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Meeting No. 4 Agenda
October 28, 2020

Virtual Meeting
Register online at: https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/5083907980666870539

6:00 pm Welcome – Col. Marc Kelly, Stewart Air National Guard Base, and Mr. Chuck Thomas, RAC Co-Chairs

6:05 pm Restoration Advisory Committee (RAC) Business
- Upcoming Meetings
- Vote on Operating Procedures
- Election for RAC Co-Chair
- Election for RAC Open Positions
- Other business

6:40 pm Update on Environmental Projects at Stewart Air National Guard Base
- Site 3 (aka Site 1) Former Base Landfill – Annual Long-Term Monitoring
  o Year 21 of 30 for monitoring
- PFOS/PFOA
  o Update on Interim Storm Water Treatment System (ISWTS) at Rec Pond

7:20 pm RAC Open Discussion
- Opportunity for RAC members to review remediation questions and concerns
- Propose topics and action items for February’s meeting

7:40 pm Public Questions – please submit through the Question Module

8:00 pm Adjourn
Agenda de la reunión en español
(Spanish Agenda)
Stewart Air National Guard Base
Comité Consultivo de Restauración

Reunión No. 4 Agenda
28 de octubre de 2020

Reunión Virtual
Regístrese en línea en: https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/5083907980666870539

6:00 pm Bienvenido – Col. Marc Kelly, Stewart Air National Guard Base, y Sr. Chuck Thomas, Co-Presidentes del Comité Consultivo de Restauración

6:05 pm Asuntos del Comité Consultivo de Restauración (RAC por sus siglas en inglés)
• Próximas Fechas de Reunión
• Vota de Procedimientos Operativos
• Elección para copresidente de RAC
• Elección para posiciones abiertas de RAC
• Otros asuntos

6:20 pm Actualización sobre Proyectos Ambientales en la Stewart Air National Guard Base
• Sitio 3 (también conocido como Sitio 1) – Antiguo Vertedero de Base –
  Monitoreo a Largo Plazo
  o Año 21 de 30 para el monitoreo
• PFOS/PFOA
  o Actualización sobre el Sistema Interino de Tratamiento de Aguas Pluviales en el Rec Pond (ISWTS por sus siglas en inglés)

7:20 pm Discusión Abierta del RAC
• Oportunidad para que los miembros del RAC revisen las preguntas y preocupaciones de la corrección
• Proponer temas y puntos de acción para la reunión de febrero

7:40 pm Preguntas Públicas - por favor enviar a través del Módulo de Preguntas

8:00 pm Aplazar
Air National Guard Presentation Slides
Restoration Advisory Committee for Stewart Air National Guard Base

Meeting 4
October 28, 2020

Final
Air National Guard Team

- **National Guard Bureau**
  - Robert Subasavage, Chief, Environmental Quality Branch
  - Keith Freihofer, Senior Restoration Program Manager
  - Nicole Wireman, Restoration Program Manager

- **Stewart Air National Guard Base**
  - Colonel Marc Kelly, Maintenance Group Commander, and Co-Chair
  - Colonel Edward Cook, Commander, 105th Mission Support Group
  - Mike Oettinger, Environmental Manager
  - MSgt Sara Pastorello, Public Affairs

- **U.S. Army Corps of Engineers**
  - Michelle Lordemann
  - Kinjal Shah
  - Stephen Kitt

- **Contractors**
  - BERS Weston Services
  - Wood
RAC Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Fern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aura Lopez Zarate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassie Sklarz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Mack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Lawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Clarke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Patricia Garcia Balbuen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramona Burton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Sanchez-Potter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Group Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newburgh Conservation Advisory Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Caldwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quassaick Creek Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manna Jo Greene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson River Sloop Clearwater, Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Wagner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newburgh Clean Water Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Leung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverkeeper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Grice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Newburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Hines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on behalf of the Town of New Windsor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6:00 PM  Welcome – Col. Marc Kelly and Mr. Chuck Thomas
6:05 PM  RAC Business
  • Upcoming Meetings
  • Vote on Operating Procedures
  • Election for RAC Co-Chair
  • Election for RAC Open Positions
  • Other Business
6:40 PM  Update on Environmental Projects at Stewart ANGB
  • Site 3 Former Base Landfill – Annual Long-Term Monitoring
  • PFOS/PFOA
    • Interim Storm Water Treatment System
7:20 PM  RAC Open Discussion
7:40 PM  RAC Public Questions
8:00 PM  Adjourn
Meeting Notes / Guidelines

• Tonight’s presentation is being transcribed.
• Please introduce yourself before speaking.
• All phones are muted and will need to be unmuted prior to speaking.
• Five minutes allotted for Questions and A by RAC members after each topic.
• During the RAC Open Discussion, the RAC members may raise their hand to make a comment or ask a question – 3-minute limit.
• Public questions should be submitted through the question module and will be read and addressed in the order they are received. Questions that cannot be answered before the meeting ends will be recorded and written responses will be provided.
RAC Business
Upcoming Meetings

• RAC Meeting 5 – February 3, 2021
  Virtual unless significant changes allow for the Newburgh Armory

• RAC Meeting 6 – April 28, 2021
  Newburgh Armory*

• RAC Meeting 7 – Proposed for July 28, 2021
  Newburgh Armory*

*If local and national COVID-19 travel, meeting, and social distancing restrictions are lifted.
Operating Procedures

• Air National Guard (ANG) met with Chuck Thomas, Mary Wagner, and Victoria Leung on July 31 and September 10 to discuss final comments on Operating Procedures.

• Comments were received from RAC members on September 16.

• ANG submitted a final version to the sub-group on September 29 for review.

• Comments?

• Vote.
2021 Co-Chair & Secretary

- Chuck’s 1-year term ends this year – Thank you Chuck!
  - Nomination for Ed Lawson to be the 2021 Co-Chair
  - Discussion
  - Vote
  - RAC Members please use the raise your hand function to show your approval

- Nomination for the 2021 Secretary
  - Discussion
  - Vote
RAC Open Positions

• Thank you, Cynthia Mack and Anthony Fern for your service on the RAC.

• There are 2 open seats for the 2021 RAC.
• Nominations for the open positions.
  – Discussion
  – Vote
Other RAC Business

• RAC members please raise your hand if you have other business to discuss.
Update on Environmental Projects at Stewart Air National Guard Base

Nicole Wireman
Restoration Program Manager
NGB/A4VR
AR Quick Navigation Aids

https://ar.afcec-cloud.af.mil/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Name</th>
<th>AR # Main Report</th>
<th>AR # for Additional Parts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 2020 RAC Meeting Materials</td>
<td>601741</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final SI Report for PFOS/PFOA (2018)</td>
<td>598617 (Part 1 of 3)</td>
<td>598619 and 598621 (Parts 2 – 3) 598642 (explains change in AR #s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final SI Report Addendum for PFOS/PFOA (2019)</td>
<td>584628</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final LTM Work Plan for Site 3 – Former Base Landfill (2020)</td>
<td>595733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final 2019 Annual LTM Report for Site 3 (SS003, aka Site 1)</td>
<td>590042 (Part 1 of 5)</td>
<td>590058 - 590061 (Parts 2 – 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final RI Report for Pesticides in Monitoring Well-01 (SS005, Site 5) (2017)</td>
<td>556572 (Part 1 of 3)</td>
<td>556573 - 556574 (Parts 2 – 3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bold Green** text indicates new document since last meeting

AR = Administrative Record  
LTM = Long Term Monitoring  
SI = Site Inspection  
PFOA = Perfluorooctanoic Acid  
PFOS = Perfluorooctane Sulfonate  
RI = Remedial Investigation
Recent News Article on Stewart’s PFAS RI

• Next step in CERCLA = Remedial Investigation (RI)
  – ANG sequences installations for RIs using a data- and risk-based process – essentially worst first

• News article indicated community would be penalized because of switch to an alternative drinking water source

• This is contrary to official position of the ANG
  – Relative Risk Site Evaluation (RRSE) considers impacts to original drinking water source in the migration pathway and receptor analysis
  – Sequencing of Stewart PFAS RI will not be impacted by alternate drinking water source currently being used
Site 3 (aka Site 1) Former Base Landfill – Annual Long-Term Monitoring

Kerry Tull
Senior Principal/Project Manager
Wood PLC
Site 3 – Former Base Landfill (LF003)

- **Background**
  - Landfill received municipal domestic waste from former onsite Air Force residents during the 1960s and 1970s.
  - Landfill cover installed with an engineered cap in 1999.
  - Annual long term monitoring since 2000 (2020 represents the 21st year that LTM has been performed).
Site 3 – Former Base Landfill (LF003)

- Background
  - Annual Sampling Event Completed Week of 6 Apr 2020.
    - Groundwater sampling at 7 wells.
    - Surface water and sediment sampling.
    - Landfill gas monitoring along landfill perimeter.
Site 3 – Former Base Landfill (LF003)
Site 3 – Former Base Landfill (LF003)

- Update since last RAC meeting
  - 2020 Annual Long Term Monitoring Report

- Findings
  - Low levels of solid waste-related chemicals detected in groundwater; most chemicals show stable or decreasing concentration trends.
Site 3 – Former Base Landfill (LF003)

• Findings (continued)
  – Several solid waste-related chemicals show variable or increasing trends over time (for example, chloride, sodium, iron, and solvent break-down products).
  – No solid waste-related chemicals are present above NYSDEC criteria in the most downgradient well (MW-19) or in surface water and sediment samples.
Site 3 – Former Base Landfill (LF003)
Site 3 – Former Base Landfill (LF003)

• Findings (continued)
  – Nominal levels of landfill gas were detected at perimeter sampling stations indicating low or no levels of biological activity.
  • Positive information because high levels of biological activity can result in the need for gas treatment and (or) the generation of elevated chemical concentrations in leachate.
RAC Questions

Site 3 Former Base Landfill Questions

RAC Members
Please Raise Your Hand to Ask a Question

5 Minute Timer

Time’s Up!
Interim Storm Water Treatment System at Recreation Pond

Doug Close
BERS Weston Services
Phase 2 – ISWTS Site Layout

- Sand Filter Container
- Electrical Distribution
- Pre-treatment Container - Control Panel & Bag Filters
- Treatment Containers (GAC & Resin)
- Influent Pipe
- Effluent Pipe
- Treatment Containers (GAC & Resin)
Phase 2 – ISWTS Structure
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Flow Design and Sample Ports

As operated during Phase 2 Pilot

July to September 2020

Stewart Air National Guard Base

New York

Effluent

To Silver Stream

Flow Monitor

LEGEND

• Sample Port ID

UNCLASSIFIED
Timeline Reminders

- Constructed improved pretreatment system in June 2020.
- Commissioned system in early July 2020. Commissioning included pressure testing of new equipment and configuring the controls.
- Changed GAC media and the Primary Ion Exchange Resin (prior to startup).
- Started Phase 2 Pilot (with sand filtration skid) and changed media (GAC and Resin) on 13 July 2020.
Data Summary for the period of 13 July through 15 September 2020 (65 days of operation).

- For 50 of the 65 days [>75%], the pond water level remained below the weir (no bypass flow into Silver Stream).
- More than 21 million gallons of Rec Pond water was treated.
- Levels of PFOS & PFOA in effluent (water outflow from treatment system) remained below 5 parts per trillion (PPT) and predominantly Non Detect (ND).
Phase 2 – Sampling Results

Influent PFOS/PFOA Levels

- Average level 405.44 ppt

Effluent PFOS/PFOA Levels

- Average level 0.98 ppt

ND = Non Detect, which means PFOS/PFOA was not detected above detection limits

PPT = Parts Per Trillion
Phase 2 – Rec Pond Water Level

Four rain events during Phase 2 operations:
A. Aug 4-5, >0.5 in. rain
   Loss of power for 2 days
B. Aug 18 =0.5 in. rain
C. Aug 27-28 >0.5 in rain
D. Sept. 2 >0.5 in rain
Outfall 10 Comparison

View of ISWTS discharge outfall with approx. 1ft. drawdown

View of ISWTS discharge outfall after rain event
Outfall 10 Comparison

View of Outfall 10 weir structure during draw down from the treatment system

View of Outfall 10 weir structure during a storm event with >2ft of bypass over weir
Changing pond conditions such as high turbidity, algae, pond weeds, and microorganisms negatively impact the functionality of the ISWTS.
Total Organic Carbon (TOC) is a water quality indicator. TOC present in surface water is likely impacting media (GAC & Resin) life and contributing to biofouling. Guideline from Resin supplier TOC <2 parts per million (ppm).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOC Result Summary (parts per million)</th>
<th>Influent Average</th>
<th>4.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sand Filter Effluent Avg.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bag Filter Effluent Avg.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GAC Effluent Avg.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Resin Effluent Avg.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Resin Effluent Avg.</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effluent Avg.</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Influent and Effluent Turbidity

SanG B - ISWTS
**Turbidity/Solids**

- Turbidity is a measurement that can quantify the amount of solids present in the water.
- During Phase 1 Pilot (Feb – Mar) influent (water coming into treatment system) turbidity averaged 3.4 NTU.
- During Phase 2 Pilot (July – Sept) influent turbidity averaged 9.5 NTU or approximately 3 times higher.
  - As a result of increased turbidity, we increased maintenance to control system performance.
  - After treatment turbidity averaged 1.6 during this period.

NTU = Nephelometric Turbidity Units
Biofouling Control

• Biofouling is the accumulation of micro-organisms on wetted surfaces.

• Two chemical additions were considered to control biofouling: algicide and chemical dosing with peracetic acid.
  – An algicide, known as Cutrine, application to the pond was not used this season. Will continue to research options for next season.
  – NYSDEC approved the use of 15% Peracetic Acid at low levels with a maximum dosing rate of 7.3 lbs/day (0.75 gallons/day) at 500 gpm avg. flow measured at the outfall.

• The low dose approved by NYSDEC did not appear to inhibit biofouling; however, monitoring will continue.
Peracetic Dosing System

- Metering pump
- Sand filter vessel
- Backwashing site glass
- Eye wash station
Sand Filters

- Filters were equipped with automated backwashing, which allowed for reduced operations and maintenance labor.
- Filters normally operate in downflow regime (e.g. top to bottom of vessel). Backwashing reverses the flow, so the water is used to remove solids collecting on top of the bed.
- During Phase 2, the backwashing controls were optimized to achieve acceptable backwashing at variable water flows.
- Course and fine sand filters were backwashed approximately 3 to 4 times per day (220 to 280 times).
Biofouling in Sand Filters

Example of biological fouling on sand filter lid by growth of pond algae and organisms, which negatively impact the ISWTS mechanical components and functionality
Bag Filters

- Bag filters were changed approximately every other day.
  - Primary bag filters changed 25 times (300 bags).
  - Secondary bag filters changed 34 times (400 bags).
- Alternative bag filters ranging between 25-micron and 5-micron pore sizes were tested. (A micron is 1000\textsuperscript{th} of an inch.)
- Based on summer conditions, the most effective configuration is to use 25-micron primary bag filters with 10-micron secondary bag filters.
Regular cleanings of bag filters are required to address buildup of solids and algae in order to keep pretreatment system operational.
Operational Summary (Con’t)

Treatment Trains

• Treatment train pressure is monitored to confirm when maintenance is required. Solids accumulation in the vessel restrict flow, which causes increased pressure.
• Carbon backwashing was standardized to 2 or 3 times/week (16 times).
• Backwashed Primary Resin twice during operations & maintenance period. Did not backwash secondary resin, although pressures were rising.
• Post internal vessel inspections are conducted to ensure no channeling is caused by backwashing.
September Media Changes

Results from primary resin sample taken on 9/1/20 (received 9/10/20) triggered a media change requirement after PFOS and PFOA levels tested above 35 ppt.

The following ISWTS changes were made:

1. Primary Resin vessel was replaced with GAC, because
   a. High Total Organic Carbons in water require frequent backwashing maintenance and Resin is not designed to be backwashed.
   b. GAC has been proven to effectively remove PFOS/PFOA.

2. All media was replaced, and a system cleaning occurred during the system shutdown to mitigate any biofouling.
ISWTS September Redesign

Peracetic Acid Recreational Pond Biofouling Control
Untreated Water
INF PS SFBW
Turbidity Barrier
Train A Recycle GAC 1 GAC 2 Fine Sand Filter
Train B Resin 1 Resin 1 Train C GAC 2
Train D GAC 2

LEGEND
Sample Port ID

Stewart Air National Guard Base
New York
Interim Storm Water Treatment System
Flow Design and Sample Ports
After Modification in September 2020

UNCLASSIFIED
Path Forward

• Continue monitoring effectiveness of low Peracetic Acid dose.
• Continue evaluating performance of GAC being substituted for Primary Resin in order to compare each media performance.
• Continue optimizing ISWTS through operations and maintenance.
• Continue sampling for system compliance.
RAC Questions

Interim Storm Water Treatment System Questions

RAC Members Please Raise Your Hand to Ask a Question

5 Minute Timer

Time’s Up!
RAC Open Discussion
RAC Open Discussion

• Opportunity for RAC members to review remediation questions and concerns.
• Propose topics and action items for February’s meeting.
Public Questions

Please submit questions through the Question Module. Questions will be read by the moderator.

If there is not enough time to respond to all questions, the questions will be downloaded and written responses will be provided.
Public questions on this presentation may be submitted to

Mary Wagner at
mary@inherentgood.co

Questions will be accepted until Nov 15.
Air National Guard
Presentation Reference Figures
Results exceeding the NYSDEC AWQS are shaded in blue. All laboratory analytical results in µg/L.

### Analyte

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analyte Description</th>
<th>NYSDEC AWQS (µg/L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,1-Dichloroethane (1,1-DCA)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cis-1,2-Dichloroethene (cis-1,2-DCE)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dichlorodifluoromethane (DCDFM)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trichloroethylene (TCE)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinyl Chloride</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results exceeding the NYSDEC AWQS are shaded in blue.

**Legend**

- **Stewart ANG Installation Boundary**
- **Site 3 Former Landfill Boundary**
- **Monitoring Well (Lodgement Till)**
- **Surface Water / Sediment Sampling Location**
- **LTM Sample Location**
- **Monitoring Well (Weathered Shale Bedrock)**
- **Monitoring Well (Competent Shale Bedrock)**
- **Well presumably abandoned; cannot be located**
- **Approximate shallow groundwater flow direction**

**Image Source:**
2016 6-inch Resolution 6-Band Orthoimage, East Zone, NYS Office of Information Technology Services, GIS Program Office. 09-30-2016

**CLIENT**
Air National Guard
Shepperd Hall, 3501 Fetchet Avenue
Joint Base Andrews, Maryland 20762

**Contract Number:**
W9133L-19-F-2504

---

**Detected VOCs in Groundwater**

April 2020
PROJECT NO: BERS-34190046
PFOS/PFOA Interim Mitigation
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Stewart Air National Guard Base, New York

FIGURE 1
Interim Storm Water Treatment System (ISWTS) Location

- Untreated Water Influent
- Treated Water Effluent
- Recycled Water
- ISTWS Outfall Structure
- Weir Structure
- Outfall 010
- To Silver Stream
- Western Interceptor Drain
- Western Airfield Drains
- Eastern Airfield Drains
- NY Route 17K Storm Drain
- ISTWS Outfall Structure
- Sand Filter Skid
- Treatment Skid No. 1
- Treatment Skid No. 2
- Pre-Treatment Skid

FIGURE 2
Enlarged Interim Storm Water Treatment System (ISWTS) Location

- Sand Filter Effluent
- Pre-Treatment Effluent
RAC Community Presentation Slides

The following community slides were presented by John Clarke, Mary Wagner, and Bill Fetter on behalf of the RAC community members during the RAC Open Discussion portion of the RAC meeting. After the 20 minutes allotted for RAC Open Discussion was complete the meeting proceeded to Public Questions, as scheduled.
Which Magic Number Do We Apply to Our Communities?

The Maximum Contamination Level** or MCL is what I call a Magic Number determined by compromise of participants in the decision process.

- The Magic Number - United States EPA is 70 ppt (parts per trillion)***
- The Magic Number - State of New York is 10 ppt****
- The Magic Number according to Medical Studies?

What is the cost consideration for polluting my body?

What PFAS Magic Number will our community be subject to?

---


** As defined by the EPA, Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) - The highest level of a contaminant that is allowed in drinking water. MCLs are set as close to MCLGs as feasible using the best available treatment technology and taking cost into consideration. MCLs are enforceable standards.

Maximum Contaminant Level Goal (MCLG) - The level of a contaminant in drinking water below which there is no known or expected risk to health. MCLGs allow for a margin of safety and are non-enforceable public health goals.


**** NY State: [https://regs.health.ny.gov/sites/default/files/proposed-regulations/Maximum%20Contaminant%20Levels%20%28MCLs%29.pdf](https://regs.health.ny.gov/sites/default/files/proposed-regulations/Maximum%20Contaminant%20Levels%20%28MCLs%29.pdf)
PFAS Are In Several Waterways

*Maps altered from: “The Atlas of the Moodna Creek Watershed”, Orange County, New York, 2008*
Surface/Groundwater Transport to Several Receptors

- Lake Washington (drinking water)
- Browns Pond (drinking water)
- Kroll Well (drinking water)
- Butterhill Wells (3) (drinking water)
- Private wells in the Beaver Dam Lake area and others (drinking water)
- Fish in every habitat (affects entire food chain)
- What does it look like to the north?

*Map altered from: "Major Aquifers of Orange County", Orange County Water Authority, 2010*
What Criteria and Where?

What is the cumulative affect on each drinking water supply (a receptor) from each of the several contributing modes of transport?

What’s the Magic Number to trigger clean-up in:
  • A stormwater outfall?
  • A stationary body of water?
  • Surface water?
  • Sediment?
  • Groundwater?

What chemicals will be cleaned up and to what level?
(Only a few or all of them? Long and short chain?)
Who Pays?

Who Pays for Clean Water?
Who Pays for Clean-Up?
Who Pays for Poor Health?
How Will Our Site Be Ranked in Fight for Cleanup Funding?

- US Air Force’s Relative Risk Site Evaluation (RRSE) Policy uses data-driven scoring that prioritizes “worst first” sites for funding

- Scoring Criteria: drinking water contamination, migration, receptors...

- **Does the NYC water supply or the Washington Lake filter reduce Stewart’s RRSE score?** By how much?

