sample result is above the threshold, a bottled water response will be initiated.

Mr. Myer asked for any questions from attendees online. Ms. Boltz identified a question from Mr. Toby Kessler and opened the floor to him. Mr. Kessler noted that the EE/CA document is coming out and there will be public comment on the pilot study, and then asked whether funding for the study is in place and if there would be a public comment period. Mr. Myer explained that a draft UFP QAPP addendum will be submitted to the EPA and PADEP, outlining procedures for collecting groundwater data, hydraulic testing, and pressure transducers. Mr. Myer noted that when the draft document is submitted to the regulators, it could also be submitted to the RAB members for comment.

Mr. Kessler then asked whether detections below 70 ng/L, but above the state MCL, would be handled by the PA Hazardous Sites Cleanup Program (HSCA). Mr. Wade explained that the PADEP is acting at HSCA sites throughout Pennsylvania based on PADEP's newly promulgated MCLs of 14 ng/L for PFOA and 18 ng/L for PFOS. If any detections outside the site boundary are above these MCLs, PADEP should be contacted. Mr. Wade noted that private well water quality is not regulated by PADEP, so people are encouraged to sample their private wells for PFAS, volatile organic compounds, and common metals. They can provide their results to PADEP for follow-up sampling.

Mr. Meyer asked whether there were additional questions. There were none. Mr. Myer then handed the meeting over to Ms. Kloss.

Ms. Kloss began her presentation by thanking those who participated in the EPA PFAS forum on March 2nd. Ms. Kloss then provided an update on the draft drinking water regulation for PFAS, including that the EPA released a draft drinking water regulation for PFAS, proposing an MCL for PFOA, PFOS, perfluorohexanesulfonic acid (PFHxS), perfluorononanoic acid (PFNA), and perfluorobutane sulfonic acid (PFBS). Water systems will be required to monitor these six PFAS and notify the public if the proposed standards are exceeded. After the rule is finalized, water systems will be required to take action to treat water if it exceeds these standards. EPA has finalized the draft drinking water regulation and anticipates finalizing it by the end of 2023. The Navy has sent out a notice about a webinar and public meetings coming up in May. EPA's goal is to restore groundwater aquifers to drinking water use and adjust as needed as new standards are defined. Ms. Kloss noted that PFAS dust and vapor intrusion are not included in the risk evaluation for PFAS, as there are no air testing methodologies or health toxicity values to assess risk from human or ecological exposures. She explained that dermal toxicity from PFAS is still being studied, but all human health risk assessments include the evaluation of the dermal pathway by default and oral toxicity values are used to estimate dermal risk. Ms. Watson commented that Ms. Kloss is correct and that oral toxicity values are used for all contaminants, not just PFAS, to extrapolate dermal exposure risk.

Mr. Ames was given the floor, and he noted that the Navy and ANG have submitted various documents, QAPPs, sampling plans, and EE/CAs, to the BRAC cleanup team. He asked whether these documents are the highest priority, or if there is a priority list that the regulators are working

through while ANG and the Navy provided input. Ms. Kloss explained that there is a constant, ongoing discussion about prioritizing documents. Their tech support team reviews the documents, and documents like EE/CA are prioritized. Ms. Kloss noted that they are always trying to keep up with the volume of documents.

Ms. Kloss then turned the meeting over to Mr. Wade. Mr. Wade expressed appreciation to those who submitted comments on Pennsylvania's new drinking water standards and asks if there are any additional questions. He also indicated that Tim Cherry from the PADEP was attending the meeting virtually. Ms. Boltz responded that there are no questions. Ms. DeFreitas commented that are no additional questions from the in-person meeting attendees and then begins concluding the meeting. Ms. DeFreitas thanked everyone for their questions and comments and noted contact information for each of the agencies involved with the meeting. She mentioned where to sign up for updates via their website and urges the attendees to fill out an application to become a RAB community member. Ms. DeFreitas then concluded the meeting at 7:49 p.m.