- **Newburgh should not be penalized for doing the right thing** to protect our community. Scoring should be based on the state of our original drinking water source, which has at least 12 PFAS chemicals contaminating it.
Sample Ranking Worksheets

DoD, Relative Risk Site Evaluation Primer,
Summer 1997 Revised Edition Worksheet Example
Former Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan Presentation
Sources of PFAS Contamination
Stewart Air National Guard Base & Stewart International Airport
State Superfund Site
On August 12, 2016, NYS Dept. of Environmental Conservation determined that the Stewart Air National Guard Base: Site No. 336089 is a primary source of PFAS to the watershed and DEC and DOH listed the base area as a Class 2 State Superfund site, identifying the U.S. Department of Defense as a potentially responsible party for the contamination detected in the area and in the City of Newburgh's public drinking water supply.
Newburgh’s Drinking Water Reservoirs & Current Sources

- **Down hill/stream** from PFAS sources
- **Washington Lake** (Original Source; 12 PFAS)
- **Brown’s Pond** (Backup)
- **Current Drinking Water Source: Catskill Aqueduct**, NYC’s clean and protected supply
- City will switch to **Brown’s Pond** November 30, 2020 for estimated 10-week period while Catskill Aqueduct is repaired
- City will test for PFAS and run water through Granular Activated Carbon (GAC) Filtration system to ensure it meets **NYS Drinking Water Standards** of no more than 10 ppt per each PFOS & PFOA & no more than 1 ppb of 1,4 Dioxane
Soil & Water Contamination
Stewart Air National Guard Base

“PFOS concentrations in Rec Pond sediment samples ranged from 2,140 ppt to 424,000 ppt.” - DEC

PFOS in Surface Soil; Stewart International Airport
Samples collected 8/15 – 8/24/2016. Orange County Map – Figure 7

PFOS in Outfall Water; SANG-B Stormwater Retention Pond;
Samples collected 3/31 – 5/12/2016. Orange County Map – Figure 5

Source: https://www.health.ny.gov/environmental/investigations/newburgh/docs/infosheetgroupresults.pdf
Soil Contamination
Stewart International Airport – Port Authority of NY/NJ

PFOS in Surface Soil; Stewart International Airport. Samples collected 6/30 – 8/23/2016. Orange County Map – Figure 9
Body Contamination

NYS Dept. of Health 1st Round Biomonitoring Results for 1,917 People (out of total of 3763 tested), who are currently on City of Newburgh Water

City residents were exposed for nearly 3 decades of PFAS, between 1990 to 2016
Residents outside of the City of Newburgh had levels comparable to national averages 2013-14

~2X ~3X ~7X

National Avg. of PFOA National Avg. of PFOS National Avg. of PFHxS
[50th Percentile] [50th Percentile] [50th Percentile]

Source: https://www.health.ny.gov/environmental/investigations/newburgh/docs/infosheetgroupresults.pdf
Body Contamination

NYS Dept. of Health 1st Round Biomonitoring Results for 1,917 People (out of total of 3763 tested), who are currently on City of Newburgh Water

National Average of PFOS Middle (50th percentile) 5.20
High (95th percentile) 18.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>Number of participants with blood PFOS levels within specific ranges, in micrograms per liter (mcg/L), For people currently served by City of Newburgh public water: Tested from November 2016 through December 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 5 mcg/L PFOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Adults</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: https://www.health.ny.gov/environmental/investigations/newburgh/docsinfosheetgroupresults.pdf
Newburgh’s Body Contamination

NYS Dept. of Health 1st Round Biomonitoring Results for 1,917 People (out of total of 3763 tested), who are currently on City of Newburgh Water

~ 1750
City residents are above National Avg. of PFOS
[50th Percentile]

91%
City residents tested are above National Avg. of PFOS
[50th Percentile]

53%
City residents tested are above National Avg. of PFOS
[95th Percentile]

Source: https://www.health.ny.gov/environmental/investigations/newburgh/docs/infosheetgroupresults.pdf
PFAS Health Risks
Even at low levels of 2 parts per trillion

- Kidney Cancer
- Thyroid Cancer
- Endocrine/Hormone Disruption
- Osteoarthritis
- High Cholesterol
- Obesity
- Pregnancy & Breastfeeding Complications
- Reproductive Issues (Ovaries & Breast Cancer)
- Child Development Issues
- Immune Suppression (Concern w/ Covid & Vaccine Interference)
Newburgh’s Childhood Cancer

"It is imperative that MCLs for PFOA, PFOS, and the entire class of PFAS chemicals be limited to the lowest detectable levels. I lived across from Stewart Air National Guard Base and my own son died of childhood cancer. My friend's son, who lived five houses away from us, is suffering from disabilities in the aftermath of childhood cancer and its archaic treatment. **Countless students are currently battling childhood cancer in the Newburgh Enlarged City School District, and others are experiencing neurological and immunodeficiencies.** It is derelict behavior to allow this contamination to continue. Acknowledging childhood cancers are gravely under researched and cannot be directly correlated with the contamination of our drinking with the PFOA, PFOS, and 1,4-dioxane, the fact remains that there are multiple negative effects on fetal development as well as overall infant and child growth and development."

— Cynthia Mack, Greater Newburgh Resident, Mother & Teaching Assistant in Newburgh Enlarged City School District
# Orange County Cancer Incidences

NY Dept. of Health Cancer Registry 1976-2016
Newburgh’s Incidences? Under-reporting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cancer Type</th>
<th>Rate per 100 K</th>
<th>Avg. Annual Cases</th>
<th>Rate per 100K</th>
<th>Avg. Annual Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>389.5</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>493.9</td>
<td>1966.2 (2x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidney</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>73.2 (5x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thyroid</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>85.4 (16x)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Stewart ANGB and Newburgh Clean-up Must be Prioritized in Next Round of Remedial Investigation Funding”
- U.S. Senator, Chuck Schumer

After Four Years of Waiting for USAF To Clean-up Newburgh’s Drinking Water Source, USAF Bureaucratic Guidelines May Delay and Derail Clean-up of Newburgh Water—And Absurdly Penalize the City For Quick & Decisive Action.

“The bottom line is Washington Lake was and will be Newburgh’s drinking water source, and the United States Air Force can and must clean up the toxic PFAS mess they made in the lake and its tributaries with all due speed. Newburgh’s residents have been plagued for far too long by the toxic PFAS contamination of their drinking water, and they should not be punished for the swift, logical, and health conscientious decision to protect the wellbeing of their community. The Air Force must immediately remove this—and any—roadblock that would prevent the continuation of the imperative cleanup efforts to restore Washington Lake and the safe, clean drinking water that Newburgh residents need and deserve. No one should fear that their health or that of their family is being damaged by the water they drink, which is why I am calling on the Air Force to immediately expedite the cleanup process, approve funding for a Remedial Investigation at Stewart ANGB, and allow the cleanup to move forward ASAP.”

Photo by Lauren Berg
Site Comparison

PEASE Air Force Base - Portsmouth, NY

- Base shut down in 1990; Declared Federal Superfund Site 1991
- Redeveloped into Commercial Trade Port with 250 businesses, college, daycare, 10K People (no longer USAF property)
- 2015 hazardous PFAS levels discovered in groundwater aquifer; EPA issues administrative order under Safe Drinking Water Act requiring USAF clean up on their dime & on strict timeline
- Wood Engineering hired; 300 specialists working over 6 years; wins awards for their innovative and quick cleanup. Normal time would be 10-20 yrs.
- Active airport and Air National Guard; GenX firefighting foam still used as ‘environmental alternative’; Green Science Policy debunks as myth; may persist longer

Stewart Air National Guard Base, Newburgh, NY

- Declared State Superfund Site in 2016 (Non-NPL Status)
- 2016 hazardous PFAS levels discovered in Drinking Water affecting 30K+ people, businesses, schools, daycares, colleges, hospitals; No EPA administrative order or enforcement
- State (taxpayers) pay $25 Million for Granular Activated Carbon (GAC) Filter; Found not to be adequate for short-chain PFAS
- After 2 year ANG delay, Wood Engineering hired; Senators Schumer & Gillibrand source funds
- Another 2 years later, Interim filter with GAC filter and ion resin built on Rec Pond; Filter doesn’t work and not up to capacity; Dept. of Conservation (regulatory body) finds Expanded Site Investigation problematic; Current price tag?
- Active airport & Air National Guard; GenX firefighting foam still used as ‘environmental alternative’; Green Science Policy debunks as myth; may persist longer

Former Base Landfill

- **SECTION 1.2**
  - URP Site 2 - Has there been or will there be an effort to delineate and quantify pesticide product? Can the pit (source) be excavated & removed?

- **SECTION 1.3**
  - Has there been any thought to performing a few transects of shallow gas monitoring over the middle of the landfill for potential leaks in the cap?

- **SECTION 1.4**
  - At the end of this section there is discussion of deeper wells into competent bedrock. As the local shales can be brittle and fractured, where fractures characteristic if the rock in these wells? Was the rock cored to aid in the segment of well to be screened?

- **SECTION 2.2**
  - It is mentioned that ORP was measured. What does this indicate? What would make the oxidation/reduction potential vary in the groundwater, leachate or surface runoff?

- **SECTION 2.3**
  - At the end of this section, there is a reference to a preceding section (2.3) that I believe is intended to be 2.2
SECTION 2.5
Why was a hammer drill needed to advance a probe hole? Is/was the soil dense enough to require that much energy? Would it be beneficial to lean toward softer more permeable areas that may be preferential migratory pathways? Is the hammer drill possibly circulating air into the probe hole during drilling so as to displace any vadose sample with fresh air?

SECTION 3.6
Reviewing the long term monitoring graphs, it was evident that the MDL for certain parameters was elevated by significant amounts. Why would one choose (if that is the case) to employ a less sensitive analysis when the data is being used to forecast and plan future actions?

SECTION 4.0
Conclusion #2 closes by saying release of particular compounds has “affected” downgradient water quality. A more appropriate description such as “negatively impacted” is warranted. Conclusion #8 alludes to continued monitoring for assessment of additional action. How long, how many testing cycles are projected to be needed for recommended additional actions?

GENERAL
Has there been any attempt to normalize some of the highly variable results over time with an overlay of preceding rainfall. A 30 or 60 day trailing cumulative rainfall may shed some light on product mobility and quantity. I tighter spaced downgradient well pattern or at least soil probes would help better define soil/rock migratory pathways.
The report summarizes long term monitoring associated with the closure/post closure of the old onsite landfill which received residential waste under NYS regs. Based on the data, there clearly was a source of PCE and TCE onsite within the landfill. The upgradient well did not have VOCs. DCE and VC are breakdown products of PCE and TCE so the data indicates that PCE and TCE are breaking down (dechlorination – when one of the chlorine atoms is knocked off so PCE (4 chlorine) becomes TCE (three chlorine) then one of the DCE’s (two chlorine) and finally Vinyl chloride (one chlorine). The detection of cis 1,2 DCE in mw 19 is interesting. It is not above standards just a detect but it appears to be the first time it is detected in a downgradient well and Wood does say they will keep an eye on it. Vinyl chloride jumped in another downgradient well MW 16. It is difficult to say too much about one sampling point but it is a change in the pattern that they will keep an eye on. It is always disconcerting when you see a contaminant in a downgradient well that is supposed to be “clean” because it shows the contamination may be moving. One data point is not enough to draw any conclusions but if the pattern continues next year they will need to spend more time understanding it.
Several of the monitoring wells are also sampled for PFAS as part of the site investigation and the results are not discussed in this report. The wells can be monitored for both VOCs and PFAS without creating problems.

Questions for Wood
• Are related to the appearance of contaminants in the downgradient wells and how they will respond, clarifying what they mean when they say they will pay attention to the wells.
• Potential questions – will they increase monitoring frequency?
• How will they determine if additional monitoring is required?
• Which are the sentinel wells for this plume? (sentinel = guard. You put in wells outside of the extent of the plume. If the wells become impacted the plume is migrating)
Clean drinking water is a human right

Safe water for Newburgh

Clean drinking water is a human right

#safewater

for kids

Clean drinking water is a human right

Clean drinking water is a human right
Public Comments

• Catskill Aqueduct - Who is paying?

• Our City filtration system does not remove all the PFAS chemicals getting into our water; no ion resin on site

• We cannot expect to always have NYC water at our disposal. Long Islanders also want that water due to their own air base contamination problems and the lack of sensible watershed protections statewide

• COVID has eroded tax revenues and NYS can't pay for good water for everybody ad infinitum.

• It's on the DOD (and any partners they want to bring in, like NYNJ Port Authority or NYC DOT) to fix the problems they've created.
Meeting Questions and Responses
Stewart Air National Guard Base Restoration Advisory Committee
Questions and Responses from October 2020 Meeting

The document contains responses to questions submitted through the GoTo Meeting question module and after the meeting via email. Responses that were provided to questions during the meeting are available in the meeting transcript. The questions/comments presented in this question log are listed exactly as they were submitted. As such, acronyms or abbreviations may be defined later in the document than when they first appear, or some acronyms/abbreviations may be listed in multiple ways. A list of acronyms and abbreviations is provided on page 13 of this log.

Legend: Q = Question, A = Answer/Response, C = Comment

Questions Submitted During the Meeting

Q. Anthony Grice: So does that mean that Washington Lake will be back on the list for remediation next year?
A. A verbal response was provided during the meeting and is available in the meeting transcript.

Q. Mary Wagner: What accounts for the increase in chlorinated solvents: DEC and Vinyl Chloride and what is their associated toxicity?
A. A verbal response was provided during the meeting and is available in the meeting transcript.

Q. Chuck Thomas: So Site 3 is not contributing to PFAs or other negative exposure to our water supply?
A. A verbal response was provided during the meeting and is available in the meeting transcript.

Additional response after the meeting: The Air National Guard (ANG) has no historical evidence of Aqueous Film Forming Foam (AFFF) disposal/use at Site 3, the former landfill. Therefore, this question was answered “that’s correct” during the meeting, based on the fact that available data does not indicate Site 3 is a Per-and Poly-Fluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) source. However, because groundwater in Site 3 monitoring wells had Perfluorooctane Sulfonate (PFOS)/Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA) concentrations which exceeded screening levels during the Expanded Site Inspection (SI), the area will continue to be investigated during the Remedial Investigation (RI) as part of the delineation of nature and extent of contamination from other on-base PFAS sources.

Q. Rick Shoyer: Could ANG please provide historical trend graphs for the groundwater compounds of concern reported above limits and the landfill gas concentrations for Site 3?
A. A verbal response was provided during the meeting and is available in the meeting transcript.
Q. John Clarke: Was there any testing for short chain polyfluorinated compounds before and after filtration?
A. A verbal response was provided during the meeting and is available in the meeting transcript.

Q. Rick Shoyer: NYSDEC in October 2020 provided their updated PFAS Guidelines. The Guideline requires the analysis of 21 PFAS compounds. The Presentation only discussed PFOA/PFOS. Will ANG plan to comply with NYSDEC’s updated Guidelines for reporting 21 PFAS compounds?
A. A verbal response was provided during the meeting and is available in the meeting transcript.

Q. Rick Shoyer: Carbon is effective for PFOA and PFOS, but much less effective for short chain PFAS. The use of Carbon for a second vessel replacing one resin will be misleading to the public. Please provide the full list of PFAS compounds analyzed.
A. A verbal response was provided during the meeting and is available in the meeting transcript.

Q. Anthony Grice: If tis is interim then what is next? Why cant this stay?
A. A verbal response was provided during the meeting and is available in the meeting transcript.

Q. Gina Calderone: Where do I get the recent reports for the project. Where is the link to the admin records. Thank you
A. https://ar.afcec-cloud.af.mil

Q. Tamsin Hollo: Q: What will the final trigger level be for changing filter media (currently 35 ppt), given that NYS has set maximum level at 10 ppt?
A. A verbal response was provided during the meeting and is available in the meeting transcript.

Q. Karen Johnson: Beaver Dam has tributaries coming directly in from Moodna Creek and the lake has a very high level Phosphorus and in the deep sections of the lake there is an issue with oxygenation. What is being done about the pollutants still coming into our lake
A. A verbal response was provided during the meeting and is available in the meeting transcript.
Q. Rick Shoyer: NYSDEC updated PFAS Guidance states that further assessment of water may be warranted if either the following: any PFAS (not PFOA or PFOS) is detected in water at or above 100 ng/l (ppt), and total concentration of PFAS (including PFOA and PFOS) is detected in water at or above 500 ng/l- for the total of the 21 PFAS to be analyzed for. Will ANG be analyzing for the 21 Compound List (Appendix G of the NYSDEC Guideine)? Will ANG follow these latest Guidance criteria for indivisual and total PFAS?

A. The Department of Defense (DoD) appreciates that evaluating the applicability of state PFAS standards and guidance is a complicated issue. During the RI, ANG expects to analyze for the 21 Compound List identified in Appendix G of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation’s (NYSDEC) Revised PFAS Guidance (Sampling, Analysis, and Assessment of Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances [PFAS] Under NYSDEC’s Part 375 Remedial Programs, October 2020). However, ANG is still evaluating NYSDEC’s Revised PFAS Guidance regarding further assessment of individual and total PFAS (not PFOS or PFOA) and its applicability to delineation of nature and extent of contamination during the RI. It should be noted that evaluation of Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs) for cleanup objectives occurs later in the CERCLA process, typically during the Feasibility Study. DoD’s intent is to have a consistent Administration-wide answer on how to approach promulgated state standards. DoD is evaluating its legal authorities and will engage with our Federal agency partners on how to address state standards in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process.

Q. Karen Johnson: so this directly affects beaver dam. What is Stewart doing to corret this!

A. The Stewart Air National Guard Base (ANGB) PFAS SI and Expanded SI have focused on releases from ANG mission-related activities to Lake Washington, based on the direction of groundwater and surface water flow leaving the base. Further investigation of potential migration pathways to other receptors may be evaluated during the RI, as the nature and extent of PFAS impacts from ANG-mission related activities is investigated further.

Q. Rick Shoyer: How is disposal of media (sand, bag filters, carbon and resin) being managed and disposed?

A. A verbal response was provided during the meeting and is available in the meeting transcript.

Q. Dan Shapley: Relative to testing of the interim stormwater system and the screening levels used in the expanded Site Investigation, can you explain the rationale for use of the "modified" EPA Method 537? EPA Method 537.1 includes 18 PFAS, whereas the modified method includes only 6 PFAS. EPA has other validated methods that can effectively measure 29 PFAS. Particularly when it comes to the efficacy of a filter and the fact that AFFF firefighting foams have included various formulations over time with multiple PFAS, it is important to measure the greatest possible number of PFAS.
A.  A verbal response was provided during the meeting and is available in the meeting transcript.

Q. Karen Johnson: Why isn’t the federal govt taking care of this?
A. The ANG is committed to protecting human health on and around our bases and are working with regulators and community leaders. When past ANG activities are the cause of contamination, we are committed to following the CERCLA process at ANG release sites to evaluate unacceptable risk to human health and the environment with the understanding that individual release sites may result in a range of response and clean-up actions. We work with the community to determine response actions such as providing an alternate drinking water source, filtration system, and/or providing bottled water, if needed. Now that the Expanded SI is complete, an RI is planned for Stewart ANGB as the next step in the CERCLA process.

Q. The treatment vessels installed by the city of Newburgh are a larger version of the vessels used in the ISWTS. Would the City of Newburgh consider congaing out their media from GAC to Resin to capture those short chains?
A. ANG is not aware of any proposed changes to the filtration system at Lake Washington.

Q. Tamsin Hollo: Another question: How transparent will the scoring process be? Will we be able to view our score or have input as a community? And for the record, I hate the idea of competing with other affected communities for resources to remediate our site and protect our residents.
A. A verbal response was provided during the meeting and is available in the meeting transcript. Additional response after the meeting: ANG uses the DoD Relative Risk Site Evaluations (RRSE) at all of our installations that have confirmed the presence of PFAS released into the environment to inform our decision-making. The RRSE is used to evaluate the relative risk posed by an environmental restoration site in relation to other sites. This process entails soliciting public review and input on the RRSE outcomes. The availability of RRSE scores for Stewart ANGB will be published in a local newspaper ad, and the RRSE scores will be provided to the public via the Stewart ANGB website. The public will have a 30-day period to review and comment on the RRSE scores for Stewart ANGB.

Q. Rick Shoyer: The NYSDEC October 2020 PFAS Guidance has 2 ppt for water and 0.5 ppb for soil. Where these the the Reporting limits obtained by the laboratory?
A. The sensitivity for PFAS analytes is compound specific; however, the laboratory can detect all appropriate PFAS analytes below 2 parts per trillion (ppt) for aqueous samples and 0.5 parts per billion (ppb) for soil samples (even though we are not analyzing soil at Stewart Rec Pond). For example, the detection limit for aqueous PFOS is around 0.43 ppt and PFOA is around 0.23 ppt.
Q. Rick Shoyer: Please provide any updates on reducing stormwater flow in both dry and wet conditions. Any progress on rerouting 17K outfall around Stewart ANG property?
A. A feasibility study to divert the 17k pipe has been completed by New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT). A draft report with preferred options is currently under review by NYSDOT.

Q. Jennifer Rawlison: The City of Newburgh is currently on the Catskill Aqueduct. We have not received the funds allocated from the state putting our community in the position to most likely have to raise our water bills.

There must be the understanding that although this process is a marathon, not a sprint...we here in the City of Newburgh are being impacted. Both health wise and now economically. Can you assure the issue of sustainable solutions must be priority? A clean, remediated Lake Washington is the ultimate solution for our community.

A. We are committed to protecting human health on and around our bases and are working with regulators and community leaders. Our focus remains the health and safety of our Guardsmen, their families, and our communities. When past ANG activities are the cause of contamination, we are committed to following the CERCLA process at ANG release sites to evaluate unacceptable risk to human health and the environment with the understanding that individual release sites may result in a range of response and clean-up actions. The next phase in the CERCLA process is the RI, which will evaluate the nature and extent of PFAS impacts caused by ANG mission-related activities.

Q. Rick Shoyer: When will a workplan for the RI be developed and shared with the public?
A. Stewart Air National Guard Base will be sequenced for a RI alongside other ANG and Air Force enterprise-wide locations. When the RI is initiated, RI activities will be briefed to the Restoration Advisory Committee (RAC) and public during RAC meetings. An RI Work Plan will be developed and shared with the public in the online Administrative Record (AR) when it is finalized.

Q. John Clarke: How will having one less ion resin filter in the system affect the filtration of short chain compounds?
A. Treatment of the short chain compounds should not be affected. The useful life of the resin was not being optimized due to what we think is sediment clogging the filters. Resin is not designed to be backwashed but we were having to backwash the resin filters due to pressure building up which is highly likely to cause channeling. Since Granulated Activated Carbon (GAC) is designed to be backwashed, it was decided to change out the primary treatment vessel from Resin to GAC to allow for backwashing. The secondary treatment vessel or polishing unit remains a Resin vessel and seems to be removing the short chains. We will continue to operate the system, make changes as necessary and communicate those changes. The overall system performance is confirmed by regular sampling, which will document the effectiveness of the system for all PFAS compounds detected.
Q. Rick Shoyer: Comment- the EPA 537.1 List has been recently increased to 18 compounds where NYSDEC’s Oct 2020 Appendix G has 21 compounds.

A. Noted. Please see the following table for a comparison of the compounds being tested for in the Interim Storm Water Treatment System (ISWTS) and the NYSDEC’s Oct 2020 compound list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PFAS Sampling Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISWTS PFAS Compounds Tested</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfluorobutanoic acid (PFBA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfluoropentanoic acid (PFPeA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfluorohexanoic acid (PFHxA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfluoroheptanoic acid (PFHpA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfluoro-octanoic acid (PFOA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfluorononanoic acid (PFNAn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfluorodecanoic acid (PFDA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfluoroundecanoic acid (PFUnA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfluorododecanoic acid (PFDoA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfluorotridecanoic acid (PFTRDA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfluorotetradecanoic acid(PFTEDA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfluorobutanesulfonic acid (PFBS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfluorohexanesulfonic acid(PFHxS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfluoroheptanesulfonic acid (PFHpS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfluoroctane Sulfonate (PFOS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfluorodecanesulfonic acid (PFDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfluoroctane Sulfonamide (PFOSA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MeFOSAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EtFOSAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:2 Fluorotelomer sulfonic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:2 Fluorotelomer sulfonic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfluoropentanesulfonic acid (PFPeS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfluorononanesulfonic acid (PFNNS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:2 Fluorotelomer sulfonic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hexafluoropropyleneoxide dimer acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,8-Dioxa-3H-perfluorononanoic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9Cl-PF3ONS (F-53B Major)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11Cl-PF3OUDS (F-53B Minor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions Submitted After the Meeting

Q. Anthony Grice: Last night’s meeting still left me, and some of the constituents I represent, unclear in regards to Remediation Investigation funds. It was good to hear that
switching from Washington Lake was, and will not be, a factor in determining the eligibility. And I understand that there is a process. However, considering we were not slated, it seems as though that process has already started. My question is, are we slated for Remediation Investigation funds for next year, and if not why not? My other question is besides the RAC, whom do I direct the community members to? While I appreciate the collaboration between the Air National Guard and the RAC, it is not the RAC’s responsibility to defend decisions, or answer questions about decisions, that are made out of our control.

Also, I found the statement of commending the city in finding another drinking water source off-putting as we would not have had to do that if our water wasn’t contaminated in the first place. The commendation should have gone to the people in the early founding of Newburgh who established Washington Lake as a drinking water source.

A. Response provided on 29 Oct 2020: We are committed to protecting human health on and around our bases and are working with regulators and community leaders. When past Air National Guard activities are the cause of contamination, we are committed to following the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process at Air National Guard release sites to evaluate unacceptable risk to human health and the environment with the understanding that individual release sites may result in a range of response and clean-up actions. We work with the community to determine response actions such as providing an alternate drinking water source, filtration system, and/or providing bottled water, if needed.

We reaffirm that we do not penalize local officials for finding a new drinking water source and the sequencing of a Remedial Investigation will not be impacted by the fact that alternate drinking water sources are currently being used by the communities surrounding the installation. The Stewart Air National Guard Base Final Expanded Site Inspection was completed in September 2020 and the installation is now ready for the Remedial Investigation phase.

We use the Department of Defense Relative Risk Site Evaluations (RRSE) at all of our installations that have confirmed the presence of PFAS released into the environment to inform our decision-making. The RRSE is used to evaluate the relative risk posed by an environmental restoration site in relation to other sites. This process entails soliciting public review and input on the RRSE outcomes. The RRSE is actively underway at Stewart Air National Guard Base. Stewart Air National Guard Base will be sequenced for a RI alongside other ANG enterprise-wide locations.

We will continue to prioritize and address sites where risk to human health is the highest. Our focus remains the health and safety of our Guardsmen, their families, and our communities.

If members of the public have questions, they can call MSgt Pastorello, 105th Airlift Wing Public Affairs, at 845-563-2075. However, MSgt Pastorello will be providing the answer above to any inquiries.

Q.

Dan Shapley: Thank you. Can you clarify what this means? “This process entails soliciting public review and input on the RRSE outcomes.” When and how is public review solicited, and how does public input influence the RRSE decisions? We would
all, I think it’s fair to say, welcome public input opportunities that can help us express our interest in prioritizing remediation activities at Stewart.

A. Response provided on 3 Nov 2020: The ANG will provide updates on RRSE at an upcoming RAC meeting and through the online AR as more information becomes available. As indicated during the 28 Oct 2020 meeting, any additional questions on the RAC meeting should be submitted to Mary Wagner by 15 Nov 2020, and ANG will then prepare written responses to the complete set of questions.

Q. Anthony Grice: In this situation, the response action that is needed is a full and sustained remediation of Rec Pond and it’s tributaries. I can with a degree of certainty tell you that if the community were asked, this is the least they would request.

Being sequenced for an RI alongside other ANG enterprise-wide locations, does not specifically tell me if we are in the upcoming round that may be decided by December. Which is what my constituents want to know, and if not, why not. Further, they want to know in plain talk.

As far as risk, the City of Newburgh has close to 30,000 people. However, as correctly pointed out, the impacted area is actually larger than the City of Newburgh.

A. Response provided on 3 Nov 2020: The ANG provided the latest status on RRSE and the RI for Stewart during last week’s RAC meeting, and will continue to provide updates on RRSE and the RI as more information becomes available. As indicated during the 28 Oct 2020 meeting, any additional questions on the RAC meeting should be submitted to Mary Wagner by 15 Nov 2020, and ANG will then prepare written responses to the complete set of questions.

Q. When will Wood complete its current contract? Are they being rehired? If another engineer is being hired to take over the project, how will that affect the project timeline?

A. Wood’s contract for annual Long Term Monitoring (LTM) at Site 3 expires in 2024. Wood’s contract for the Expanded SI expired in October 2020. When a PFAS RI for Stewart ANGB is sequenced and funded, a new contract will be bid and awarded. A project schedule for the RI will be developed after contract award.

Q. Have biological (plant & microbe) remedies been explored to alleviate the bio-accumulation in Rec. Pond? Please see John Todd Ecological Design who created "Eco-Machine" and designed OMEGA's sewage filtration system.

https://www.eomega.org/eco-machinetm
https://www.amazon.com/dp/B078QSTGMY/ref=dp-kindle-redirect?_encoding=UTF8&btkr=1

A. The Eco-machine uses the following processes which are standard in wastewater treatment; settlement & equalization tanks, anoxic tanks, constructed wetlands, aerated lagoons, sand filter and dispersal. The ISWTS starts at the sand filter process in this 7 step process. If we want to apply this set up to Rec Pond, we could consider Rec Pond to be a Constructed Wetlands. Our problem is that when there is too much growth of plants and microorganisms, this growth clogs the filters in the ISWTS creating bio-fouling. In the literature on the eco-machine, the author stresses that they have identified and treat the overpopulation of the micro community of bugs sustainably so their wetlands and
aerated lagoons can work optimally. Our task with the ISWTS and Rec Pond is to understand how the existing plant and aquatic life function and changes seasonally in order to manage this ecosystem to not overburden our filters. Since the water passing through the GAC and Resin media needs to be relatively clean, finding this balance is critical.

We have learned that the Recreation Pond is very dynamic and water quality can change rapidly during storm events. We have been screening alternatives for both chemical and non-chemical technologies that could be considered to reduce bio-growth (invasive weeds and algae predominantly). To date we have not identified any non-chemical alternatives suitable for trial. We are carefully documenting pond conditions to better define what we encounter and continue with routine maintenance to keep biofouling to a minimum.

Q. Are you looking at Nanomaterials to accelerate treatment? There was a recent UMASS [link](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlelanding/2019/ew/c8ew00621k#!divAbstract)

A. We have looked at many different PFAS remediation technologies. Nanomaterials look promising at the bench study (laboratory) level, but have not been proven at a pilot or treatability level in the field. It is not known how this technology would work on surface water because surface water is dirtier than groundwater and can cause matrix issues. Also, Table 2 shows that performance times are too long to work at the Stewart Recreation Pond. Currently, we have a residence time of less than 5 minutes. It is also unknown how much this technology would cost to implement, as no pilot or treatability studies have been conducted. It is anticipated that a more comprehensive technology screening will be done during the Feasibility Study phase of the CERCLA process, which would include applicability of Nanomaterials and other emerging technologies.

Q. Are you testing for trichloroethylene (TCE). If so, where? And, what are the findings?

A. Groundwater samples were collected from seven monitoring wells during the April 2020 LTM event at Site 3. In accordance with the requirements of the NYSDEC Title 6 New York Codes, Rules, and Regulations (NYCRR) Part 360 solid waste permit, samples from each monitoring well were analyzed for volatile organic compounds (including trichloroethylene (TCE)), metals, and various leachate parameters. As shown on Table 3-3 of the LTM report, TCE concentrations were not detected above the reported sample quantitation limit at six of the seven monitoring wells. At one monitoring well, MW-09, TCE was positively identified at an estimated concentration of 0.23 µg/L (micrograms per liter), which is below the 5 µg/L NYSDEC Ambient Water Quality Standard (AWQS).

Q. Final ESI Report, General (Comment 1): It is stated in the Executive Summary and again in the Conclusions & Recommendations that efforts have been and in the future will be focused on Silver Stream and Washington Lake as it is traditionally a drinking water supply. That appears to be a clear indication that no adjacent and/or peripheral sub-
watershed stream will be evaluated for potential historic impact to residential wells that they recharge.

A. The Stewart ANGB PFAS SI and Expanded SI have focused on releases from ANG mission-related activities to Lake Washington, based on the direction of groundwater and surface water flow leaving the base. Further investigation of migration pathways to other receptors may be evaluated during the RI, as the nature and extent of PFAS impacts from ANG-mission related activities is investigated further.

Q. Final ESI Report, General (Comments 2-5 – all related to off-base sampling):

- I see that evaluation of contaminant pathways to off-site wells has been added to the Recommendations to be worked on. This evaluation should include an assessment of the soil/material used from grading during the various expansions over the years. Is these materials are an more permeable than the natural glacial till underlying most of the site, historical topography may not be an accurate indicator of current day groundwater migratory pathways. Does that include consideration of sampling streams around the base and nearby residential wells?
- At a minimum, it would seem prudent to visit/contact each home downgradient of any Stewart effluent, explain the circumstances of this investigation and offer to test their well water. Should results prove negative in all participants’ wells, the testing could be suspended for a year or two.
- If, however, relevant quantities of the subject contaminants are found in any well, the testing should be expanded to the nearby properties, if they are not already participating. In addition, potable water would need to be provided. Also, frequency of well testing in affected areas could be done frequently (quarterly?) to establish any historical trend.
- I think this scenario is especially true of the unnamed steam that exits Stewart near Rte. 207 & Jackson Ave. The stream generally follows Jackson Avenue south and terminates in Beaver Dam Lake. I don’t believe there is any municipal water in that corridor which leaves many residents relying on what they believe is clean individual wells. There is mention in a Beaver Dam Lake newsletter early on in this crisis that the NYSDEC has concerns of PFAS in Beaver Dam Lake.

A. Additional surface water sampling will focus on impacts caused by ANG mission-related activities and will be conducted as part of the RI. New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) sampled 64 private wells within the Lake Washington Watershed area downgradient of the base through 2020; no samples detected PFOS/PFOA above the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Lifetime Health Advisory (LHA). The RI will include a private drinking water well survey and, if warranted based on investigation results, further additional sampling.

When past ANG activities are the cause of contamination, we are committed to following the CERCLA process at ANG release sites to evaluate unacceptable risk to human health and the environment with the understanding that individual release sites may result in a range of response and clean-up actions. We work with the community to determine
response actions such as providing an alternate drinking water source, filtration system, and/or providing bottled water, if needed.

Q. Final ESI Report, General (Comment 6): Do finances look to be a concern for continuation?
A. After the RRSE is completed, Stewart ANGB will be sequenced for an RI alongside other ANG and Air Force enterprise-wide locations. RIs will be awarded as funding is available.

Q. Final ESI Report, Section 6.0 (Comment 7): Was there a reason not to chase the flow in dry weather as an emergency action to further locate potential areas of infiltration?
A. Interim response actions are taken for mitigation of drinking water impacts. In 2018, New York State completed construction of a drinking water treatment system at Lake Washington which treats PFOS/PFOA in water to below the EPA LHA. This constitutes an interim response action. The ANG will continue to follow the CERCLA process to identify further response actions during this multi-year effort.

Q. Final ESI Report, Section 6.2.3 (Comment 8): We have gone from talking microgram concentrations to grams. That is a factor of $10^6$, albeit still a relatively small quantity.
A. The difference in units reflects the different concepts being discussed (concentration versus mass). The concentration of PFAS in a water sample is measured in terms of micrograms per liter. Total mass (expressed in grams), represents concentration times volume; for example, the average storm water concentration times the volume of an entire storm water discharge equals grams of PFAS discharged over the entire event. Or, in Section 6.2.3, the estimated total flux from sediment to surface water is expressed in terms of grams/day (estimated flux of sediment pore water/day (at an estimated average concentration) over the area of Rec Pond).

Q. Final ESI Report, Section 6.3.3 (Comment 9): 400 gpm of PFOS/PFOA through Rec Pond in dry flow conditions. That’s 576,000 grams/day. More than 1200 lbs/day. Need to track down the source ASAP
A. This question confuses units associated with the flow of water with those associated with PFAS concentration. Section 6.3.3 is presenting various storm flow scenarios. For the storm flow analysis, a dry weather flow of 400 gallons per minute (gpm) was distributed throughout the model based on flows entering Recreation Pond. The 400 gallons per minute of water entering Recreation Pond should not be misinterpreted as 400 grams per minute of PFOS/PFOA “through Rec Pond”, which appears to be how 576,000 grams per day was calculated in the question. The highest concentration of combined PFOS/PFOA in dry weather storm drain samples was 4.05 parts per billion. Using this concentration at the 400 gpm flow, the rough calculation is approximately 9 grams per day or 0.02 pounds per day vs. the 1200 pounds per day presented. Even so, determining the nature and extent of PFOS/PFOA contamination resulting from Stewart ANGB mission activities is the primary goal of the pending RI and will be executed as expeditiously as possible.
Q. Final ESI Report, Section 6.4.5 (Comment 10): Data indicates downward vertical gradient in bedrock wells. MW-17 appears artesian based on purging data. No trouble maintaining water level while purging. This is difficult to do in a tight shale. Is it in fractured rock and not sealed from overburden?

A. The purging data, which is on the order of 200 milliliters per minute (ml/min) or about the volume of a coffee cup per minute, does not indicate artesian flow, nor is artesian flow evident in any of the base monitoring wells constructed in bedrock (although artesian conditions could exist to the east of the base in the Murphy’s Gulch wetland area). A detailed assessment of vertical flow gradients was provided as part of the remedial investigation of Site 2 (former pesticide burial pit; Aneptek, 1997 [AR# 29943/29944]). This investigation, which included vertical hydraulic cross-sections, identified downward vertical gradients within the upper (filled) area of the base, lateral gradients at the toe of the landfill slope, and upward vertical gradients within the wetland area/Murphy’s Gulch to the east of the landfill.

Q. Final ESI Report, Section 6.4.5 (Comment 11): Finding large sections of drainage pipe below the groundwater surface is perplexing. Typically drainage pipe is laid in an open trench at a specified pitch sometimes requiring shoring to prevent collapse in a deep or unstable sidewalls. However, other than localized perched water, it seems extraordinary to lay pipe accurately in a submerged trench.

A. Comment noted. Additional investigation will be completed in the RI.

Q. Final ESI Report, Section 6.4.5 (Comment 12): This may be cause to show that re-grading the land and granular backfill around the pipe may be providing pathways throughout the base for the contaminants to spread. This is further cause to broaden the evaluation to other flow paths offsite besides Silver Stream. It would not take much impedance in any one pipe trench to alter the local gradient and direction of flow. Partially clogged or collapsed pipe may have a similar impact with flow within the pipe.

A. Comment noted. Additional investigation will be completed in the RI.

Q. Final ESI Report, Section 7 (Comment 13): With the thousands of feet of camera work and all the other information to date, is there not at least a suspicious location or area of concern for the continued source of this material.

A. The SI and Expanded SI (ESI) identified some areas with screening level exceedances for soil. These areas will be further investigated during the RI.

Q. Final ESI Report, Section 7 (Comment 14): What about recommending some exploratory test pits in the prime candidate area in conjunction with following the dry weather drainage up stream? It appears from the report than only the drainage pipe around the perimeter of the apron was surveyed. Were no laterals identified that cold/should have been investigated?

A. The SI and ESI were completed to investigate presence or absence of contamination. Further investigation will be completed in the RI.
## Acronyms and Abbreviations for the October 2020 Meeting Question Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFFF</td>
<td>Aqueous Film Forming Foam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANG/NYANG</td>
<td>Air National Guard / New York Air National Guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGB</td>
<td>Air National Guard Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAR</td>
<td>Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWQS</td>
<td>Ambient Water Quality Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERCLA</td>
<td>Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCE</td>
<td>cis-1,2-Dichloroethene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC/NYSDEC</td>
<td>Department of Environmental Conservation / New York State Department of Environmental Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoD</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESI</td>
<td>Expanded SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>Granulated Activated Carbon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gpm</td>
<td>gallons per minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISWTS</td>
<td>Interim Storm Water Treatment System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lbs</td>
<td>pounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHA</td>
<td>Lifetime Health Advisory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTM</td>
<td>Long Term Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ml/min</td>
<td>milliliter per minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ng/l</td>
<td>nanograms per liter (also parts per trillion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYCRR</td>
<td>New York Codes, Rules, and Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYSDEC/DEC</td>
<td>New York State Department of Environmental Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYSDOH</td>
<td>New York State Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYSDOT</td>
<td>New York State Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFAS</td>
<td>Per-and Poly-Fluoroalkyl Substances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFOA</td>
<td>Perfluorooctanoic Acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFOS</td>
<td>Perfluorooctane Sulfonate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ppb</td>
<td>parts per billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ppt</td>
<td>parts per trillion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAC</td>
<td>Restoration Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec Pond</td>
<td>Recreation Pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Remedial Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRSE</td>
<td>Relative Risk Site Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Site Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANGB</td>
<td>Stewart Air National Guard Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>Trichloroethylene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>micrograms per liter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Welcome, everybody, to the Stewart Air National Guard Base Restoration Advisory Committee meeting. This is our fourth meeting, October of 2020. I know there are still a lot of people logging in, but we have a packed agenda tonight, and so I want to go ahead and get things started. Next slide, please.

So I would like to start off with a few of our introductions, and then we will roll into our opening comments. With the National Guard Bureau, we have Robert Subasavage, Keith Friehofer, and Nicole Wireman with us tonight. From Stewart Air National Guard Base, we have Col. Marc Kelly, Col. Edward Cook, Mike Oettinger, and Master Sergeant Sara Pastorello. Thank you all. From the Corps of Engineers, we have -- Michelle Lordemann, she's actually not with us tonight -- but we have Jessica Frehse, Kinjal Shah, and Stephen Kitt. And then, of course, our contractors, BERS-Weston.
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Services, who I am with, as well as Doug Close, who will be speaking later today; and Kerry Tull from Wood. So thank you, everyone, for being here. Next slide.

Our RAC members for this evening, our community representatives, we have Anthony Fern, Cassie Sklarz, John Clarke, Ramona Burton, Aura Lopez Zarate, Cynthia Mack, Carla Johnson, Edward Lawson, Laura Patricia Garcia Balbuen, and Robert Sanchez-Potter. Thank you guys for joining us and participating as our RAC members.

Our community group representatives: Chuck Thomas, our co-chair, with the Newburgh Conservation Advisory Council; Jack Caldwell, Quassaick Creek Watershed Alliance; Manna Jo Greene with Hudson River Sloop Clearwater; Mary Wagner with Newburgh Clean Water Project; and Victoria Leung with Riverkeeper.

Our government representatives are Anthony Grice with the City of Newburgh;
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Keith Miller with Orange County; and
Patrick Hines on behalf of the Town of
New Windsor.

And then additionally, I know I saw
Justin Starr with New York DEC, and I
know we have a number of other
representatives with us this evening,
including the representative from Senator
Schumer's office. Next slide.

So here is our agenda for this
evening, and I'll leave that up as we
start off with our opening comments and
our welcome with Col. Kelly and Chuck
Thomas. Colonel Kelly?

COL. MARC KELLY:

Thanks, Heather. Thank you
everyone for signing in. I think we're
up to 73 people. It's great that we can
continue our momentum in this format. I
know we would all rather be in person,
but until COVID subsides and we can begin
meeting in large groups, we'll have to
continue to do it this way. So I
appreciate everyone's patience. I know
everyone in the community and in the government would be rather face-to-face, so thanks for your patience.

I wanted to introduce Col. Ed Cook. I've had the pleasure of being in this role for about a year and a half now, and it is my turn to move on. Col. Donnell, our wing commander, has appointed Col. Cook to sort of take over as the senior representative for Stewart Air National Guard Base. I've certainly enjoyed my year and a half in this role. I've gotten to know a lot of people, and I want to say thanks to all the Guard Bureau team, the contractors, subcontractors, and the community leaders. It's been a pleasure getting to know you. I will still be in the background and still probably get a lot of emails, but from this point on, Col. Cook is going to assume my role. So Ed, if you want to say a few comments?

COL. EDWARD COOK:

First of all, I'd like to thank
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Col. Kelly publicly for all of his work over the last year and a half. I have been actively shadowing him for the last year since I arrived at Stewart, actually before the first RAC meeting last fall. And I look forward to working with everyone virtually to continue to move this forward, and also to get everyone on Base as soon as the COVID risk subsides. Hope to do that in the near future. Not only getting our community members on Base, but getting our families back on Base would be a great benefit to all of us. So I look forward to working with you, and we'll talk soon. Thank you.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Thank you, Col. Cook. And now I'd like to turn it over to Chuck Thomas.

MR. CHUCK THOMAS:

Thank you very much. Marc, I'm going to miss you already. And Col. Cook, we welcome you. Glad to have you aboard.

I just have a brief few words to
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say here. When we initiated the RAC process for the City of Newburgh residents and the stakeholders to collaborate on an investigative and restorative process, we came in with the goal of securing a comprehensive and timely cleanup for our water reservoir and surrounding watershed that serves over 30,000 people. To this end, I want to thank the RAC members and our partners for this effort over the past year. This is the fourth quarterly meeting of this process, and my last meeting, also, as your community co-chair. Working together, we've created a culture of communication and collaboration. We have crafted operating procedures allowing greater participation in both review and public participation. The studies have been undertaken to better understand the sources of contamination and the movement of contaminants through the area. This has begun to demonstrate varied and unexpected sources of pollution, new
migration pathways, and further exposure.
It's important to recognize and understand. It's also important to recognize the net result is that pollutants are primarily entering our drinking water source, Washington Lake, and our watersheds, such as Silver Stream and the Moodna Creek, through one venue: Recreation Pond.

Last winter, a trial filtering system was placed in Rec Pond, and it almost immediately failed due to clogging and the system being overwhelmed by area rainfall. Since that time, there's been no apparent progress towards replacing that failed system with an adequate replacement system. We're now approaching another year without filtering taking place. Why is that? I'm not looking for the answer now, but rather pointing out that this is something that the community really feels needs to be addressed. This unfiltered water is blocked from entering Washington
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Lake, but that doesn't help the remediation of Washington Lake, which is our ultimate goal.

Washington Lake was created back in the 1800s as a robust and active water system for the entire City of Newburgh. It actually predates the New York City water system. Isn't it important to be filtering this water now? New York State will not be able to foot the bill indefinitely for our use of New York City's clean Catskill aqueduct water, which other PFAS-affected communities are now tapping into as well. Meanwhile, we will not allow our community, that's already suffered with three decades of PFAS poisoning, to go back onto Washington Lake, knowing that our current filtration system can't filter out all the PFASs. Furthermore, we want to prevent the continuing degradation of our streams, Moodna Creek and Silver Stream among others, that flow into America's river, the Hudson River, which serves as
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the drinking water for seven other communities.

This is not the fault of the good folks in this virtual room, but rather a system that seems to prioritize economics over health and safety. Four years ago, PFASs were identified in our drinking water. Four years ago, the New York State DEC identified the problem and recommended a solution. Our cleanup is now being penalized because we are not using Washington Lake as our drinking water source. The priority we have, and had, is our health and safety. We need to bring our collective and powerful voices to bear to expedite the cleanup process, approve funding for remedial investigations, and move the cleanup forward.

The City of Newburgh did not willy-nilly-decide to stop using Washington Lake, but rather was forced to stop supplying polluted drinking water to our citizens for their health and safety.
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Now is the time to immediately raise our collective voices to fund and start remediation of Washington Lake, a water supply system predating the venerable New York City system, and I call on this body to lead that call to action.

I thank each and every one of you for your participation and I look forward to this group moving forward to find a better water system for the City of Newburgh. Thank you.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Thanks, Chuck. I know we'll be hearing more from you a little bit later on. We are going to roll right into our RAC business for tonight.

I did want to point out before we move on that I have received word that a representative from Senator Gillibrand's office is also with us this evening, and Wendy Kuehner from the New York State Department of Health is also with us, along with many other representatives from the Town of New Windsor, from
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Newburgh, and other state agencies. So we thank all of you for joining us this evening and participating in this meeting. Next slide, please.

So our meeting notes and guidelines for tonight, we do have a representative here who is transcribing the meeting proceedings. So again, if everyone can try to introduce themselves, remember to introduce yourself, that way, we can have everyone's comments attributed to the person and the organization that you represent if you are speaking. This is generally for our presenters and our RAC members. All phones are muted at this point. It helps us keep the noise level down during the meeting, so we appreciate you working with us on that. If you do have questions, there is a question module. Please insert your questions there. There will be time at the end of the meeting to discuss our responses to some of those questions, and so we will read off those questions and the
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individuals that they are attributed to
at that time. So you can start inserting
your questions as you like throughout the
meeting. Next slide, please.

So onto our RAC business. Our
upcoming meetings are going to be
February 3rd. That is a Wednesday. It's
just offset a little bit due to the
holidays. It's one week back. But we
hope everyone will be able to join us on
February 3rd. We would like to say that
we will be meeting in person, but I think
we've all been monitoring the COVID
issue, and it will most likely be a
virtual meeting once again. But we will
definitely send out the information via
the email list that we have for the RAC
meetings, as well as place a newspaper
advertisement and things like that to let
everybody know whether we will have
another virtual meeting or if there's the
capability of meeting in person. Our
sixth meeting will be April 28th, and our
seventh meeting is proposed for
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July 28th. With RAC approval, I think we will be able to keep on our quarterly schedule, so please mark your calendars now for those dates. Next slide.

Our operating procedures have been an ongoing discussion for the RAC, and I would just like to thank Chuck Thomas, Mary Wagner, and Victoria Leung for all their work, as well as all the other RAC members who had comments and took the time to review the procedures. I think there have been some really great conversations back and forth with the Air National Guard. And we finally have a set of operating procedures that I think we have finalized, as it shows up on our slide. We had meetings to discuss the final comments, and the final comments were received from those RAC members on September 16th, who then submitted a final copy that I believe has been shared with the entire RAC. And so now, unless there are any comments -- and you can raise your hand if there's any additional
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questions or comments on the operating procedures -- I would like to see if we are ready for a vote on those. Chuck?

MR. CHUCK THOMAS:

I would like to move that we accept the operating procedures as written, rewritten, and submitted for comments. Thank you. Any other comments from the RAC members?

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

If you raise your hand, we'll make sure you get unmuted. Okay, if not, if all of our RAC members can go ahead, and if you would like to accept the operating procedures, please raise your hand and we will make a record of those to make sure that we do have the majority. You should, on your panel, have the picture of a little hand that you can use to raise your hand. So I will ask all of the RAC members to do that now. Thank you, Chuck. And it looks like we have the vote from Victoria, Anthony Grice, John Clarke, Bill Fetter, Jack Caldwell
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Manna Jo Greene, Mary Wagner, Patrick Hines, Laura Garcia, Aura Lopez Zarate.

Anybody else? Final moments. I believe it looks like we have ten members with Chuck, which looks like the majority.

Thank you everyone for raising your hand. Is there anyone that abstains or opposes adopting the operating procedures as they stand? Victoria, it looks like you are the one that raised your hand in opposition -- or maybe not.

MS. VICTORIA LEUNG:

Sorry. I clicked the wrong button. I went to support the operating procedures, and I went to lower my hand after that.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Okay, perfect.

MR. CHUCK THOMAS:

RAC members, if I may, there was more than just a few of us that worked on this, these operating procedures. We had a lot of feedback and I thank everyone for that.
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MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Yes. Thank you. It looks like we have the majority to go ahead and approve them. We will make sure everyone gets those final copies if you don't have one, so thank you for that. Next slide, please.

So as Chuck mentioned in his opening comments, we've had a great year working with him as the RAC co-chair for our community members, and we appreciate all the service. I know he's not leaving us, he'll still be supporting the RAC and we appreciate that, but his term is over. I believe there was a nomination for Ed Lawson to be the co-chair. Is that correct, or are there any other nominations for co-chair?

MR. CHUCK THOMAS:

Yes. We've nominated Ed Lawson as the co-chair. Are there any other nominations from the board?

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Doesn't look like it. So if our
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RAC members would once again go ahead and raise their hands if they're in support of Ed being co-chair. Hopefully, he's in support of being co-chair as well. I'm assuming you had that conversation with him. So again, it looks like we have Victoria, Anthony, John, Laura, Bill, Jack, Manna Jo, Mary Wagner, and Patrick all in support of Ed as our co-chair. Again, that looks like 10 or 11 of us, so thank you. Again, that is a good majority. Thank you everyone for voting. I'll go ahead and lower your hands. I appreciate your participation. I know this is kind of an odd way of going about it.

It looks like we also had a nomination or -- Laura, I think you're still muted. Did you have a question or comment that you wanted to make?

MS. LAURA GARCIA BALBUEN:

    No. I'm sorry. I'm also having issues with raising and lowering my hand.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:
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All right. Thank you. So we are good. Were there any nominations for the secretary? Did we need any discussion?

MR. CHUCK THOMAS:

I would just say that Mary Wagner's done a terrific job, and I hope that doesn't scare away other possible nominees, because it's really an important job. Every RAC member has the ability to do this, so I do hope someone will step forward and do the secretarial function.

MS. MARY WAGNER:

Yes, thank you. I've had some great support as well and I would welcome any nominees from the floor. If not now, hopefully in the next couple weeks we'll find some. Thank you.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

If anyone would like to volunteer or nominate someone, you can go ahead and raise your hand. If not, please feel free to reach out to Chuck or Ed or myself or Mary. And again, Mary has done
a wonderful job. Even if that's something that -- because it is quite a bit of work, if that's something that possibly two people want to take on together and maybe share some of those responsibilities, I'm sure that's something that can be worked out as well. So if we have no discussion on that, it looks like at this point, please continue to consider that in the next coming weeks. And we can move onto our next topic.

So we have two open positions, as had been announced, I believe, for Cynthia Mack and Anthony Fern. I would like to thank both of you for your service on the RAC. We appreciate the time and dedication that you have committed to serving on the RAC. And I would like to open it up. Chuck, do you have any comments to make about Cynthia and Anthony before we move onto nominations?
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Well, Cynthia really gave us a great view of what was happening outside of our current borders and our current areas of interest, and I really appreciate all that she did to bring us forward here. Anthony, too, was a great main person for providing scientific insight into the studies that we were reviewing. So I thank both of them. We had some discussions, and I've asked Mary to present -- I think we have ten candidates, which I'm thrilled about, for the two open positions. I'm really excited that we had so many candidates. Our membership got together and we narrowed it down to I believe four candidates, and I'm going to ask Mary to speak to those four candidates if she will.

MS. MARY WAGNER:

Sure. Thank you to Cynthia and Anthony. And echoing Chuck, it's great to see so many qualified people apply.

The four people we narrowed it down
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to are Ronald Zorrilla from the City of Newburgh. Ronald is a conservation advisory council member and also a co-founder of Outdoor Promise, which connects youth and families to nature and cultivates young environmental leaders.

The second person is Robert Browning, a longtime Town of Newburgh resident but very involved with the City of Newburgh. He's a former educator, board president of Independent Living, and has served on then Congressman Sean Patrick Maloney's Veterans Committee.

So those two candidates got the majority of votes. We had eight people voting -- and Heather, I can share our document. And the other two candidates are Kevin Phillips. He is from Cornwall and a member of the Beaver Dam Lake Association. As I understand it, they're also a PFAS-affected community. And Ernestine Ballard from the Town of Newburgh, who is an employee at Castle Point, the veterans hospital.
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So thank you to you all, and we will be in touch with you.

MR. CHUCK THOMAS:

Thank you, Mary.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Thank you. And then Cassie and Mary, did you have plans to vote this evening, or is the RAC going to get together and let us know the final decision at a later date?

MR. CHUCK THOMAS:

We had a vote among ourselves, and I believe eight of the members voted in favor of the two people who were mentioned: Ronald Zorrilla and Robert Browning. We can re-do that vote if necessary but we were trying to save time.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

No, that's perfect. I just wanted to make sure I had all the information I needed. So it looks like you'll be moving forward with those two, then, as the new RAC members filling Cynthia's and
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Anthony's positions. Wonderful.

Well, if we can move onto the next slide. We are ahead of schedule for this topic. Thank you everyone, thank you Chuck and Mary for organizing everything so we can move through these topics fairly quickly, which will give us some more time for the rest of our presentation. I know the community RAC group is going to have a presentation a little bit later tonight. Was there any other RAC business that needed to be discussed before we move onto our presentation?

MR. CHUCK THOMAS:

No other business has come to my attention.

MS. MARY WAGNER:

Just a quick note if together we can work to find out a way to get at least Spanish captioning and/or interpretation for 2021. I have high hopes, as 50% of our community is Spanish speaking. So I wanted to put that on so
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that we can all brainstorm. Thank you.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Thank you, Mary. We will
definitely take note of that. Before we
move on, I did want to point out to
everybody, there are some handouts. You
should be able to see them in the bar
where your audio control and question
module is located. In tonight's
handouts, we have the slides from
tonight's presentation, our agenda.
There's also a document called RAC terms
and abbreviations that has a lot of the
acronyms that are used, as well as short
glossaries. We're trying not to use as
many acronyms in our presentation, but in
case we do, it's a handy reference that
you can look at. So please take time to
look at those handouts. You can download
them. So that information is available
under your handouts. Next slide, please.

So we will start off on our next
topic a little bit early. Again, thank
you for helping us get to those
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presentations. Nicole, I think you are first up.

MS. NICOLE WIREMAN:

Awesome. Thank you, Heather and everyone else for working through that so quickly. Good evening, everyone, and thank you for being here, sincerely, taking your time to come and learn more about the environmental projects happening at Stewart and really opening up the discussion on it. We appreciate all the time you commit to this.

Again, my name is Nicole Wireman, and I serve as the restoration program manager for Stewart. And I can't go on without saying how pleased we are with the progress that we've made, the positive steps. When we look back to our first official RAC meeting in February, and the fact that, you know, through a lot of hard work, we got through some operating procedures that I think have a lot of common interest. It took a lot of coordination and a lot of phone calls, as
Chuck and Mary and Victoria can attest to, and some compromise on both sides. And it's just really great to have the final operating procedures tonight that we can use going forward. I also wanted to welcome our two newest RAC members this evening, as well our new RAC co-chair. I really appreciate the time that you all commit to volunteering for this.

On top of that, we have great news to share -- we can go to the next slide now, please. We have great news to share in that, since our last meeting, we now have a final expanded site inspection report or expanded SI report. So if you remember at our last meeting, we were at the draft final stage. We submitted the draft final report in mid June with the comment period ending in mid July. So since the last meeting at the end of July, the Air National Guard prepared responses to the comments that we received from stakeholders. We submitted
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those responses back to everyone in late August, and posted them also to our online administrative record, or AR. And you can see at the top of the slide, there's a link that gets you to our online AR. Then we coordinated further with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, or DEC, and we were able to work through the comments and get to a point where, on September 22nd, we received a letter from DEC indicating that they had no further comments on the report, and we should proceed forward to the remedial investigation, or RI. So that's a big step for us to complete the site inspection phase and be able to proceed forward into the RI phase. We then put that final expanded SI report on our online AR to make it accessible to everybody. That was done at the end of September. And we're displaying for you here the AR numbers where you can access that report. Unfortunately, there are 33
files because it's a big report with a lot of data in it, but the main file that will likely be of interest to you is the very first one, because that includes the text of the report, the figures, and the tables. And then the other 32 files contain all the appendices. So I would particularly point out to you appendix P, the very last appendix, because that includes also all of the stakeholder comments we responded to which caused changes to the report from the draft final to the final stage. So if you have any questions about how comments were addressed, we encourage you to in particular look at appendix P.

So this evening, we are not going to be giving a presentation on the expanded SI, and that's because at our last two RAC meetings in April and July, we broke up the information and presented that to you during that time, and there really hasn't been significant changes in getting to the final report. So if you
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were not at the last RAC meeting perhaps and wanted to access the information on the expanded SI, we do have the slides from the last meeting as a download through this GoToWebinar forum, where you'll find items you can download. And then, of course, a way to access all the materials from the last meeting is to go to our online AR. And we do that after every quarterly meeting, when everything gets finalized, you'll see the AR number there for the July RAC materials. And that includes the agenda, the slides, the transcripts in both English and Spanish, as well as answers, written answers to any questions that we couldn't get to during the meeting. There's really a lot of valuable information in there. So we encourage you to check out our online AR and you may be able to get some of your questions answered just by looking through some of that material as well.

So we had planned to go directly into presenting on our former Base
landfill and the long-term monitoring
program going on there -- that would be
at Site 3 -- as well as giving you an
update on our interim stormwater
treatment system. But I did want to
cover one topic before we did that. And
if we could go to the next slide. This
is actually a new slide that we inserted
because there was a recent news article
last week and we wanted to address that
right upfront. So first off, I wanted to
say, as far as coming from the expanded
SI, we will be going into the remedial
investigation. That's the next step in
the CERCLA process. And again, CERCLA is
the Comprehensive Environmental Response,
Compensation, and Liability Act. And so
we will be proceeding based on the data
from the expanded SI and the two SIs. We
will be planning to proceed to an RI.
The way that will happen is that the Air
National Guard is actively sequencing
installations for RIs using scientific
data and a risk-driven process. So
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essentially, we look at worse first among the installations. And we do this in conjunction with Air Force sites as well Air National Guard sites.

So related to this, there was a news article which indicated that the community around Stewart would be penalized because of the switch to an alternate drinking water source in 2016. And I just wanted to make very clear that that is not accurate, and it's contrary to the official position of ANG. So we do not penalize local or state officials for finding a new drinking water source. In fact, we applaud the efforts that were made to find that alternate drinking water source in 2016, and then also to install a filtration system at Lake Washington in 2018 which treats PFOS and PFOA in drinking water to an acceptable level.

So in proceeding forward to the RI, the steps that we are using, one part of it, at least, is to use a risk-based
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process for decision-making that is called relative risk site evaluation, or RRSE. And during that process, we do not account for the short-term mitigation of risk that results from changing a drinking water source. So RRSE considers the original drinking water source in the migration pathway and receptor analysis. Because of that, the RRSE for Stewart, and then subsequently the sequencing of the Stewart RI, would not be impacted by the fact that an alternate drinking water source is currently being used by the community surrounding Newburgh. So there might be some further questions on that which we can discuss during the general Q&A period, but I did want to make sure we covered this topic right up front because of that recent news article.

And now what I'd like to do is stick with our original agenda and go to the next slide. And that presentation is going to be provided by Mr. Kerry Tull from Wood. Kerry, you can take over at
MR. KERRY TULL:

Thank you. Good evening, everyone. Again, Kerry Tull with Wood Engineering. And this is for Site 3, also previously known as Site 1. This is the former Base landfill. This has been a long-term monitoring program that's gone on for a couple of decades and more. Next slide, please.

So as the arrow indicates, this is on the eastern-most side of the Base. The landfill received municipal domestic waste from former on-site Air Force residents during the '60s and '70s. The landfill was covered, I believe a cover or cap was installed in 1999, and annual long-term monitoring has gone on since 2000. 2020 represents the 21st year that long-term monitoring has been performed. Next slide.

As background, the final work plan for the long-term monitoring to go on between 2020 and 2024 was submitted to
the New York State DEC in February of 2020. Annual sampling event was completed the first week of April, 2020. This had to be conducted in the very midst of our -- the beginning of the COVID issues, so it took some extra effort, but everyone was able to rally, and the Base was very accommodating. So groundwater samples were collected from seven wells. Surface water and sediment sampling was collected, and landfill gas monitoring along the landfill perimeter. It's important to remember, as this has come up as a theme, that the landfill has a cap and has about a dozen or so large vents. So it regularly -- it has the ability to off-gas. If some gasses that typically accumulate from typical domestic waste do collect, it's able to off-gas those through those vents. Next slide.

So this slide shows the perimeter and sampling points all around. The wells, most importantly on the
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downgradient side, will be to the east, to the right-hand side. And we also have wells upgradient as a comparison. The cap is represented by that clear grassy area right along the center there, running north and south. Next slide.

So updates since the last RAC meeting. The 2020 annual long-term monitoring report. The draft final report was submitted to New York State DEC and the RAC on the 29th of September. We've received some comments and we've been addressing those. The findings were basically low levels of solid waste-related chemicals detected in groundwater. Most chemicals show stable or decreasing concentration trends. Next slide.

Findings. Several solid waste-related chemicals show variable or increasing trends over time, for example, chloride, which is a salt, sodium, iron, and solvent breakdown products. Specifically, the solvent breakdown
products are chlorinated solvents typical of a landfill of this type. They are going to break down in an anaerobic state. And the amount of oxygen that's in any given landfill after it's been capped and sitting for decades, the amount of oxygen is very low, and you have what is considered an anaerobic condition. This actually helps break down chlorinated solvents, and the degradation products of those solvents we're seeing are typically DCE and vinyl chloride. Those will continue to be monitored both around and off of the landfill itself. No solid waste related chemicals are present above the New York DEC criteria in the most downgradient well, MW-19, or in surface water and sediment samples. It's important to remember that the groundwater that travels through or comes out of the landfill is going to display itself in the nearby surface water receptors, and we're not seeing -- or the samples that
we've taken have not displayed any contaminants above those criteria thus far. Next slide.

So again, we've got locations where we have seen some exceedences, and those are -- it's kind of difficult to see, sorry -- but as you can see there, in the center, they're highlighted in blue. We've got some vinyl chloride in that well, I believe it's 16; and then just on the toe, the bottom part of that, you can see we've got some vinyl chloride and some DCE. Again, these are long-term expected, anticipated breakdown products from solvents. It's part of the dechlorination process. Next slide.

So continuing with the findings, nominal levels of landfill gas were detected at the perimeter sampling stations, indicating low or no levels of biological activity. Positive information, because high levels of biological activity can result in the need for gas treatment and/or the
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generation of elevated chemical
concentrations in leachate. The sum
total of this wording is that the
landfill is acting and is in a state in
which we would expect it to be. There's
nothing about the landfill that is
unanticipated or projecting a problem
that would need a call to action. We
monitor -- again, this is being monitored
over a long period of time, has been, and
will continue to be.

And that's it. So I can certainly
field any questions for the next five
minutes.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Thank you, Kerry, for your
presentation. I think our first question
is coming in from Mary Wagner, and then I
will ask any of the RAC members who have
a question on the Site 3 presentation
that Kerry gave, please raise your hand
and we'll try to get as many questions in
in five minutes as we can. Mary, unmute
yourself and ask your question.
MS. MARY WAGNER:

  Sorry, Kerry, I think you already
  answered it mostly. If you could just
  speak to the toxicity associated with the
  vinyl chloride and DCE?

MR. KERRY TULL:

  Yes. So vinyl chloride and DCE are
  solvents. You do not want elevated
  concentrations of those. The important
  point is, while they have been detected
  downgradient of the landfill at
  concentrations that exceed the New York
  DEC guidance, we're not seeing them
  beyond. This is not a plume that's
  expanding. Those types of results are
  typical of previous sampling rounds and
  are not indicating a trend that is
  worrisome.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

  Do we have any other questions from
  our RAC members on Site 3? I'm not
  seeing any hands. Oh, Victoria, I see
  you.

MS. VICTORIA LEUNG:
So you mentioned downgradient wells. And in the report, it seems that there's attention in one to DCE and vinyl chloride in some downgradient wells where it wasn't seen before. I know the report mentions that this is something that we'll be monitoring further, but I was wondering if you would be -- how exactly you will be doing that? Will you be increasing frequency? And how will you determine if any additional monitoring is required for that?

MR. KERRY TULL:

Thanks. That's a great question. At this time, again, working with the State, the Solid Waste Department, the New York State DEC, this landfill, because of its age, is sampled only on an annual basis. But to your point, if those trends continue, or more importantly, if we were to see a trend of increasing concentration, or find it in the sediment and/or surface water beyond, then clearly, there's starting to create
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an indication that this may be more than what we would want or expect, and plans and actions will be taken. At this time, though, the relatively minor amounts, however above the guidance, are just that. They are expected to be seen and will be checked annually before any action or plans for that are taken.

MS. VICTORIA LEUNG:

Thanks. And one additional --

MS. NICOLE WIREMAN:

Sorry, Victoria. I was just going to add that, of course, we will continue to brief the RAC the next time we sample in April and have a report. We will share the draft final report for stakeholder and RAC review and include it in a presentation at that time.

MS. VICTORIA LEUNG:

Thanks. And then I was wondering, which are the sentinel wells for the plume, the ones outside the extent of the plume?

MR. KERRY TULL:
The ones that are specifically called sentinel, I would call all of them sentinel really. I think that that can be a phrase that maybe only identifies one or two of the wells. But the wells are viewed -- sample results from the wells are looked at in their entirety. So not just the sentinel wells, although that's important, but the wells that extend from the borders outward, as well as the sediment and surface water, all viewed in its entirety.

MS. VICTORIA LEUNG:

Thank you.

MS. NICOLE WIREMAN:

Are there any more questions, Heather, or is there time for me to say one more thing?

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

It looks like there is one more question from Chuck.

MR. CHUCK THOMAS:

Thank you. I don't seem to have a raise-the-hand function so I thought I'd
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just put it in there. So what we're saying, that Site 3, the former landfill, is not contributing PFASs or other negative products to our water supply?

MR. KERRY TULL:

That's correct.

MR. CHUCK THOMAS:

Okay, so we ruled that one out.

Thank you.

MR. WILLIAM FETTER:

Hi. This is Bill Fetter. Can I speak?

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Hi, Bill. We can probably have time for one more quick question and Nicole to wrap up.

MR. WILLIAM FETTER:

A lot of the leachate is based on the amount of flow or rainfall, that is, passing over the property. Is that not correct?

MR. KERRY TULL:

That's not correct. The landfill has a cap on it. It doesn't receive
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rainfall.

MR. WILLIAM FETTER:

And is the cutoff trench at the top end to prevent any migration of surface water flow under the top edge?

MR. KERRY TULL:

No. No, there is not. The landfill is not isolated in that sense.

MR. WILLIAM FETTER:

Isn't it on a hillside and likely in a wet area towards the Base?

MR. KERRY TULL:

It's not in a wet area. It's up on a hillside. It's quite elevated.

MR. WILLIAM FETTER:

All right. And one last question. Were the tanks removed off the pesticides that were dumped?

MR. KERRY TULL:

The pesticide area was excavated fully about 30 years ago. It was completely delineated, excavated, and post-extraction samples were collected. The pesticide area is no more.
MR. WILLIAM FETTER:

And 20 years later, we're still looking at it.

MR. KERRY TULL:

Well, it's always part of the monitoring program, but the area in which pesticides were dumped was removed.

MR. WILLIAM FETTER:

I mean, it's still present, though, in some of the wells.

MR. KERRY TULL:

Yes.

MR. WILLIAM FETTER:

We can move on. I'll talk to you later more about this.

MS. NICOLE WIREMAN:

For the sake of moving on, I'll just add a comment later when we talk about Site 3 again. So proceed forward to the treatment system.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Thank you. I just want to let Mr. Grice know that we do see your question in there. Since it's not
directly related to Site 3, we will pick that up at the end. Right now, we will move on to our interim stormwater treatment system update with Doug from BERS-Weston Services. Take it away, Doug.

MR. DOUG CLOSE:

Thanks, Heather. Thanks everyone. Good evening. Doug Close with BERS-Weston, interim stormwater treatment system project manager. Next slide, please.

We met last July and we started to talk about the layout for the new filtration systems. We gave you a quick briefing because we were only a couple weeks into the addition of a new sand filtration skid and additional pretreatment. Here is a little bit of a photo or capture of our layout at the point of the weir structure and behind the Rec Pond berm. Next slide, please.

This slide, if we start at the right-hand side of the page or the three
o'clock position, we added in a new filter container. That container includes five skids of course and fine sand that really helps with the removal and the separation of the solids that we were struggling with in the early adaption of our system. Moving around to the left-hand side, we go into a pretreatment structure and control panel. That's where our electric is received. This is where we filter the next part of the processed water through bags. Once it leaves the bag filtration, it goes through the internal piping into our two treatment containers, and those containers are what hold our media, both carbon and resin. Next slide, please.

A more thorough skeleton shot of the system, if you will. The pump is in the upper left corner. The raw water is taken in. It goes into an acid addition, the biocontrol portion of our system, goes through a separator, and then down through the sand filtration within the
container. That water's moved over into the pretreatment container where our bag filter housing is. Once it's gone through bag filtration, we get into our media treatment. And you can see how each container is aligned with two trains each, with carbon-resin-resin. Next slide, please.

So a couple reminders of timelines since the last meeting. We commissioned the system in July. We started up with all new media. We put in new resin and new carbon, along with all new sands and our bag filtration system. The system was started on 13 July.

And we're going to look at -- next slide, please -- we're going to look at a window of data from 13 July to 15 September, roughly 65 days of operation. Of those 65 days, 50 of those days, we were successful in maintaining the pond drawdown, or the water being below the weir elevation and providing no bypass into Silver Stream. This accounted for
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21 million gallons of Rec Pond water being treated and released as clean water down into Silver Stream. The levels of our PFOS and PFOA effluent were at 5 parts per trillion or lower, and predominantly in the non-detect situation. Next slide.

This is a chart, probably a little bit easier to look at. On the left-hand side, you can see our influent levels of PFOS/PFOA as they come in from the raw pond water, and as they've gone through our complete pretreatment and final media treatment. And these are the results in the effluent level on the right. Next slide, please.

Four events occurred during that period of performance where rain events were the significant factor in why we didn't maintain the drawdown. You can see a very steep spike in letter A. Some of you will remember the topical storm that came through the Newburgh area. That's what that is a function of. We
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also lost some power in the entire community for up to 55 hours, and that was a big part of taking some time to get it drawn back down. But as you go across the board, the B event was just over a half inch or right at a half inch, so just crested over the weir. We recaptured that and continued with the drawdown -- as well as events C and D were over the one-half-inch threshold that we're monitoring, and it took just 24 to 48 hours to recapture in some of those events. Next slide, please.

For our comparison, you would look at the left-hand side photo. This is a typical working scenario for us during drawdown. This would be about a 1-foot drawdown at the entire elevation of the pond water with no discharge, where the right-hand side would be a rain event exceeding a half inch, and, you know, regaining the elevation that we had captured in drawdown and overtopping the weir. Next slide.
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This is a more dramatic look at typical drawdown on the left, and significant rainfall, in the neighborhood of 2 to 4 inches of rainfall in a 24-hour period. You can see how the entire Rec Pond area is flooded. And this is a storm when we were seeing in excess of 100,000 gallons per minute going over the weir. Next slide, please.

Some of the operational challenges, we wanted to give you a couple pictures, because we had mentioned our efforts during the summer to combat algae and pond weed growth at Rec Pond. On the left-hand side, if your picture is tuned in, you can see the very green layer of algae growth at the subsurface level. That's an impact for us in both sediment intake and biofouling. As well as on the right-hand side, you can see the pond weed growth. This is early in the summer. We didn't have a problem at our intake pump, but we were managing that and considering some options to remove
the pond weed. But we were able to work around that. Next slide, please.

Total organic compound continues to be one of the water quality indicators that we can look at, along with turbidity, on a daily basis, where we can do our very best to combat that through our prefiltration. This is where we made some strides in getting this number down to an acceptable level. When it first started up, we were well impacted by the TOC in our resin material. So we are concentrating on that on a regular basis. You can take a look at what the average is as it comes down. I think it's important to note that, at the GAC, which is your carbon, it takes about 50% of that TOC number down, and that's pretty significant, because we want to get it down to below 2 to protect that resin, which is your ultimate polisher for the PFOS/PFOA. Next slide, please.

Another visual graph. Turbidity. We talked about that. You can see, the
blue is your influent turbidity. That's your raw water, what we're measuring as we pump it into our system. And then the turbidity as it goes through our filtration system is the lower brown bar. Next slide.

We talked about turbidity and its units of measure last time. During Phase 1, which was -- we had a smaller scale system that we were provided the opportunity -- our turbidity was averaging about 3.4 NTUs. In Phase 2, which was the summer, which would contribute to the algae growth and the other biogrowth in the pond that we saw in the photos, it was up to three times higher. So, you know, really, a big part of our filtration is to manage that sediment and NTU level. It requires us to do constant maintenance and controlling of the system through backwashing. Next slide, please.

So biofouling control is the accumulation of micro-organisms on wetted
surfaces. We address two options for chemical additions to be considered to address biofouling. An algicide was considered early in the summer. It's an in-pond application that would have killed the weeds and algae that you saw in the photos. Through working with our stakeholders, the land owners, and yourselves, we considered to use other options. We did not go forward with an in-pond application of an algicide. What we did do was work closely with DEC to apply a 15% peracetic acid at a regulated rate of about 0.75 gallons per day when we're operating at 500 GPM. That application is being monitored. The low dose isn't eliminating the biofouling, but we're continuing to monitor to see if there's an effect from that low of a dose. Next slide.

Here's a quick look at the inside of a sand filter. This is a typical sand filter skid. When I say skid, you have two vessels side by side. The metering
pump is the small pump that pulls from a 5-gallon storage can and applies the peracetic acid in a regulated dose. Next slide.

Sand filters have been really a big step forward for us. We equipped the skids inside of the new container. When we run the system, your downflow regime is top to bottom, so the water's coming in through the top of your vessels. The sands are knocking down the sedimentation. Part of our operational maintenance for those sand filters are backwashing, where we reverse the flow. That flow goes back up through the column of sand and takes out the sediment. We divert that back through a discharge line. And during this phase, we've been really mindful of our backwashing. We've actually automated the system, and it is operated at any of our variable flow rates, and we're doing backwashes on those sands three to four times per day. Next slide.
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A real quick, you know, what is that? It is biofouling that is inside our sand vessel containers. It usually comes in more as a microscopic smaller egg, if you will, but we'll see live growth inside of our vessels. So is the dosing working to kill it? No. Is our system being shut down because of it? No. We're still running. The filtration is working. We're focused on the sedimentation. We continue to monitor the biogrowth that happens within our system, but we're operating and dealing with it through filtration. Next slide.

The bag filters is another part of our step process for filtration. We have a primary bag filter and a secondary bag filter with two individual setups. We alternate different cloth materials with different micron sizes to maintain good filtration, but also maintain our pressure buildup, allowing our system to run. During the heaviest of growth and sedimentation in the summer, we used a
combination of 10-micron bags and a
25-micron bag in the lead position. Next
slide.

This is kind of a photo of what's
going on inside the bag filtration. On
the left-hand side, those are the steel
cylinders that fit in the center photo.
Within those steel cylinders are cloth
bag filters. You can see how we pick up
both sedimentation and live growth.
Those are organisms that are getting into
and being taken out by our bag filters.
You can also notice in the center photo
that we've got a pretty significant green
tint from the algae. I think these were
taken in, like, August. Next slide.

Treatment trains, of course, is the
final phase of treatment. Pressure is
monitored to confirm when we need
maintenance. Solids are accumulating in
the vessels, but we are able to utilize a
backwashing system, much like our sand
filters -- you know, carbon vessels.
When we start off with new media, we
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slowly go into it, but as the system runs 24/7, we're now in two to three times a week to maintain these carbon vessels. We don't backwash the resin. We try not to. It's not recommended. So it's really important that the carbon -- you know, it's a big, heavy lifter, you know, it takes the load of all our sedimentation, and we'll do most of our backwashing through our carbon vessels.

Next slide.

So the results from some of our resin samples and our effluent samples taken during late September triggered us in our mitigation plan where the media change is put into play when we're at our 35 parts per trillion breakthrough at our lead or center vessels. So we saw that in early September. By September 10th, we confirmed it through validating the data. We quickly moved into action to start scheduling media changes. And it's done with a primary resin vessel being replaced. I'm going to show you on the
diagram, but what we want to take away from this in the September media change was, we saw how effective the carbon is in reducing our TOCs and protecting, ultimately protecting, our resin. So we wanted to incorporate more carbon to address the organics in the water. We didn't want to rely on chemicals. So we're using that now going forward.

We're piloting two vessels of carbon with a polishing of resin to be a more effective removal of the PFOS and PFOA.

Next slide, please.

So here's what we've done. We've highlighted it in a bar. We realized that the resin was not an effective media as the majority media to deal with all of the turbidity, the TOCs, and the solids loading in our system. So we replaced that second vessel with more carbon, and that's taking the load of both PFOS removal, organic removal, sedimentation collection, and ultimately protecting that resin vessel, which is your real
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polisher in knocking down your PFOS/PFOA discharge. Next slide, please.

So we've been moving beyond since September 15th. You know, we're still -- a month later, we're still effectively pumping. The system is still averaging right around the same, over 75% of drawdown during the period. We did experience some more rain events. We continue to monitor our chemical issue with our peracetic acid. We're evaluating now the performance of our two carbon vessels substituting the primary resin. We find that it gives us a much more maintenance-friendly approach to protecting, ultimately, the final resin media, and we continue to optimize the system with what we're learning now that we're operating on a regular basis.

I think that's it for my slides. We can take any questions.

MR. WILLIAM FETTER:

This is Bill Fetter. Can I ask a few questions?
MR. DOUG CLOSE:

Sure.

MR. WILLIAM FETTER:

Does the pond have capacity where the spillway could be battered to increase the capacity of the pond, or is the integrity not known? Could you increase the capacity of the pond to hold some more rainwater, more than a half an inch?

MR. DOUG CLOSE:

We looked at that originally, and I think you probably stated it best. The integrity of that berm and how the weir's constructed, it's not constructed as a dam.

MR. WILLIAM FETTER:

Understood. What is the fate of the backwash when you wash the different components?

MR. DOUG CLOSE:

If you reference the early diagram, it goes back into the pond behind the turbidity barrier.
MR. WILLIAM FETTER:

So you're just kind of -- well, it's less waste. Any schedule of scaling up a little bit, or are you kind of refining this first before you move on?

MR. DOUG CLOSE:

We really like the opportunity we've been given to refine this. You heard me talk about the shift to go to the carbon. It's for, you know, heavy on allowing us to deal with the sediment. The sediment is the real challenge down at Rec Pond --

MR. WILLIAM FETTER:

Understood. Understood.

MR. DOUG CLOSE:

-- the velocity, the discharge from the outfall or algae growing, it's a shallow pond and it doesn't take much to bring it --

MR. WILLIAM FETTER:

Turn it over, yeah. Is there a date in mind to think about scaling up? What's your target now to evaluate what
you're doing?

MR. DOUG CLOSE:

Well, some of that might be out of my pay grade, but we'll be running the system for Stewart and the ANG through the year, until September. Things that happen between now and then, that would be for some others to maybe address.

MR. WILLIAM FETTER:

Thank you.

MR. DOUG CLOSE:

You're welcome.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

I believe there is a question from John Clarke.

MR. JOHN CLARKE:

Thank you. Did you do any short-chain polychlorinated compound testing before and after filtration?

MR. DOUG CLOSE:

No.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

And then are there any other RAC members, since we have a few moments
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left, with additional questions?

MR. DOUG CLOSE:

I'm looking at my notes, and I think it was Bill that asked the question, the last question. Short-chain PFAS compounds were sampled, both before and after filtration.

MR. JOHN CLARKE:

Thanks. That was John.

MR. DOUG CLOSE:

Sorry, John.

MR. JOHN CLARKE:

Is the filtration as successful for the short-chain as for the long?

MR. DOUG CLOSE:

As far as our working parameters, yes.

MR. JOHN CLARKE:

The question came to my mind when you showed the before and after graphs, and I just -- I mean, obviously, you have the chemicals that you tested for specifically, but I wasn't sure what specifically was being represented there,
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if the short ones were or just the PFOA and PFOS.

MS. JESSICA FREHSE:

Douglas, I can talk to that. I think in the graph, we just specifically mention PFOA and PFOS. But we are following the EPA modified method 537.1 as required by the New York DEC.

MS. MARY WAGNER:

Would you be able to point us to -- in the final report, is there an appendix that includes a list of those, the PFAS that were tested for? That's great to hear it took out short-chain as well.

MS. JESSICA FREHSE:

So for the interim stormwater treatment system, we don't have a final report quite yet, and we won't until after we're finished with the entire project. So we have been seeing interim tech memos that do have sample results. I want to say that the last one was tech memo 2. Douglas, you can jump in if I'm incorrect. But that has all of the data
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and all of the method, up through the pilot study. We're still working on the start-up memo that we will be releasing.

MS. MARY WAGNER:

Got it. Thank you.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

It does look like our time is up for the five minutes of questions. Some of you are adding questions into our question module, so please continue to add those so that we can address them during the public comment period at the end. So we will kind of move on, because I definitely want to make sure we have enough time for our RAC open discussion.

We just got the slides from our community members today. Thank you guys for putting this all together. I know it was a lot of work. If we can switch over to that presentation now. I will turn it over to Chuck, Mary, Bill, and John, who I believe will be our presenters tonight.

So thank you.

MR. JOHN CLARKE:
Hello. Good evening. My name is John Clarke. I am grateful to be able to participate in this effort. As part of how I view my responsibility as a community member, I have been trying to understand what the process is, what the problem is, and I've been trying to come up with better questions and a better way to represent what I've learned to the communities that I, I guess, intersect with. I'm not a representative of sorts, but I'm an active member in the community. So I attempted to make some visual tools to share that, and to come up with some language that can make sense to a non-technical vocabulary person. So not to make light of the situation or belittle it, but just to try to make it understandable. Next slide, please.

So the magic number. What magic number are we applying to our communities? In reading through the site investigation, the expanded site investigation, there are a lot of numbers
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and technical terms that are thrown at us. I'm more of a visual person and understand that we need to use language that is more recognizable. I can't come up with a better term than the magic number.

So the United States EPA defines the maximum contamination level on their web page. They also assigned a maximum contamination level goal. The MCL, or the magic number, is what's enforceable according to the United States EPA. Our state has just recently passed legislation to make that magic number 10 parts per trillion. And there are many references in the extended site investigation that reference, like, an SL. I don't quite remember what SL -- sample limit or something, sample level.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Screening level.

MR. JOHN CLARKE:

Screening level. Thank you. It's kind of, nevertheless, a magic number to
most people. We don't really understand until we really dig in and wrestle with the terminology. None of us will spend as much time as the professionals who are involved with this.

So it's not really clear that the magic number is related to medical studies. And there have been some very large-scale medical studies associated with PFAS. And the EPA says that the goals are -- or the MCLs are set as close to the goals as feasible using the best available treatment technology and taking cost into consideration. So that doesn't sound like it is strictly related to personal health or effects on health. And it drives the question, what is the cost consideration for polluting my body or another member of our community's body? And I recognize that there's not necessarily a specific answer, and that sometimes our hands are tied based on regulation or litigation as to how we can process this. But my hope is that we can
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capture some of our learning in the
slides and continue to present them to
possibly communicate who the responsible
organizations are, who makes the
decisions, and what the limits are, in an
understandable way.

So one of the outstanding questions
in my head after reading the expanded
site investigation was, what magic number
is going to be the deciding factor for a
migration pathway for a receptor? Is it
just drinking water? It's not clear.
And I hope as it becomes clearer, I can
continue to share that information. Next
slide, please.

So Orange County has created
several useful maps. And so, just taking
snips off of their maps, I created this
graphic, this info graphic here that
shows the approximate location of the
Base and where the spill or the use of
the chemicals have happened. And the red
lines represent the waterways, those
migration pathways on the surface. They
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don't represent groundwater. But this kind of shows the extent of what I am aware of, and I'm hoping to continue to improve these so that we capture what we do know. I'm really not aware of what, if anything, is affected north of the Base. I know that some levels have been detected. Next slide, please.

So those migration pathways, they typically look like surface water and groundwater, and both are recognized in the site investigation. And a receptor is like the receptacle. It's where the chemicals seem to be accumulated, and I believe specifically drinking water is an emphasis. We were shown levels in Lake Washington, Browns Pond, the Kroll Well, the Butterhill Wells in New Windsor, and there is a reference to private wells in the Beaver Dam Lake area. These are all drinking water. But what hasn't really been addressed or acknowledged is the food chain that the chemicals are going into, and eventually, we will all become
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receptors of the chemicals in our
environment. So this graphic is an
attempt to represent the places that we
know of that are of concern, and that
it's not just a Lake Washington and City
of Newburgh concern, but this is a
concern of multiple communities around
us. And a lot of people in the community
feel that this is being minimized by
saying it's just a City of Newburgh
problem because it's only our water
source that is affected by it. So next
slide, please.

So what criteria and where? Again,
back to the magic number. And this is
kind of what I was describing earlier,
what is the magic number for all of the
different aspects? There was language as
to say there's some insignificant
contributors without any reference to how
they determined significance. One well
along the entire, I guess, shore of Lake
Washington doesn't quite represent the
groundwater contribution to the lake.
And there is a specific calculation done in the expanded site investigation that shows a flux of chemical through the groundwater into the lake, a contribution, and I feel it can be done similarly to Lake Washington. We also -- we don't hear much about short-chain chemicals, and we know that polyfluorinated organic compounds, carbon chain chemicals, will accumulate in our bodies. Next slide, please.

Big question is, who's paying? Who's going to pay for the clean water? This is specifically about utility cost and cost to the community members and cost to the state, cost to our municipality. Who pays for the cleanup? There was some question about the National Defense Authorization Act and the different acronyms that are thrown out there for government spending or memos and such. It's kind of not intelligible to people unless they're really involved. And we'd like to be
able to just say, these people are paying for it -- or these people are not paying for it because it hasn't been approved by a legislative body. And we would just like to help make that clear so that people can appeal to the right folks to try to make this a priority.

The last one there: Who pays for poor health? There's a lot of different ways you can represent that question. Most of the folks who are affected would say that they are paying for it with poor health. Next slide. And I will pass it off to Mary.

MS. MARY WAGNER:

Thank you, John. That was a great overview. And what John was alluding to is, we are in this -- we're obviously not the only community with this type of PFAS pollution. I know Jack or Bill can probably share the number of sites across the country that are dealing with this. But we are fighting for a limited pool of funds. Ideally, all communities that
have contaminated drinking water would be cleaned up. But we want to know how we will be scored, and this is the relative risk site evaluation strategy or scoring process that was mentioned before. So Nicole, it was great to hear that we wouldn't be penalized for having a temporary clean water source. Yes, so it looks like you did answer that question. And I welcome any other RAC community members to step in as well.

I know I have limited time, so I just want to make a note that these slides are available on our website, NewburghCleanWaterProject.org, under the RAC tab. Next slide, please. Thank you.

So these are different sample ranking sheets. And as you can see in the lower left, this groundwater worksheet you see in the orange, the migration pathway and the receptor factors, so those are some of the things that we will be scored on that John was illustrating in his maps. Next slide,
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please.

So here, for those new to the situation, this is kind of a real bird's-eye view of the different spills that we've had over the few decades starting in 1990. You'll see in the right lower, 4,000 gallons from the Air Base, and then we also have spills from the airport as well, as well as testing areas and a fire. Next slide, please.

So the DEC, the regulatory -- the Department of Environmental Conservation, the regulatory body, did determine that the Air Base was the primary source of the pollution in our water. Next slide, please.

And this shows you, if you see in the yellow, we have the airport and Air Base, Stewart Air National Guard Air Base, SANG. This is a topographical map. This is the highest point of our land. So these two pollution sources, the contaminants run down the hill from there. And as you can see, that's where
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Washington Lake is, towards the bottom, and then Browns Pond towards the very bottom of the screen. That's our backup reservoir. For all Newburgh residents on the call, we do have clean water right now coming through Catskill aqueduct. Again, this is a temporary water source that New York State actually pays for -- or our city pays first and then the state, you know, reimburses us. So there is some concern there. We all know with COVID, the state's budget is very impacted. How long will our access to that water supply last? So that's our sense of urgency right now. We need a working interim filter system that works above a half an inch rainfall event.

And, you know, we do have -- our city does have a water -- a granular activated carbon filtration system. Unfortunately, it doesn't take out all those short-chain PFAS chemicals that John was asking about and speaking to. Next slide, please.

These are Orange County maps.
These are more snapshots. As you can see, the soil and water contamination, the highlighted yellow areas, so on the left, these are for PFOS, the main contaminant we've been looking at. PFOS is one of 5,000 PFAS chemicals. We know of 12 that have entered into our drinking water -- into Washington Lake, our reservoir. So you can see that's -- the lower left, 5,620 parts per trillion, and that is for -- soil is on the left, and then on the right is water -- you know, different outfalls with the levels of PFOS contamination in the water. So from the DEC report, the Rec Pond sediment -- so Rec Pond is the body of water that's in our watershed. Our water comes through that and flows through various bodies into Washington Lake. And sediment samples there range from 2,140 parts per trillion to 424,000 parts per trillion. So it's significant. Next slide, please.

And then we also have to look at
what other sources of pollution there are. Right now, the Port Authority is not at the table, but as you can see, and I think this might have been related to the spill, but in the lower left, again, the highlighted number, that's almost 2 million parts per trillion of PFOS. Correct me, anybody, if I'm reading these numbers wrong. Next slide, please.

Body contamination. What are we talking about? So the New York Department of Health, in their first round of bio-monitoring, we had almost 4,000 people tested. Of those participants, the people who were on the City of Newburgh water, so presumably Newburgh residents, 1,917 people were tested. And we don't know how long, necessarily, they'd been living in the city and exposed to the chemical, but as you can see here, those people, their rates, the accumulation in their body of these three contaminants is higher than the national average. So PFOA is two
times higher; PFOS is three times. And this one that we haven't heard much about, PFHxS, was seven times. Next slide, please.

And then if we dig in a little bit more to that, we can see that, of those nearly 2,000 people -- so our national average is 5.20 and 18.5. Sorry, this is a little dense. If you go to the next slide, I can show you the numbers. So 91% of our city residents tested above the national average for the 50th percentile of PFOS. 53% of our city residents were very high, so they were in the 95th percentile, 53% above national average. Next slide, please.

So we have just one minute left. I want to -- many of you may be familiar with these health risks, and you can learn more on our website, but they're obviously very concerning. This is on top of residents that have already been -- our city water department is doing a great job. As you know, our city
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is old and it has lead service pipes as well, so people have been exposed to lead, PFAS, and PCPs in the river. So this is an environmental justice community, and obviously, our site needs to be made a priority for cleanup. Next slide, please.

This is a testimonial from Cynthia Mack, who is a former RAC member and works in the school system. Her own son died of cancer. She lived across from the Air Base. Another child there has come down with a rare cancer. And she's testified that countless students are currently battling childhood cancer, and others are experiencing neurological and immune deficiency, so this needs to be looked at. Next slide, please.

I'm going to stop there. You can find our slides, again, on our website. I just want to pass it over to Bill. Thanks for your time.

MR. WILLIAM FETTER:

Hi, everyone. Can you hear me?
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Can everyone hear me out there?

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

We can, Bill. And I just wanted to say really quick, I want to give you the time to talk about your slides, but if you can be as brief as possible so that we can move onto the next section, I would appreciate it.

MR. WILLIAM FETTER:

We don't need to talk through the slides. People can look at them on their own. The technical comments have been submitted. So just a couple of expanded questions. Don't worry about the slides at this point, really. People can read it at their -- they're more technical than informative, I think.

A couple of things, though. In the long-term monitoring report in section 4, you talk about how particular components have affected groundwater quality. I think that should be a little more clear, and say negatively impacted at a minimum, if not worse. I think it's a little too
buffered to say affected, which, you know, is in your purview. But back to section 3.6 and some of the graphs. Looking at long-term monitoring MDLs, you change mid stream -- or somebody did -- mid course, on the MDLs for certain parameters. The MDLs were raised. I was wondering why you would change methods if we're looking for these compounds and you're going to what appears to be a less sensitive analytical type. I don't know if you have an answer to that at this point or not. I'm sorry I didn't note the graph. I've been working my way through these things for a couple of days.

Back over to the landfill -- not the landfill, but the airport. During the camera work that you did, thousands of feet you said that were done, was there a reason not to chase suspect drainage in the dry weather when you said you were having -- you detected wet flow in dry weather conditions? It doesn't
look like any laterals were chased down during the camera work based on the graph that was provided in the report. It looks like you just did the perimeter around the apron, with the many spots that are sagging and open. That's pretty good to see. I'll stop any time anybody wants to have some input here, or if you want to wait until it's all done.

There's an analysis in loading leaving the detention pond, Rec Pond. I think you use 400 grams per minute -- and Kerry, correct if me if I'm wrong here, I don't want to carry this too far -- of PFOS/PFOA going over the spillway, I guess. 400 -- 400, yeah, I think it was grams per minute. I'm hoping it's not gallons per minute now. No, it had to be grams per minute. That translates into 1,200 pounds a day. I don't know if that was just a model that you ran, or if that's based on actual numbers, results. If there's 1,200 pounds a day spilling over that dam, that has to be found
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pretty quick. And if I'm wrong, you need
to correct me right now so it doesn't go
any further. With that, I think I've
said too much. That's all. Thank you.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Thanks, Bill. Really quick, Kerry,
I don't know if you were paying attention
to that last question about if it was
grams or gallons going over the weir. Do
you have a quick answer for that?

MR. KERRY TULL:

That sounds odd, on the high side,
as Bill suspected. If Nicole and I read
that -- we would certainly want to see
any of these questions, they're very good
and relevant questions, Bill, but we'd
like to see those via email or however
you could convey them.

I will quickly answer your question
regarding the method detection limit. No
one chose the method detection limit.
The method detection limit is set up in
the laboratory for the instrument. The
method detection limit is below the
actual reporting level of the detection limit, which again is well below the standard set by the state or government entity. So the method detection limit -- again, I'm not a chemist, I'm not a lab person -- but the basic cursory setup is to set up an MDL that will then in turn give the laboratory the ability to see whether or not it's below or above the reporting limit, which again is well below the standard that they're working with.

MR. WILLIAM FETTER:

I didn't get a chance to look at the actual lab reports to see that, if methods were changed. I thought that perhaps the less expensive method was employed to save money for other efforts.

MR. KERRY TULL:

No, no. The method --

MR. WILLIAM FETTER:

Same method for twenty years.

MR. KERRY TULL:

Right, yes. So the method is
agreed upon in the plan, in the sampling and analytical plan, which is reviewed by the state, which everybody signs off and agrees to. There is no variation there.

MR. WILLIAM FETTER:

Understood. Thank you. I think the rest of my comments and questions are clear in the paperwork. Thanks.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

I would like at this point to move on to our public question and comment period so that we have those 20 minutes to address those. Again, if you would please submit those questions into the question module, we will address as many as we can get to tonight. If we can't address all of the questions, we will be downloading them and responding to the questions in written form after the meeting. There will also be an opportunity -- we'll put the slide up in a minute. If there are questions that come up after the meeting, Mary has been so wonderful to collect those for the RAC
and submit them to us. Hopefully, she'll be willing to do that again for this meeting. We really appreciate it. So please continue sending those questions.

First up, Anthony Grice, I want you to know that we did not lose track of your question. You will be the first one up. Your question is: Does that mean that Washington Lake will be back on the list for remediation for next year? I think, Nicole, that question is for you or Keith.

MS. NICOLE WIREMAN:

I'll take that. Again, I'm uncertain by the question. Remediating Washington Lake itself would not be up. Again, the process to address the contamination and clean up the contamination is further down the road as we work through the CERCLA process through the remedial investigation and the feasibility study. What I believe where that question may be coming from is because it came in, I think, right after
I was talking about that slide we had regarding the remedial investigation and when that will happen. And again, I want to say that the purpose of that slide was to say that the RRSE process considers the original drinking water source, and therefore, the community is not penalized for choosing an alternative source. But our evaluations of RRSE are ongoing. The Air National Guard is using this process to assess all of our installations where SIs have been completed for PFOS and PFOA. And as we develop information, we will be able to share it with you. But at this time, we cannot say which installations will have RIs executed in FY21.

Thank you, Nicole. And Councilman Grice, I have unmuted you. Do you have any other questions related to that?

So that was part of it. It was really based on that article, because,
you know, if there was an opportunity for Washington -- well, not Washington Lake -- for Rec Pond to be remediated, that would be preferable, especially if it was next year. While we do understand that there is a process to it, that one gave us some immediate concern. And so, you know, I think that John and Mary really spoke well to this sense of urgency that we have for Washington Lake -- and not just for Washington Lake, but for the whole surrounding area. So that was that.

And then my other question, while I have the microphone, was on the interim filter that's at Rec Pond. Why is that interim? If it seems to be working fairly decently, you know, or better than the first one, why can't that just keep continuing?

MR. ROBERT SUBASAVAGE:

I'll take that one. So it's interim, so it was put in before the site inspection was complete, obviously before
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the remedial investigation. So it's not the ultimate solution for cleaning up PFAS at Stewart Air National Guard Base. It's an interim solution to kind of hold us over to do something to mitigate PFAS impacts for a point in time. As it's been discussed, it's not capturing everything. So that's why it's an interim solution until a more well-developed full-blown solution can be implemented. Does that help?

MR. ANTHONY GRICE:
Yes.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:
Thank you. At this point, I would like to move on and make sure we get to some other questions. In the question module, the next one is from Rick Shoyer. Could the Air National Guard please provide historical trend graphs for the groundwater compounds of concern reported above limits and the landfill gas concentrations for Site 3?

MS. NICOLE WIREMAN:
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So Kerry, correct me if I'm wrong on that, but I know there are those types of historical graphs in the long-term monitoring report that go all the way back to when long-term monitoring began. And so Kerry, do those graphs speak to this question?

MR. KERRY TULL:

The graphs, or any of that background info, we'd have to pull together. I don't have that readily available. But yes, you're correct, Nicole.

MS. NICOLE WIREMAN:

So they're in the report that's currently being reviewed by the RAC members. Okay. And that gives me an opportunity, by the way, that one comment I had wanted to say earlier was that we did receive RAC member comments. Bill, thank you very much for your extensive comments on the Site 3 LTM report. We received those on the 19th of October and we have prepared responses to those
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comments. However, the comment period is until -- for stakeholders like RAC members -- until the 30th, and we were not sure if that was the complete set of RAC comments on the Site 3 report. I think the way it came in, it said, personal comments with your name. And so we will -- you know, after the 30th, we will be responding with written responses, and it will cover all of the questions, Bill, that you have already submitted. And for those that are wondering in the future, we always put our responses to comments in an appendix in the back of the final report. That's what I was referring to earlier on the expanded SI report. So we will respond back to the RAC on those specifically, but then they will get included into the report that is available to the public.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Thank you. Our next question is also from Rick Shoyer. He says: New York State DEC, in October of 2020,
provided their updated PFAS guidelines. The guidelines require the analysis of 21 PFAS compounds. The presentation only discusses PFOS/PFOA. Will the Air National Guard comply with New York DEC's updated guidelines for reporting 21 PFAS compounds? I think it was a little bit addressed. I don't know if Nicole, Jessica, or anybody else wanted -- maybe Robert wanted to comment on that?

MS. NICOLE WIREMAN:

Sure. I'll address that. So we will be following DoD guidance as far as the analytical methods that are used, so 537.1 modified, and the number of associated analytes with that. So when the remedial investigation starts, we will be following that policy.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Thank you. Also from Rick Shoyer: Carbon is effective for PFOA and PFOS, but much less effective for short-chain PFAS. The use of carbon for a second vessel replacing one resin will be
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misleading to the public. Please provide a full list of PFAS compounds analyzed. Does anyone want to comment on that?

MS. JESSICA FREHSE:

So this is Jessica Frehse. I think, going through the entire full list on this call would be a little much. We can provide that in writing when we respond to questions. You can Google the EPA 537.1 method, or look at our tech memos and see the full list of analytes there.

MR. ROBERT SUBASAVAGE:

I'd like to follow up on that as well. It is worth pointing out that there was a carbon-resin-resin, now there's carbon-carbon-resin. So you still have the resin in place as the polishing round, stripping out the short-chain PFAS. So there still is a resin in place.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Thank you, Robert. Then we have quite a few questions coming in from Gina
Calderon. And one is about the location of the administrative record. Gretchen, who's running our slides, I'm going to ask you to go back to that administrative record slide. That slide at the very top does provide the location of the administrative record. So we will put that up on the screen for you, Gina. It might take a few minutes, so give us time, and we'll move on to your next question. What will the final trigger level be for changing filter media -- it's currently 35 parts per trillion -- given that New York State has set maximum levels at 10 parts per trillion?

MR. ROBERT SUBASAVAGE:

I'll take that. Currently, the trigger level for media change-out is going to be at 35 parts per trillion, but that's in between the GAC and the resin. And that, obviously, goes through the resin as well. So for us, the change-out will continue to be 35, but the effluent, as we've seen, has been pretty much below
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5 parts per trillion the entire time.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Thank you. The next question, I believe it's from Tamsin Hollo. What will the final trigger level be for changing filter media -- currently 35 parts per trillion -- given that -- I think we just covered that. Sorry. Karen Johnson. Beaver Dam has tributaries coming directly from Moodna Creek, and the lake has a very high level of phosphorus, and in the deep sections of the lake, there is an issue with oxygenation. What is being done about the pollutants still coming into our lake?

MS. NICOLE WIREMAN:

At this time, in the site inspection and the expanded site inspection, we have been focusing on Lake Washington because that is the drinking water source that Rec Pond feeds into from Silver Stream. We, in the remedial investigation, will be doing a full
nature and extent analysis to determine if there are other pathways that could be leading to the other drinking water sources that are being mentioned. But I want to make clear that that is only if we determine that there are ANG mission-related activities that led to that contamination. So we've talked before about how this is a national problem and there are multiple sources of PFAS contamination. The purpose of our remedial investigation is to look at sources stemming from Stewart Air National Guard activity.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Thank you. And then our next question -- unfortunately, I'm sorry, I don't know who this is from. How is disposal of media, the sand, bag filters, carbon and resin being managed and disposed?

MR. ROBERT SUBASAVAGE:

Got it. So I'll take it. Right now, as far as the sand, you know, the
sand is being reused. Bag filters, I'll defer that one to Doug. And then spent media, so carbon and the spent resin from the -- let's see, that was the end of -- or the beginning of September change-out. I believe that went for incineration. Can you confirm that, Doug?

MR. DOUG CLOSE:

The three primary waste streams, the bag filters, the carbon, the resin, are being sent to an incineration facility, Covanta. And we're using a location in the State of Indiana right now.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Thank you. Our next question is from Dan Shapley. Relative to testing of the interim stormwater system and the screening levels used in the expanded site inspection, can you explain the rationale for use of the modified EPA method 537? EPA method 537 includes 18 PFAS, whereas the modified method includes only 6 PFAS. EPA has other
validated methods, but can't effectively measure 29 PFAS, particularly when it comes to the efficacy of a filter and the fact that AFFF firefighting foams have included various formulations over time with multiple PFAS. It is important to measure the greatest possible number of PFAS.

MR. KERRY TULL:

This question arises frequently. What's going on in the commercial world versus what can go on in the world of the Department of Defense are two different things. The Navy, among others, leads the way for the Department of Defense for the administration and screening of new methods as they come out. Simply put, these new methods have not met all of the testing standards as required under DoD. They may eventually, but that's the reason that I was provided three months ago when this came up.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Thank you. So our next question --
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I think they're starting to get away from me a little bit. The treatment vessels installed by the City of Newburgh -- actually, I don't know if that is a question. Moving on. This one is from Tamsin Hollo. How transparent will the scoring process be? Will we be able to view our score or have input from our community? And for the record, I hate the idea of competing with other affected communities for resources to remediate our site and protect our residents.

MS. NICOLE WIREMAN:

I can answer that. I believe that she is talking about the relative risk site evaluation process, and that is something that we will eventually brief to the RAC as far as specifically how that was completed for Stewart. We cannot say at this time exactly when that will happen, but it will happen at a RAC meeting.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

This will be our last question.
Again, we will be downloading and responding to the additional questions in our module. So if you have any final questions, please get them in. Our last question is coming from Rick Shoyer. The New York State DEC October, 2020 PFAS guidance has 2 parts per trillion for water and 0.5 parts per billion for soil. Were these the reporting limits obtained by the laboratory?

MS. NICOLE WIREMAN:

I think maybe Doug needs to speak to that. I don't know the specific reporting limits.

MR. KERRY TULL:

No, I'm not aware of what Doug's working under right now. The reporting limits that we worked under, our work is that which is -- again, needs to match the EPA approved methodology.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Thanks, Kerry. Doug or Jessica, do you have anything to add? That wraps up our 20 minutes for our comments. Thank
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you again to everyone who came and
participated in tonight's meeting. As I
just mentioned, we will be downloading
the questions and providing written
responses. You can also reach out to
Mary and provide questions through, I
believe, November 15th for our questions
that can come in after the meeting. I
would like to open it back up to either
Col. Kelly or Col. Cook and to Chuck
Thomas if they would like to make any
closing comments before we end for the
evening.

COL. EDWARD COOK:

I just wanted to say thank you to
everyone for their participation and
their time this evening. I know there
are a lot of things going on that compete
for our valuable time, but this is
important to us as a community and
important to us as the 105th Airlift
Wing. We want to do everything we can to
continue to address it and push the issue
forward as best we can. Thank you all,
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and best wishes for a Happy Holidays.

Thank you.

MS. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

I will again remind everyone,
please insert your questions or send them
to Mary. Again, I would like to welcome
our two new RAC members who will be
starting in February at our first meeting
of the New Year. Again, that will be in
February, 2021. And then I would like to
thank all of our members for their
service here. And for outgoing members,
we really, again, appreciate your time
and comments. I thank everyone for being
with us and spending the time. Thank you
to Chuck for your service as our co-chair
for the year. Thank you to the RAC
community members for the presentation.
I think these are definitely topics that
we will be picking up, even at future
meetings. Again, we look forward to
receiving those comments on RAC's
long-term monitoring for Site 3. Any
other questions from the presentation
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	onight, please submit those along with your other questions so that we can make sure to respond to those questions. Have a good evening, and we'll see all of you, hopefully, in February.
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| **areas** | 91:13 |
| **arises** | 101:11 |
| **around** | 32:8; 35:24; 37:15; 48:8; 53:3; 61:8; 73:8; 85:6 |
| **arrived** | 6:5 |
| **arrow** | 34:12 |
| **article** | 31:10; 32:7; 33:20; 90:25 |
| **aspects** | 73:19 |
| **assess** | 90:12 |
| **assigned** | 69:10 |
| **associated** | 40:5; 70:10; 95:17 |
| **Association** | 22:21 |
| **assume** | 5:22 |
| **assuming** | 18:6 |
| **attempt** | 73:4 |
| **attempted** | 68:14 |
| **attention** | 24:18; 41:4; 86:8 |
| **attest** | 27:2 |
| **attributed** | 12:12; 13:2 |
| **audio** | 25:1 |
| **August** | 28:3; 58:17 |
| **Aura** | 3:9; 16:3 |
| **Authority** | 80:3 |
| **Authorization** | 74:20 |
| **automated** | 56:21 |
| **available** | 25:21; 70:14; 76:15; 93:13; 94:21 |
| **average** | 53:15; 80:25; 81:9; 13,17 |
| **averaging** | 54:13; 61:7 |
| **aware** | 72:4; 6; 103:17 |
| **away** | 4:4 |

| **B** |
| **back** | 20:20 |
| **beginning** | 35:6; 100:6 |
| **begun** | 7:24 |
| **behalf** | 4:3 |
| **behind** | 47:22; 62:24 |
| **become** | 72:25 |
| **becomes** | 71:14 |
| **becoming** | 93:6 |
| **begin** | 4:22 |
| **backwash** | 59:5; 62:20 |
| **backwashing** | 56:23 |
| **bag** | 48:13; 58:2 |
| **Balbuena** | 3:11; 18:22 |
| **Ballard** | 22:23 |
| **bar** | 25:8; 54:6; 60:16 |
| **barrier** | 62:25 |
| **Base** | 2:1; 17:5; 12:6; 10; 13,14; 30; 25; 34; 7; 13; 35; 9; 45; 12; 71; 22; 72; 8; 77; 9; 15, 20; 21; 82; 13; 92; 4 |
| **based** | 31:19; 44:19; 70:23; 85; 3; 23; 90:25 |
| **basic** | 87:7 |
| **basically** | 36:15 |
| **basis** | 41:20; 53:7; 14; 61; 20 |
| **battered** | 62:6 |
| **battling** | 82:16 |
| **bear** | 10:17 |
| **Beaver** | 22:20; 72:21; 98:10 |

<p>| <strong>C</strong> |
| <strong>calculation</strong> | 74:2 |
| <strong>Calderon</strong> | 97:2 |
| <strong>Caldwell</strong> | 3:18; 15:25 |
| <strong>calendars</strong> | 14:4 |
| <strong>call</strong> | 11:6; 7; 39:9; 43:3; 78:6; 96:8 |
| <strong>called</strong> | 25:13; 33:3; 43:3 |
| <strong>calls</strong> | 26:25 |
| <strong>came</strong> | 7:6; 50; 24; 65; 20; 89; 25; 94; 7; 101:23; 104:2 |
| <strong>camera</strong> | 84:20; 85:3 |
| <strong>can</strong> | 93:9 |
| 4:19; 22; 12:9; 11; 13:3; 14:24; 15:14; 20; 19:22; 20; 8; 12; 22; 17; 23:17; 24; 3:7; 21; 25:2; 19; 20:27; 2; 6; 13; 28:5; 24:30; 7; 33; 17:25; 38; 8; 12; 24; 39; 13; 24; 43:4; 44; 12; 15; 46; 15; 49; 65; 10; 11; 21; 52:6; 17:21; 53; 6; 7; 15:25; 56:3; 58; 10; 14; 61; 22; 24; 66; 5; 24; 65; 12; 20; 68; 16; 70; 24; 25; 71:14; 74; 67; 7; 5; 7; 11; 21; 76; 19; 77; 25; 79; 2; 10; 80; 4; 22; 81; 7; 11; 20; 82; 20; 25; 83; 2; 4; 7; 8; 12; 16; 88; 17; 92; 11; 96; 9; 10; 100; 8; 21; 101; 13; 102; 15; 104; 9; 23; 25; 106:3 |
| <strong>cancer</strong> | 82:12; 14; 16 |
| <strong>candidates</strong> | 21:13; 15; 18; 19; 22; 15; 18 |
| <strong>cap</strong> | 34:18; 35:16; 36:5; 44:25 |
| <strong>capability</strong> | 13:23 |
| <strong>capacity</strong> | 62:5; 7 |
| <strong>capped</strong> | 37:7 |
| <strong>captioning</strong> | 16:14 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>drawn</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drinking</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easier</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>east</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eastern-most</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>echoing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effect</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effective</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectively</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effects</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficacy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effluent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effort</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efforts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>egg</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eight</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>either</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electric</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elevated</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elevation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eliminating</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>else</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>email</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emails</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encourage</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ending</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enforceable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enjoyed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enough</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entered</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entering</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entire</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entirety</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43:8,13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equipped</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernestine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>especially</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>essentially</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluating</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evening</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>events</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>everybody</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>everyone</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:5,4,18,5:2,6,8,9;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,9,13,11,16,7,24;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,5,18,13,24,5;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,6,7,28,2,34,4;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,8,47,9,82,25;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83,2,104,2,17,105,5,15;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:25,12,12;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:19,102,21;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36,22;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45,21,23;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exceed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exceedingly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excess</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excited</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>executed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expanding</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expanded</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expected</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expected</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expedite</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expensive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiencing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extend</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extended</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extensive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extra</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,7;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36,22;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45,21,23;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face-to-face</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facility</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fact</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>factor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>factors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>failed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:13,17;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fairly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>familiar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>families</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>far</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fault</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>favor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>反馈</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,9,10,19,24;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55:2,10,9,19;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85:3;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81:19;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85:15,95:14,99:25;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102:19;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:13;38:4,65:17;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85:15,95:14,99:25;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102:19;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:13;38:4,65:17;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85:15,95:14,99:25;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102:19;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:13;38:4,65:17;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85:15,95:14,99:25;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102:19;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:13;38:4,65:17;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85:15,95:14,99:25;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102:19;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:13;38:4,65:17;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85:15,95:14,99:25;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102:19;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:13;38:4,65:17;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85:15,95:14,99:25;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102:19;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:13;38:4,65:17;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85:15,95:14,99:25;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102:19;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Jack (4)
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Jessica (7)
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jump (1)
66:24

June (1)
27:20

justice (1)
82:5

Justin (1)
4:6

K

Karen (1)
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keep (3)
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Keith (3)
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Kelly (6)
2:18;4;14,15;16;6;2,104;11
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Kevin (1)
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Nicole (21)
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30,000 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94:4,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59:18,97:14,20,24,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13:8,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Z</strong></td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52:5,83:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,000 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77:8,80:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85:13,17,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>424,000 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Z</strong></td>
<td>5 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50:5,98:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,000 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,620 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,820 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24:24,53:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Z</strong></td>
<td>9 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Z</strong></td>
<td>95th (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81:16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transcripción en esplañol
(Spanish Transcript)
COMITÉ CONSULTIVO DE RESTAURACIÓN
PARA
BASE DE LA GUARDIA NACIONAL DEL AIRE STEWART

Fecha: 28 de octubre de 2020
Comenzando a: 6:00 p.m.
Reportera de la Corte: Laura Evans

MINUTOS DE
REUNIÓN DE VIDEOCONFERENCIA

MARY T. BABIARZ COURT REPORTING SERVICE, INC.
(845) 471-2511
Bienvenidos a la reunión del Comité Consultivo de Restauración de la Stewart Air National Guard Base. Esta es nuestra cuarta reunión, octubre de 2020. Sé que todavía hay mucha gente iniciando sesión, pero tenemos una agenda llena esta noche, así que quiero seguir adelante y empezar las cosas.

Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Así que me gustaría comenzar con algunas de nuestras introducciones, y luego entraremos en nuestros comentarios iniciales.

Con la National Guard Bureau, tenemos a Robert Subasavage, Keith Friehofer y Nicole Wireman con nosotros esta noche. De la Stewart Air National Guard Base, tenemos al coronel Marc Kelly, al coronel Edward Cook, a Mike Oettinger y a la sargenta Sara Pastorello. Gracias a todos. Del U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, tenemos- Michelle Lordemann, en realidad no está con nosotros esta noche - pero tenemos Jessica Frehse, Kinjal Shah, y Stephen Kitt. Y luego, por supuesto, nuestros contratistas, BERS-Weston
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Services, con quienes estoy, así como Doug Close, que hablará más tarde hoy; y Kerry Tull de Wood. Así que gracias a todos por estar aquí. Siguiente diapositiva.

Nuestros miembros de RAC para esta noche, nuestros representantes de la comunidad, tenemos a Anthony Fern, Cassie Sklarz, John Clarke, Ramona Burton, Aura Lopez Zarate, Cynthia Mack, Carla Johnson, Edward Lawson, Laura Patricia García Balbuen y Robert Sanchez-Potter. Gracias, a todos por unirse a nosotros y participar como nuestros miembros de RAC.

Nuestros representantes de grupos comunitarios: Chuck Thomas, nuestro copresidente, con el Newburgh Conservation Advisory Council; Jack Caldwell, Quassaick Creek Watershed Alliance; Maná Jo Greene con Hudson River Sloop Clearwater; Mary Wagner con Newburgh Clean Water Project; y Victoria Leung con Riverkeeper.

Nuestros representantes gubernamentales son Anthony Grice con la
ciudad de Newburgh; Keith Miller con el Condado de Orange; y Patrick Hines en nombre de la ciudad de New Windsor. Y además, sé que vi a Justin Starr con el New York DEC, y sé que tenemos a otros representantes con nosotros esta noche, incluyendo al representante de la oficina del senador Schumer. Siguiente diapositiva.

Así que aquí está nuestra agenda para esta noche, y lo dejaré cuando empecemos con nuestros comentarios de apertura y nuestra bienvenida con el coronel Kelly y Chuck Thomas. ¿Coronel Kelly?

COL. MARC KELLY:

Gracias, Heather. Gracias a todos por iniciar sesión. Creo que tenemos hasta 73 personas. Es genial que podamos continuar nuestro impulso en este formato. Sé que todos preferiríamos estar en persona, pero hasta que COVID desaparezca y podamos empezar a reunirnos en grandes grupos, tendremos que seguir haciéndolo de esta manera. Así que aprecio la paciencia de todos. Sé que todos
en la comunidad y en el gobierno estarían más bien cara a cara, así que gracias por su paciencia.

Quería presentarle al coronel Ed Cook. He tenido el placer de estar en este puesto durante aproximadamente un año y medio ahora, y es mi turno de seguir adelante. El coronel Donnell, nuestro Wing Commander, ha nombrado al coronel Cook para que tome el cargo de representante principal de la Stewart Air National Guard Base. Ciertamente he disfrutado de mi año y medio en este puesto. He llegado a conocer a mucha gente, y quiero dar las gracias a todo el equipo de la Guard Bureau, a los contratistas, subcontratistas y a los líderes de la comunidad. Ha sido un placer conocerle. Todavía estaré en segundo plano y todavía probablemente reciba muchos correos electrónicos, pero a partir de este momento, el coronel Cook va a asumir mi puesto. Entonces Ed, ¿si quieres decir algunos comentarios?

COL. EDWARD COOK:

En primer lugar, me gustaría
agradecer públicamente al coronel Kelly por
todo su trabajo durante el último año y
medio. Lo he estado siguiendo activamente
durante el último año desde que llegué a
Stewart, de hecho antes de la primera reunión
de RAC el otoño pasado. Y espero trabajar
con todos virtualmente para seguir avanzando,
y también para conseguir que todos estén en
base tan pronto como el riesgo COVID
disminuya. Espero hacerlo en un futuro
próximo. No sólo conseguir que nuestros
miembros de la comunidad en base, pero
conseguir que nuestras familias vuelvan a la
Base sería un gran beneficio para todos
nosotros. Así que espero trabajar con usted,
y hablaremos pronto. Gracias.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

    Gracias, coronel Cook. Y ahora me
gustaría entregárselo a Chuck Thomas.

SR. CHUCK THOMAS:

    Muchas gracias. Marc, ya te voy a
extrañar. Cook, le damos la bienvenida. Me
alegra tenerte a bordo.

    Sólo tengo unas breves palabras que
decir aquí. Cuando iniciamos el proceso de
RAC para que los residentes de la ciudad de
Newburgh y las partes interesadas colaboraran
en un proceso de investigación y
restauración, llegamos con el objetivo de
asegurar una limpieza completa y oportuna
para nuestro depósito de agua y cuenca
hidrográfica circundante que sirve a más de
30.000 personas. Con este fin, quiero dar
las gracias a los miembros de la RAC y a
nuestros socios por este esfuerzo durante el
último año. Esta es la cuarta reunión
trimestral de este proceso, y mi última
reunión, también, como copresidente de su
comunidad. Trabajando juntos, hemos creado
una cultura de comunicación y colaboración.
Hemos elaborado procedimientos operativos que
permiten una mayor participación tanto en la
revisión como en la participación del
público. Los estudios se han llevado a cabo
para comprender mejor las fuentes de
contaminación y el movimiento de
contaminantes a través de la zona. Esto ha
comenzado a demostrar fuentes variadas e
inesperadas de contaminación, nuevas vías de migración y una mayor exposición. Es importante reconocer y entender. También es importante reconocer el resultado neto es que los contaminantes están entrando principalmente en nuestra fuente de agua potable, Washington Lake, y nuestras cuencas hidrográficas, como Silver Stream y Moodna Creek, a través de un lugar: Recreation Pond.

El invierno pasado, un sistema de filtrado de prueba fue colocado en Rec Pond, y casi inmediatamente falló debido a la obstrucción y el sistema se vio abrumado por las precipitaciones de la zona. Desde entonces, no ha habido un progreso aparente hacia la sustitución de ese sistema fallido por un sistema de reemplazo adecuado. Ahora nos acercamos a otro año sin que se realice el filtrado. ¿Por qué? No buscando la respuesta ahora, pero más bien señaló que este es algo que el complejo realmente se siente necesita para ser abordado. Esta agua sin filtrar está bloqueada para entrar en el Washington Lake, pero eso no ayuda a la
corrección del Washington Lake, que es
nuestro objetivo final.

Washington Lake fue creado en el 1800
como un sistema de agua robusto y activo para
toda la ciudad de Newburgh. En realidad, es
anterior al sistema de agua de la New York
City. ¿No es importante estar filtrando esta
agua ahora? El New York
State no podrá pagar la factura
indefinidamente por nuestro uso del agua
limpia del acueducto Catskill de la New York
City, que otras comunidades afectadas por el
PFAS ahora están aprovechando también.
Mientras tanto, no permitiremos que nuestra
comunidad, que ya ha sufrido con tres décadas
de intoxicación por PFAS, vuelva al
Washington Lake, sabiendo que nuestro sistema
de filtración actual no puede filtrar todos
los PFAS. Además, queremos evitar la
continua degradación de nuestros arroyos,
Moodna Creek y Silver Stream entre otros, que
desembocan en el río estadounidense, el
Hudson River, que sirve como agua potable
para siete comunidades más.
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Esto no es culpa de la buena gente en esta sala virtual, sino más bien un sistema que parece priorizar la economía sobre la salud y la seguridad. Hace cuatro años, los PFAS fueron identificados en nuestra agua potable. Hace cuatro años, el New York State DEC identificó el problema y recomendó una solución. Nuestra limpieza está siendo penalizada porque no estamos usando Washington Lake como nuestra fuente de agua potable. La prioridad que tenemos, y que teníamos, es nuestra salud y seguridad. Tenemos que llevar a cabo nuestras voces colectivas y poderosas para acelerar el proceso de limpieza, aprobar la financiación para las investigaciones correctivas y hacer avanzar la limpieza.

La ciudad de Newburgh no decidió, willy-nilly, el Washington Lake, sino que se vio obligada a dejar de suministrar agua potable contaminada a nuestros ciudadanos para su salud y seguridad. Ahora es el momento de alzar inmediatamente nuestras voces colectivas para financiar y comenzar la
remediaci\'on de Washington Lake, un sistema
de suministro de agua anterior al
venerable sistema de la New York City, y pido
a este cuerpo que dirija ese llamado a la
acci\'on.

Doy las gracias a todos y cada uno de
ustedes por su participaci\'on y espero que
este grupo avance para encontrar un mejor
sistema de agua para la ciudad de Newburgh.
Gracias.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Gracias, Chuck. S\'e que escucharemos
m\'as informaci\'on de ti un poco m\'as tarde.
Vamos a entrar en nuestro negocio de RAC para
esta noche.

Queri\'a señalar antes de seguir
adelante que he recibido la noticia de que un
representante de la oficina del senador
Gillibrand tambi\'en est\'a con nosotros esta
noche, y Wendy Kuehner New York State
Deparment of Health tambi\'en est\'a con
nosotros, junto con muchos otros
representantes de la ciudad de New Windsor,
de Newburgh, y otras agencias estatales. Asi
que gracias a todos ustedes por acompañarnos esta noche y participar en esta reunión.

Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Así que nuestras notas de reunión y directrices para esta noche, tenemos un representante aquí que está transcribiendo los procedimientos de la reunión. Así que de nuevo, si todo el mundo puede tratar de presentarse, recuerde presentarse, de esa manera, podemos tener los comentarios de todos atribuidos a la persona y la organización que representa si está hablando.

Esto es generalmente para nuestros presentadores y nuestros miembros de RAC. Todos los teléfonos están silenciados en este punto. Nos ayuda a mantener el nivel de ruido bajo durante la reunión, por lo que le agradecemos que trabaje con nosotros en eso. Si tiene preguntas, hay un módulo de preguntas. Por favor, inserte sus preguntas allí. Habrá tiempo al final de la reunión para discutir nuestras respuestas a algunas de esas preguntas, por lo que leeremos esas preguntas y las personas a las que se les
atírte ven en ese momento. Así que puede empezar a insertar sus preguntas como desee a lo largo de la reunión. Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Así que en nuestro negocio de RAC.

Nuestras próximas reuniones serán el 3 de febrero. Eso es un miércoles. Es sólo compensar un poco debido a las vacaciones. Hace una semana. Pero esperamos que todos puedan unirse a nosotros el 3 de febrero.

Nos gustaría decir que nos reuniremos en persona, pero creo que todos hemos estado monitoreando el tema COVID, y lo más probable es que sea una reunión virtual una vez más. Pero definitivamente enviaremos la información a través de la lista de correo electrónico que tenemos para las reuniones de RAC, así como colocar un anuncio de periódico y cosas por el que todo el mundo sabe si vamos a tener otra reunión virtual o si existe la capacidad de unirse en persona.

Nuestra sexta reunión será el 28 de abril, y se propone nuestra séptima reunión para el 28 de julio. Con la aprobación de RAC, creo que
podremos mantener nuestro horario trimestral, así que por favor marque sus calendarios ahora para esas fechas. Siguiente diapositiva.

Nuestros procedimientos operativos han sido un debate continuo para el RAC, y me gustaría dar las gracias a Chuck Thomas, Mary Wagner y Victoria Leung por todo su trabajo, así como a todos los demás miembros de la RAC que tuvieron comentarios y se tomaron el tiempo para revisar los procedimientos. Creo que ha habido grandes conversaciones de ida y vuelta con la Air National Guard. Y finalmente tenemos un conjunto de procedimientos operativos que creo que hemos finalizado, como aparece en nuestra diapositiva. Tuvimos reuniones para discutir los comentarios finales, y los comentarios finales fueron recibidos de los miembros de la RAC el 16 de septiembre, que luego presentaron una copia final que creo que se ha compartido con todo el RAC. Y así ahora, a menos que haya algún comentario -- y usted puede levantar la mano si hay alguna pregunta o comentario adicional sobre los
procedimientos operativos - me gustaría ver si estamos listos para una votación sobre esos. ¿Chuck?

SR. CHUCK THOMAS:

Me gustaría dejar de ser que aceptemos los procedimientos operativos tal como están escritos, reescritos y presentados para comentarios. Gracias. ¿Algún otro comentario de los miembros de la RAC?

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Si levantas la mano, nos aseguraremos de que se desenmudado. De acuerdo, si no, si todos nuestros miembros de RAC pueden seguir adelante, y si desea aceptar los procedimientos operativos, por favor levante su mano y haremos un registro de ellos para asegurarnos de que tenemos la mayoría. Usted debe, en su panel, tener la imagen de una pequeña mano que se puede utilizar para levantar la mano. Así que pediré a todos los miembros de la RAC que lo hagan ahora. Gracias, Chuck. Y parece que tenemos el voto de Victoria, Anthony Grice, John Clarke, Bill Fetter, Jack Caldwell, Manna Jo Greene,
RAC/STEWART ANG MEETING

Mary Wagner, Patrick Hines, Laura Garcia, Aura Lopez Zarate. ¿Nadie? Momentos finales. Creo que parece que tenemos diez miembros con Chuck, que se parece a la mayoría. Gracias a todos por levantar la mano. ¿Hay alguien que se abstenga u se oponga a la adopción de los procedimientos operativos tal como están? Victoria, parece que eres tú quien levantó la mano en la oposición - o tal vez no.

SRA. VICTORIA LEUNG:

Lo siento. Hice clic en el botón equivocado. Fui a apoyar los procedimientos operativos, y fui a bajar la mano después de eso.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Bien, perfecto.

SR. CHUCK THOMAS:

Miembros de la RAC, si me permiten, había más que algunos de nosotros que trabajamos en esto, estos procedimientos operativos. Tuvimos un montón de comentarios y agradezco a todos por eso.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:
Si. Gracias. Parece que tenemos la mayoría para aprobarlas. Nos aseguraremos de que todos obtengan esas copias finales si no tienes una, así que gracias por eso. Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Así que como Chuck mencionó en sus comentarios iniciales, hemos tenido un gran año trabajando con él como copresidente de RAC para los miembros de nuestra comunidad, y apreciamos todo el servicio. Sé que no nos va a dejar, seguirá apoyando el RAC y lo apreciamos, pero su mandato ha terminado. Creo que hubo una nominación para que Ed Lawson fuera el copresidente. ¿Es correcto o hay otras nominaciones para copresidente?

SR. CHUCK THOMAS:

Sí. Hemos nominado a Ed Lawson como copresidente. ¿Hay otras nominaciones de la junta?

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

No lo parece. Así que si nuestros miembros de RAC volverían a seguir adelante y
levantaran la mano si están en apoyo de que Ed sea copresidente. Con suerte, también está en apoyo de ser copresidente. Asumo que tuviste esa conversación con él. Así que de nuevo, parece que tenemos a Victoria, Anthony, John, Laura, Bill, Jack, Manna Jo, Mary Wagner y Patrick en apoyo de Ed como nuestra copresidenta. Una vez más, que se parece a 10 o 11 de nosotros, así que gracias. Una vez más, esa es una buena mayoría. Gracias a todos por votar. Te bajaré las manos. Le agradezco su participación. Sé que es una forma extraña de hacerlo.

Parece que también tuvimos una nominación o. Laura, creo que aún estás silenciada. ¿Tuviste alguna pregunta o comentario que querías hacer?

SRA. LAURA GARCIA BALBUEN:

No. Lo siento. También tengo problemas para levantar y bajar la mano.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Muy bien. Gracias. Así que estamos bien. ¿Hubo nominaciones para el secretario?
¿Necesitamos alguna discusión?

SR. CHUCK THOMAS:

Sólo diría que Mary Wagner ha hecho un gran trabajo, y espero que eso no ahuyenta a otros posibles nominados, porque es realmente un trabajo importante. Cada miembro de RAC tiene la capacidad de hacer esto, así que espero que alguien dé un paso adelante y hagan la función de secretaría.

SRA. MARY WAGNER:

Sí, gracias. He tenido un gran apoyo, así y me gustaría dar la bienvenida a cualquier nominado desde el suelo. Si no es ahora, esperemos que en las próximas dos semanas encontraremos algunos. Gracias.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Si alguien quiere ser voluntario o nominar a alguien, puede seguir adelante y levantar la mano. Si no, por favor no dude en ponerse en contacto con Chuck o Ed o yo o Mary. Y de nuevo, Mary ha hecho un trabajo maravilloso. Incluso si eso es algo que --
porque es un poco de trabajo, si eso es algo que posiblemente dos personas quieran asumir juntos y tal vez compartan algunas de esas responsabilidades, estoy seguro de que eso es algo que posiblemente dos personas quieran asumir juntos y tal vez compartan algunas de esas responsabilidades, estoy seguro de que eso es algo que también se puede resolver.

Así que si no tenemos discusión al respecto, parece que en este punto, por favor siga considerando que en las próximas semanas. Y podemos pasar a nuestro próximo tema.

Así que tenemos dos posiciones abiertas, como se había anunciado, creo, para Cynthia Mack y Anthony Fern. Me gustaría agradecerles a ambos por su servicio en el RAC. Agradecemos el tiempo y la dedicación que se ha comprometido a servir en el RAC. Y me gustaría abrirlo. Chuck, ¿tienes algún comentario que hacer sobre Cynthia y Anthony antes de pasar a las nominaciones?

SR. CHUCK THOMAS:

Bueno, Cynthia realmente nos dio una
gran visión de lo que estaba sucediendo fuera de nuestras fronteras actuales y nuestras áreas de interés actuales, y realmente aprecio todo lo que hizo para traernos adelante aquí. Anthony, también, era una gran persona principal para proporcionar información científica sobre los estudios que estábamos revisando. Así que les doy las gracias a ambos. Tuvimos algunas discusiones, y le he pedido a Mary que presente -- creo que tenemos diez candidatos, que me emocionan, para las dos posiciones abiertas estoy muy emocionado de que tuviéramos tantos candidatos. Nuestra membresía se reunió y lo redujimos a creo que cuatro candidatos, y le voy a pedir a Mary que hable con esos cuatro candidatos si quiere.

SRA. MARY WAGNER:

Seguro. Gracias a Cynthia y Anthony.

Y haciéndose eco de Chuck, es genial ver a tanta gente calificada aplicar.

Las cuatro personas a las que lo reducimos son Ronald Zorrilla de la ciudad de
Newburgh. Ronald es miembro del consejo asesor de conservación y también cofundador de Outdoor Promise, que conecta a jóvenes y familias con la naturaleza y cultiva jóvenes líderes ambientales.

La segunda persona es Robert Browning, un residente de la ciudad de Newburgh, pero muy involucrado con la ciudad de Newburgh. Es un ex educador, presidente de la junta de Independent Living, y ha servido en el entonces Comité de Veteranos del congresista Sean Patrick Maloney.

Así que esos dos candidatos obtuvieron la mayoría de los votos. Teníamos ocho personas votando— y Heather, puedo compartir nuestro documento. Y los otros dos candidatos son Kevin Phillips. Es de Cornualles y miembro de la Beaver Dam Lake Association. Según lo entiendo, también son una comunidad afectada por el PFAS. Y Ernestine Ballard de la ciudad de Newburgh, que es empleada en Castle Point, el hospital de veteranos.

Así que gracias a todos, y estaremos
en contacto con ustedes.

SR. CHUCK THOMAS:

Gracias, Mary.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Gracias. Y luego Cassie y Mary, ¿tenían planes de votar esta noche, o el RAC se reunirá y nos hará saber la decisión final en una fecha posterior?

SR. CHUCK THOMAS:

Tuvimos una votación entre nosotros, y creo que ocho de los miembros votaron a favor de las dos personas que se mencionaron: Ronald Zorrilla y Robert Browning. Podemos volver a hacer esa votación si es necesario, pero estábamos tratando de ahorrar tiempo.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

No, eso es perfecto. Sólo quería asegurarme de tener toda la información que necesitaba. Así que parece que seguirás adelante con esos dos, entonces, como los nuevos miembros de RAC llenando las posiciones de Cynthia y Anthony. Maravilloso.
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Bueno, si podemos pasar a la siguiente diapositiva. Estamos por delante de lo previsto para este tema. Gracias a todos, gracias Chuck y Mary por organizar todo para que podamos movernos a través de estos temas bastante rápido, lo que nos dará un poco más de tiempo para el resto de nuestra presentación. Sé que el grupo de RAC de la comunidad va a tener una presentación un poco más tarde esta noche. ¿Había algún otro negocio de RAC que necesitara ser discutido antes de pasar a nuestra presentación?

SR. CHUCK THOMAS:

Ningún otro asunto me ha llegado a la atención.

SRA. MARY WAGNER:

Sólo una nota rápida si juntos podemos trabajar para encontrar una manera de obtener al menos subtítulos y/o interpretación en español para 2021. Tengo grandes esperanzas, ya que el 50% de nuestra comunidad habla hispana. Así que quería ponerme eso para que todos podamos hacer una
lluvia de ideas. Gracias.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Gracias, Mary. Definitivamente tomaremos nota de eso. Antes de seguir adelante, quería señalar a todo el mundo, hay algunas limosnas. Deberías poder verlos en la barra donde se encuentra el módulo de control de audio y pregunta. En los folletos de esta noche, tenemos las diapositivas de la presentación de esta noche, nuestra agenda. También hay un documento llamado términos RAC y abreviaturas que tiene muchos de los acrónimos que se utilizan, así como glosarios cortos. Estamos tratando de no usar tantos acrónimos en nuestra presentación, pero en caso de que lo hagamos, es una referencia útil que puede ver. Así que por favor tómese el tiempo para mirar esas limosnas. Puede descargarlos. Para que la información esté disponible bajo sus folletos. Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Así que vamos a empezar con nuestro próximo tema un poco temprano. Una vez más, gracias por ayudarnos a llegar a esas
presentaciones. Nicole, creo que eres la primera vez.

SRA. NICOLE WIREMAN:

Impresionante. Gracias, Heather y todos los demás para trabajar a través de eso tan rápidamente. Buenas noches a todos, y gracias por estar aquí, sinceramente, tomando su tiempo para venir y aprender más sobre los proyectos ambientales que suceden en Stewart y realmente abrir la discusión al respecto. Agradecemos todo el tiempo que te comprometas a esto.

Una vez más, mi nombre es Nicole Wireman, y sirvo como gerente del programa de restauración de Stewart. Y no puedo seguir sin decir lo contentos que estamos con el progreso que hemos hecho, los pasos positivos. Cuando miramos hacia atrás a nuestra primera reunión oficial de RAC en febrero, y el hecho de que, ya sabes, a través de un montón de trabajo duro, hemos conseguido a través de algunos procedimientos operativos que creo que tienen mucho interés común. Tomó mucha coordinación y muchas
llamadas telefónicas, como Chuck y Mary y Victoria pueden dar fe, y algunos compromisos por ambos lados. Y es genial tener los procedimientos operativos finales esta noche que podemos usar en el futuro. También quería dar la bienvenida a nuestros dos nuevos miembros de la RAC esta noche, así como a nuestro nuevo copresidente de la RAC. Realmente aprecio el tiempo que todos ustedes se comprometen a ser voluntarios para esto.

Además de eso, tenemos buenas noticias que compartir -- podemos ir a la siguiente diapositiva ahora, por favor. Tenemos grandes noticias para compartir eso, desde nuestra última reunión, ahora tenemos un informe final de inspección del sitio ampliado o un informe SI ampliado. Así que si recuerdan en nuestra última reunión, estábamos en la etapa final del borrador. Presentamos el proyecto de informe final a mediados de junio y el período de comentarios finalizó a mediados de julio. Así que desde la última reunión a finales de julio, la Air National Guard preparó respuestas a los
comentarios que recibimos de las partes interesadas. Enviamos esas respuestas a todos a finales de agosto, y las publicamos también en nuestro registro administrativo en línea, o AR. Y se puede ver en la parte superior de la diapositiva, hay un enlace que le lleva a nuestra AR en línea. Luego nos coordinamos más con el New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, o DEC, y pudimos trabajar a través de los comentarios y llegar a un punto en el que, el 22 de septiembre, recibimos una carta de DEC indicando que no tenían más comentarios sobre el informe, y debemos proceder a la investigación remediación, o RI. Así que ese es un gran paso para que completemos la fase de inspección del sitio y podamos avanzar en la fase de RI. A continuación, ponemos ese informe final ampliado si en nuestro AR en línea para hacerlo accesible a todo el mundo. Eso se hizo a finales de septiembre. Y estamos mostrando para usted aquí los números de AR donde puede acceder a ese informe. Desafortunadamente, hay 33 archivos porque
es un gran informe con una gran cantidad de datos en él, pero el archivo principal que probablemente será de su interés es el primero, porque eso incluye el texto del informe, las cifras y las tablas. Y luego los otros 32 archivos contienen todos los apéndices. Por lo tanto, quisiera señalarle en particular el apéndice P, el último apéndice, porque eso incluye también todos los comentarios de las partes interesadas a los que hemos respondido, lo que provocó cambios en el informe desde el proyecto final hasta la fase final. Por lo tanto, si tiene alguna pregunta sobre cómo se abordaron los comentarios, le recomendamos que examine en particular el apéndice P.

Así que esta noche, no vamos a dar una presentación sobre el SI ampliado, y eso es porque en nuestras dos últimas reuniones de RAC en abril y julio, rompimos la información y te la presentamos durante ese tiempo, y realmente no ha habido cambios significativos en llegar al informe final. Así que si usted no estaba en la última
reunión de RAC tal vez y quería acceder a la información sobre el SI ampliado, tenemos las diapositivas de la última reunión como una descarga a través de este foro de GoToWebinar, donde encontrará elementos que puede descargar. Y luego, por supuesto, una manera de acceder a todos los materiales de la última reunión es ir a nuestra AR en línea. Y lo hacemos después de cada reunión trimestral, cuando todo se termine, verá el número de AR allí para los materiales RAC de julio. Y eso incluye la agenda, las diapositivas, las transcripciones en inglés y español, así como respuestas, respuestas escritas a cualquier pregunta a la que no pudiéramos llegar durante la reunión. Hay mucha información valiosa ahí dentro. Así que le animamos a echar un vistazo a nuestro AR en línea y usted puede ser capaz de obtener algunas de sus preguntas respondidas con sólo mirar a través de algunos de ese material, así.

Así que habíamos planeado ir directamente a presentar nuestro antiguo vertedero de base y el programa de monitoreo
a largo plazo que se estaba llevando a la
allí -- que sería en el Sitio 3 -- así como
darle una actualización de nuestro Sistema
Interino de Tratamiento de Aguas Pluviales.
Pero quería cubrir un tema antes de hacer
eso. Y si pudiéramos ir a la siguiente
diapositiva. Esta es en realidad una nueva
diapositiva que insertamos porque había un
artículo de noticias reciente la semana
pasada y queríamos abordar eso por
adelantado. Así que en primer lugar, quería
decir, en cuanto a venir de la SI ampliada,
vamos a entrar en la investigación
correctiva. Ese es el siguiente paso en el
proceso CERCLA. Y de nuevo, CERCLA es la ley
que se llamada de Comprehensive Environmental
Respone, Compensation and Liability Act. Por
lo tanto, procederemos sobre la base de los
datos del SI ampliado y de los dos SIs.
Estaremos planeando proceder a una RI. La
forma en que eso sucederá es que la Air
National Guard está secuenciando activamente
las instalaciones para las RIs utilizando
datos científicos y un proceso basado en el
riesgo. Así que esencialmente, nos fijamos en peor primero entre las instalaciones. Y lo hacemos en conjunto con los sitios de la Air Force, así como los sitios de la Air National Guard.

Así que relacionado con esto, hubo un artículo de noticias que indicaba que la comunidad alrededor de Stewart sería penalizada debido al cambio a una fuente alternativa de agua potable en 2016. Y sólo quería dejar muy claro que eso no es exacto, y es contrario a la posición oficial de ANG. Por lo tanto, no penalizamos a los funcionarios locales o estatales por encontrar una nueva fuente de agua potable. De hecho, aplaudimos los esfuerzos que se hicieron para encontrar esa fuente alternativa de agua potable en 2016, y luego también para instalar un sistema de filtración en el Washington Lake en 2018 que trata el PFOS y el PFOA en agua potable a un nivel aceptable.

Por lo tanto, al continuar con la RI, los pasos que estamos utilizando, una parte
de ella, al menos, es utilizar un proceso basado en el riesgo para la toma de decisiones que se denomina evaluación del sitio de riesgo relativo, o RRSE. Y durante ese proceso, no tenemos en cuenta la mitigación a corto plazo del riesgo que resulta de cambiar una fuente de agua potable. Por lo que RRSE considera la fuente de agua potable original en la vía de migración y el análisis del receptor. Debido a eso, el RRSE para Stewart, y posteriormente la secuenciación de Stewart RI, no se vería afectado por el hecho de que una fuente alternativa de agua potable está siendo utilizada actualmente por la comunidad que rodea a Newburgh. Así que podría haber algunas preguntas más sobre lo que podemos discutir durante el período general de preguntas y respuestas, pero quería asegurarme de que cubrimos este tema por adelantado debido a ese artículo de noticias reciente.

Y ahora lo que me gustaría hacer es seguir con nuestra agenda original e ir a la siguiente diapositiva. Kerry Tull de Wood. Kerry, puedes tomar el control en este
momento. Gracias.

SR. KERRY TULL:


Así que como la flecha indica, esto está en el lado más oriental de la Base. El vertedero recibió residuos domésticos municipales de antiguos residentes de la Air Force durante los años 60 y 70. El vertedero estaba cubierto, creo que en 1999 se instaló una cubierta o una tapa, y el seguimiento anual a largo plazo se ha prolongado desde 2000. 2020 representa el 21o año en que se ha realizado un seguimiento a largo plazo. Siguiente diapositiva.

Como antecedentes, el plan de trabajo final para el monitoreo a largo plazo que se llevaba a realizar entre 2020 y 2024 fue
presentado al New York State DEC en febrero de 2020. El evento anual de muestreo se completó la primera semana de abril de 2020. Esto tuvo que llevarse a cabo en medio de nuestras cuestiones COVID, así que se necesitó un esfuerzo extra, pero todos pudieron reunirse, y la Base fue muy complaciente. Así que las muestras de agua subterránea fueron recogidas de siete pozos. Se recogió el muestreo de agua superficial y sedimentos, y se realizó un seguimiento del gas del vertedero a lo largo del perímetro del vertedero. Es importante recordar, ya que esto ha venido como un tema, que el vertedero tiene una tapa y tiene una docena de respiraderos grandes. Así que regularmente - tiene la capacidad de gas de escape. Si algunos gases que normalmente se acumulan a partir de desechos domésticos típicos se acumulan, es capaz de desgasigar los que a través de esos conductos de ventilación. Siguiente diapositiva.

Por lo tanto, esta diapositiva muestra el perímetro y los puntos de muestreo
alrededor. Los pozos, lo más importante en el lado degradante, serán al este, a la derecha.  
Y también tenemos pozos upgradient como una comparación. La tapa está representada por esa zona de hierba clara a lo largo del centro, corriendo hacia el norte y el sur. Siguiente diapositiva.  

Así que las actualizaciones desde la última reunión de RAC. El informe anual de seguimiento a largo plazo de 2020. El proyecto de informe final se presentó al New York State DEC y al RAC el 29 de septiembre. Hemos recibido algunos comentarios y hemos estado abordando esos. Los hallazgos fueron básicamente bajos niveles de productos químicos relacionados con los desechos sólidos detectados en las aguas subterráneas. La mayoría de los productos químicos muestran tendencias estables o de concentración decrecientes. Siguiente diapositiva.  

Resultados. Varios productos químicos sólidos relacionados con los desechos muestran tendencias variables o crecientes a lo largo del tiempo, por ejemplo, cloruro, que es un
producto de descomposición de sal, sodio, hierro y disolventes. Específicamente, los productos de descomposición de disolventes son disolventes clorados típicos de un vertedero de este tipo. Se van a descomponer en un estado anaeróbico. Y la cantidad de oxígeno que está en cualquier vertedero dado después de que ha sido tapado y sentado durante décadas, la cantidad de oxígeno es muy baja, y usted tiene lo que se considera una condición naeróbic. Esto realmente ayuda a descomponer los disolventes clorados, y los productos de degradación de esos disolventes que estamos viendo son típicamente DCE y cloruro de vinilo. Estos seguirán siendo monitoreados tanto alrededor como fuera del propio vertedero. No hay productos químicos relacionados con los desechos sólidos por encima de los criterios de New York DEC en el pozo más downgradient, MW-19, o en muestras de aguas superficiales y sedimentos. Es importante recordar que las aguas subterráneas que viajan a través o salen del vertedero se van a mostrar en los receptores de agua superficiales cercanos, y no
estamos viendo -- o las muestras que hemos
tomado no han mostrado ningún contaminante
por encima de esos criterios hasta ahora.
Siguiente diapositiva.

Así que de nuevo, tenemos lugares
donde hemos visto algunas superaciones, y
esas son. Tenemos un poco de cloruro de
vinilo en ese pozo, creo que es 16; y luego
justo en el dedo del fondo, la parte inferior
de eso, se puede ver que tenemos un poco de
cloruro de vinilo y un poco de DCE. Una vez
más, se trata de productos de descomposición
esperados a largo plazo a partir de
disolventes. Es parte del proceso de
desclore regulación. Siguiente diapositiva.

Así que continuando con los
hallazgos, se detectaron niveles nominales de
gas de vertedero en las estaciones de
muestreo perimetrales, lo que indica niveles
bajos o no de actividad biológica.
Información positiva, porque los altos
niveles de actividad biológica pueden dar
lugar a la necesidad de tratamiento de gases
y/o la generación de concentraciones químicas
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elevadas en lixiviados. La suma total de esta redacción es que el vertedero está actuando y está en un estado en el que esperaríamos que estuviera. No hay nada en el vertedero que sea imprevisto o proyecte un problema que necesite una llamada a la acción. Volvemos a monitorear, esto está siendo monitoreado durante un largo periodo de tiempo, ha sido y seguirá siendo.

Y eso es todo. Así que ciertamente puedo hacer cualquier pregunta durante los próximos cinco minutos.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Gracias, Kerry, por tu presentación. Creo que nuestra primera pregunta viene de Mary Wagner, y luego voy a hacer cualquiera de los miembros de RAC que tienen una pregunta en la presentación del Sitio 3 que Kerry dio, por favor levante la mano y trataremos de obtener tantas preguntas en cinco minutos como podamos. Mary, desmuétate y haz tu pregunta.

SRA. MARY WAGENER:

Lo siento, Kerry, creo que ya respondiste
sobre todo. ¿Si pudiera hablar con la toxicidad asociada con el cloruro de vinilo y DCE?

SR. KERRY TULL:

Si. Así que el cloruro de vinilo y DCE son disolventes. No quieres concentraciones elevadas de esos. El punto importante es que, si bien se han detectado una degradación del vertedero en concentraciones que superan la orientación del New York DEC, no los estamos viendo más allá. Esto no es un penacho que se está expandiendo. Esos tipos de resultados son típicos de rondas de muestreo anteriores y no indican una tendencia que sea preocupante.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

¿Tenemos alguna otra pregunta de nuestros miembros de RAC en el Sitio 3? No veo ninguna mano. Victoria, te veo.

SRA. VICTORIA LEUNG:

Así que mencionaste pozos degradados. Y en el informe, parece que hay atención en uno a DCE y cloruro de vinilo en algunos pozos de degradación donde no se veía antes.
Sé que el informe menciona que esto es algo que seguiremos monitoreando, pero me preguntaba si lo estarías. ¿Va a aumentar la frecuencia? ¿Y cómo determinará si se requiere algún monitoreo adicional para eso?

SR. KERRY TULL:

Gracias. Esa es una gran pregunta. En este momento, de nuevo, trabajando con el Estado, Solid Waste Department, el New York State DEC, este vertedero, debido a su edad, se muestrea sólo anualmente. Pero hasta el punto de que esas tendencias continúan, o lo que es más importante, si viéramos una tendencia de creciente concentración, o la encontramos en el sedimento y/o el agua superficial más allá, entonces claramente, está empezando a crear una indicación de que esto puede ser más de lo que desearíamos o esperaríamos, y se tomarán planes y acciones. En este momento, sin embargo, las cantidades relativamente menores, sin embargo por encima de la guía, son sólo eso. Se espera que se vean y se revisarán anualmente antes de cualquier
acción o plan para que se tomen.

SRA. VICTORIA LEUNG:

Gracias. Y una vez más --

SRA. NICOLE WIREMAN:

Lo siento, Victoria. Sólo iba a
añadir que, por supuesto, seguiremos
informando al RAC la próxima vez que hagamos
una muestra en abril y tengamos un informe.
Compartiremos el proyecto de informe final
para la revisión de las partes interesadas y
de la RAC e incluirlo en una presentación en
esse momento.

SRA. VICTORIA LEUNG:

Gracias. Y entonces me preguntaba,
¿cuáles son los pozos centinelas para el
penacho, los que están fuera de la extensión
del penacho?

SR. KERRY TULL:

Los que se llaman específicamente
centinelas, yo los llamaría centinelas
realmente. Creo que esa puede ser una frase
que tal vez sólo identifique uno o dos de los
pozos. Pero se ven los pozos: los resultados
de las muestras de los pozos se miran en su
totalidad. Así que no sólo los pozos centinelas, aunque eso es importante, sino los pozos que se extienden desde las fronteras hacia el exterior, así como el sedimento y las aguas superficiales, todo visto en su totalidad.

SRA. VICTORIA LEUNG:

Gracias.

SRA. NICOLE WIREMAN:

¿Hay más preguntas, Heather, o hay tiempo para que diga una cosa más?

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Parece que hay una pregunta más de Chuck.

SR. CHUCK THOMAS:

Gracias. No parece tener una función de levantar la mano, así que pensé en ponerla ahí. Entonces, ¿qué estamos diciendo, que el Sitio 3, el antiguo vertedero, no está contribuyendo PFAS u otros productos negativos a nuestro suministro de agua?

SR. KERRY TULL:

Eso es correcto.

SR. CHUCK THOMAS:
De acuerdo, así que descartamos eso.

Gracias.

SR. WILLIAM FETTER:

Hola. Este es Bill Fetter. ¿Puedo hablar?

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Hola, Bill. Probablemente tengamos tiempo para una pregunta más rápida y Nicole termine.

SR. WILLIAM FETTER:

Gran parte del lixiviado se basa en la cantidad de flujo o lluvia, es decir, pasando por encima de la propiedad. ¿No es correcto?

SR. KERRY TULL:

Eso no es correcto. El vertedero tiene una tapa. No recibe lluvia.

SR. WILLIAM FETTER:

¿Y la zanja de corte está en el extremo superior para evitar cualquier migración del flujo de agua superficial bajo el borde superior?

SR. KERRY TULL:

No. No, no lo hay. El vertedero no está
aislado en ese sentido.

SR. WILLIAM FETTER:
¿No está en una ladera y es probable en una zona húmeda hacia la Base?

SR. KERRY TULL:
No está en una zona húmeda. Está en una ladera. Está bastante elevado.

SR. WILLIAM FETTER:
Muy bien. Y una última pregunta. ¿Se retiraron los tanques de los pesticidas que fueron arrojados?

SR. KERRY TULL:
El área de pesticidas fue excavada completamente hace unos 30 años. Fue completamente delineado, excavado, y se recogieron muestras posteriores a la excavación. El área de pesticidas ya no existe.

SR. WILLIAM FETTER:
Y 20 años después, todavía lo estamos mirando.

SR. KERRY TULL:
Bueno, siempre es parte del programa de monitoreo, pero el área en la que se
tiraron pesticidas fue removida.

SR. WILLIAM FETTER:

Quiero decir, todavía está presente, sin embargo, en algunos de los pozos.

SR. KERRY TULL:

Sí.

SR. WILLIAM FETTER:

Podemos seguir adelante. Te hablaré más tarde sobre esto.

SRA. NICOLE WIREMAN:

Para seguir adelante, voy a añadir un comentario más tarde cuando hablemos del sitio 3 de nuevo. Así que continúe hacia el sistema de tratamiento.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Gracias. Sr. Grice que vemos su pregunta ahí dentro. Dado que no está directamente relacionado con el Sitio 3, lo recogeremos al final. En este momento, pasaremos a nuestra sistema interino de tratamiento de aguas pluviales con Doug de BERS-Weston Services. Reemplaza, Doug.

SR. DOUG CLOSE:

Gracias, Heather. Gracias a todos.
Buenas noches. Doug Close con BERS-Weston, gerente del sistema interino de tratamiento de aguas pluviales. Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Nos conocimos en julio pasado y empezamos a hablar sobre el diseño de los nuevos sistemas de filtración. Le dimos una breve reunión informativa porque estábamos a sólo un par de semanas en la adición de un nuevo patín de filtración de arena y pretratamiento adicional. Aquí hay un poco de una foto o captura de nuestro diseño en el punto de la estructura de presa y detrás de la berma Rec Pond. Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Esta diapositiva, si comenzamos en el lado derecho de la página o en la posición de las tres, añadimos un nuevo contenedor de filtro. Ese contenedor incluye cinco patines, por supuesto, y arena fina que realmente ayuda con la eliminación y la separación de los sólidos con los que estábamos luchando en la adaptación temprana de nuestro sistema. Al movernos hacia la
izquierda, entramos en una estructura de pretratamiento y panel de control. Ahí es donde se recibe nuestra electricidad. Aquí es donde filtramos la siguiente parte del agua procesada a través de bolsas. Una vez que sale de la filtración de la bolsa, pasa a través de la tubería interna en nuestros dos contenedores de tratamiento, y esos recipientes son los que sostienen nuestro medio, tanto el carbono como la resina.

Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Una toma de esqueleto más completa del sistema, si quieres. La bomba está en la esquina superior izquierda. El agua cruda se toma. Entra en una adición de ácido, la porción de biocontrol de nuestro sistema, pasa a través de un separador, y luego hacia abajo a través de la filtración de arena dentro del contenedor. Esa agua se ha trasladado al contenedor de pretratamiento donde está nuestra carcasa de filtro de bolsa. Una vez que ha pasado por la filtración de bolsas, entramos en nuestro tratamiento de medios. Y se puede ver cómo
cada contenedor está alineado con dos trenes
cada uno, con carbono-resina-resina.
Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.
Así que un par de recordatorios de los plazos desde la última reunión.
Encargamos el sistema en julio. Empezamos con todos los nuevos medios. Ponemos resina nueva y carbono nuevo, junto con todas las nuevas arenas y nuestro sistema de filtración de bolsas. El sistema se inició el 13 de julio.
Y vamos a ver – próxima diapositiva, por favor – vamos a ver una ventana de datos del 13 de julio al 15 de septiembre, aproximadamente 65 días de operación. De esos 65 días, 50 de esos días, tuvimos éxito en mantener la reducción del estanque, o el agua que está por debajo de la elevación y no proporcionando bypass en Silver Stream. Esto representó 21 millones de galones de agua de Rec Pond siendo tratada y liberada como agua limpia en Silver Stream. Los niveles de nuestro efluente PFOS y PFOA fueron de 5 partes por billón o menos, y
predominantemente en la situación de no detección. Siguiente diapositiva.

Este es un gráfico, probablemente un poco más fácil de ver. En el lado izquierdo, puede ver nuestros niveles de afluentes de PFOS/PFOA a medida que vienen del agua cruda del estanque, y ya que han pasado por nuestro pretratamiento completo y el tratamiento final de los medios. Y estos son los resultados en el nivel de efluentes a la derecha. Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Cuatro eventos ocurrieron durante ese período de actuación donde los eventos de lluvia fueron el factor significativo en por qué no mantuvimos la reducción. Se puede ver un pico muy empinado en la letra A. Algunos de ustedes recordarán la tormenta tropical que pasó por el área de Newburgh. Eso es lo que es una función de. También perdimos algo de energía en toda la comunidad por hasta 55 horas, y eso fue una gran parte de tomar algún tiempo para conseguir que lo derriben de nuevo. Pero a medida que se cruza el tablero, el evento B fue de poco más de media
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pulgada o justo en media pulgada, así que
sólo llegó por encima sobre la cima de la
presa. Recapturamos eso y continuamos con la
reducción, así como los eventos C y D estaban
por encima del umbral de media pulgada que
estamos monitoreando, y tardó sólo de 24 a 48
horas en recuperarse en algunos de esos
eventos. Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Para nuestra comparación, usted vería
la foto del lado izquierdo. Este es un
escenario de trabajo típico para nosotros
durante la reducción. Esto sería una
reducción de 1 pie en toda la elevación del
agua del estanque sin descarga, donde el lado
derecho sería un evento de lluvia que
superaría la media pulgada, y, ya sabes,
recuperar la elevación que habíamos capturado
en la reducción y sobrepasar la presa.
Siguiente diapositiva.

Esta es una mirada más dramática a la
reducción típica a la izquierda, y las
precipitaciones significativas, en el
vecindario de 2 a 4 pulgadas de lluvia en un
período de 24 horas. Puede ver cómo toda el
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área de Rec Pond está inundada. Y esto es una tormenta cuando estábamos viendo más de 100.000 galones por minuto pasando por encima de la presa. Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Algunos de los desafíos operativos, queríamos darle un par de fotos, porque habíamos mencionado nuestros esfuerzos durante el verano para combatir el crecimiento de algas y hierbas en estanques en Rec Pond. En el lado izquierdo, si su imagen está sintonizada, se puede ver la capa muy verde de crecimiento de algas en el nivel del subsuelo. Eso es un impacto para nosotros tanto en la ingesta de sedimentos como en la contaminación biológica. Así como en el lado derecho, se puede ver el crecimiento de la hierba del estanque. Esto es temprano en el verano. No tuvimos un problema en nuestra bomba de admisión, pero estábamos gestionando eso y considerando algunas opciones para eliminar la hierba del estanque. Pero pudimos solucionar eso. Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.
El compuesto orgánico total sigue siendo uno de los indicadores de calidad del agua que podemos ver, junto con la turbidez, a diario, donde podemos hacer todo lo posible para combatirlo a través de nuestra prefiltración. Aquí es donde hicimos algunos avances en conseguir este número a un nivel aceptable. Cuando se puso en marcha, nos quedamos bien impactados por el TOC en nuestro material de resina. Así que nos estamos concentrando en eso de forma regular. Usted puede echar un vistazo a lo que el promedio es a medida que baja. Creo que es importante tener en cuenta que, en el GAC, que es su carbono, se necesita alrededor del 50% de ese número de TOC hacia abajo, y eso es bastante significativo, porque queremos bajarlo a menos de 2 para proteger esa resina, que es su pulidor final para el PFOS/PFOA. Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Otro gráfico visual. Turbidez.
Hablamos de eso. Puedes ver, el azul es tu turbidez. Esa es tu agua cruda, lo que estamos midiendo mientras la bombeamos a
nuestro sistema. Y luego la turbidez a medida que pasa a través de nuestro sistema de filtración es la barra marrón inferior.

Siguiente diapositiva.

Hablamos de turbidez y sus unidades de medida la última vez. Durante la Fase 1, que era -- teníamos un sistema de menor escala que se nos brindó la oportunidad -- nuestra turbidez estaba promediando alrededor de 3.4 NTU. En la Fase 2, que era el verano, que contribuiría al crecimiento de las algas y el otro biocrecimiento en el estanque que vimos en las fotos, fue hasta tres veces mayor. Así que, sabes, realmente, una gran parte de nuestra filtración es manejar ese sedimento y el nivel NTU. Requiere que hagamos un mantenimiento y control constantes del sistema a través del retrolavado. Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Así que el control de la contaminación biológica es la acumulación de microorganismos en superficies mojadas. Abordamos dos opciones de adiciones químicas que deben considerarse para abordar la contaminación biológica. Un
algicida fue considerado a principios del verano. Es una aplicación en el estanque que habría matado las hierbas y algas que viste en las fotos. Al trabajar con nuestras partes interesadas, los terratenientes y ustedes mismos, consideramos utilizar otras opciones. No avanzamos con una aplicación en el estanque de un algicida. Lo que hicimos fue trabajar en estrecha colaboración con DEC para aplicar un 15% de ácido peracético a una tasa regulada de aproximadamente 0,75 galones por día cuando estamos operando a 500 GPM. Esa aplicación está siendo monitoreada. La dosis baja no elimina la contaminación biológica, pero seguimos monitoreando para ver si hay un efecto de esa dosis baja. Siguiente diapositiva.

Aquí hay un vistazo rápido al interior de un filtro de arena. Este es un patín de filtro de arena típico. Cuando digo patín, tienes dos vasos uno al lado del otro. La bomba dosificadora es la pequeña bomba que tira de una lata de almacenamiento de 5 galones y aplica el ácido peracético en una dosis regulada. Siguiente diapositiva.
Los filtros de arena han sido realmente un gran paso adelante para nosotros. Equipamos los patines dentro del nuevo contenedor. Cuando ejecutamos el sistema, su régimen de bajada es de arriba a abajo, así que el agua está entrando a través de la parte superior de sus vasos. Las arenas están derribando la sedimentación. Parte de nuestro mantenimiento operativo para esos filtros de arena es el lavado posterior, donde invertimos el flujo. Ese flujo vuelve a subir a través de la columna de arena y saca el sedimento. Desviamos eso a través de una línea de descarga. Y durante esta fase, hemos sido muy conscientes de nuestro lavado de espalda. En realidad hemos automatizado el sistema, y se opera a cualquiera de nuestros caudales variables, y estamos haciendo retrolavados en esas arenas de tres a cuatro veces al día. Siguiente diapositiva.

Un muy rápido, ya sabes, ¿qué es eso? Es la contaminación biológica que está dentro de nuestros contenedores de recipientes de
arena. Por lo general viene más como un huevo microscópico más pequeño, si se quiere, pero veremos un crecimiento vivo dentro de nuestros vasos. Entonces, ¿funciona la dosificación para matarlo? No. ¿Se está apagando nuestro sistema por eso? No. Seguimos huyendo. La filtración está funcionando. Estamos enfocados en la sedimentación. Seguimos monitoreando el biocrecimiento que ocurre dentro de nuestro sistema, pero estamos operando y tratando con él a través de la filtración. Siguiente diapositiva.

Los filtros de bolsa es otra parte de nuestro proceso de paso para la filtración. Tenemos un filtro de bolsa primaria y un filtro de bolsa secundario con dos configuraciones individuales. Alternamos diferentes materiales de tela con diferentes tamaños de micras para mantener una buena filtración, pero también mantenemos nuestra acumulación de presión, permitiendo que nuestro sistema funcione. Durante el crecimiento más pesado y la sedimentación en el verano, utilizamos una combinación de
bolsas de 10 micras y una bolsa de 25 micras en la posición de plomo. Siguiente diapositiva.

Esta es una especie de foto de lo que está pasando dentro de la filtración de la bolsa. En el lado izquierdo, esos son los cilindros de acero que caben en la foto central. Dentro de esos cilindros de acero hay filtros de bolsas de tela. Se puede ver cómo recogemos tanto la sedimentación como el crecimiento vivo. Esos son organismos que están entrando y siendo sacados por nuestros filtros de bolsa. También se puede notar en la foto central que tenemos un tinte verde bastante significativo de las algas. Creo que estos fueron tomados en, como, agosto. Siguiente diapositiva.

Los trenes de tratamiento, por supuesto, es la fase final del tratamiento. La presión es monitoreada para confirmar cuando necesitamos mantenimiento. Los sólidos se están acumulando en los recipientes, pero somos capaces de utilizar un sistema de retrolavado, al igual que
nuestros filtros de arena, ya sabes,
recipientes de carbono. Cuando comenzamos
con nuevos medios, poco a poco entramos en
él, pero a medida que el sistema funciona las
24 horas del día, los 7 días de la semana,
ahora estamos en dos o tres veces por semana
para mantener estos recipientes de carbono.
No lavamos la resina. Tratamos de no
hacerlo. No se recomienda. Así que es muy
importante que el carbono -- ya sabes, es un
gran levantador pesado, ya sabes, toma la
carga de toda nuestra sedimentación, y
haremos la mayor parte de nuestro lavado a
através de nuestros recipientes de carbono.
Siguiente diapositiva.

Así que los resultados de algunas de
nuestras muestras de resina y nuestras
muestras de efluentes tomadas a finales de
septiembre nos desencadenaron en nuestro plan
de mitigación donde el cambio de medios se
pone en juego cuando estamos en nuestras 35
partes por billón de avances en nuestros
vasos centrales o de plomo. Así que lo vimos
a principios de septiembre. Para el 10 de
septiembre, lo confirmamos mediante la validación de los datos. Rápidamente pasamos a la acción para comenzar a programar cambios de medios. Y se hace con un recipiente de resina primaria que se reemplaza. Les voy a mostrar en el diagrama, pero lo que queremos quitar de esto en el cambio de medios de septiembre fue, vimos lo eficaz que es el carbono en la reducción de nuestros TOC y la protección, en última instancia, la protección, de nuestra resina. Así que queríamos incorporar más carbono para abordar los orgánicos en el agua. No queríamos depender de productos químicos. Así que estamos usando eso ahora en el futuro. Estamos pilotando dos recipientes de carbono con un pulido de resina para ser una eliminación más efectiva del PFOS y PFOA. Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Así que esto es lo que hemos hecho. Lo hemos resaltado en un bar. Nos dimos cuenta de que la resina no era un medio eficaz como los medios de comunicación mayoritarias para hacer frente a toda la
turbidez, los TOC y la carga de sólidos en nuestro sistema. Así que reemplazamos ese segundo recipiente con más carbono, y eso está tomando la carga tanto de eliminación de PFOS, eliminación orgánica, recolección de sedimentación, y en última instancia proteger ese recipiente de resina, que es su verdadero pulidor en derribar su descarga de PFOS/PFOA.

Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Así que hemos estado más allá desde el 15 de septiembre. Sabes, todavía estamos -- un mes después, todavía estamos bombeando efectivamente. El sistema sigue promediando alrededor de lo mismo, más del 75% de la reducción durante el período. Experimentamos algunos eventos de lluvia más. Seguimos monitoreando nuestro problema químico con nuestro ácido peracético. Estamos evaluando ahora el rendimiento de nuestros dos recipientes de carbono que sustituyen a la resina primaria. Encontramos que nos da un enfoque mucho más fácil de mantener para proteger, en última instancia, los medios de resina finales, y continuamos optimizando el
sistema con lo que estamos aprendiendo ahora que estamos operando de forma regular. Creo que eso es todo para mis diapositivas. Podemos tomar cualquier pregunta.

SR. WILLIAM FETTER:

Este es Bill Fetter. ¿Puedo hacer algunas preguntas?

SR. DOUG CLOSE:

Seguro.

SR. WILLIAM FETTER:

¿Tiene el estanque capacidad donde el vertedero podría ser maltratado para aumentar la capacidad del estanque, o no se conoce la integridad? ¿Podría aumentar la capacidad del estanque para contener un poco más de agua de lluvia, más de media pulgada?

SR. DOUG CLOSE:

Lo vimos originalmente, y creo que probablemente lo dijo mejor. La integridad de esa berma y cómo se construye la presa, no se construye como una represa.

SR. WILLIAM FETTER:

Entendido. ¿Cuál es el destino del
contralavado cuando se lavan los diferentes componentes?

SR. DOUG CLOSE:

Si hace referencia al diagrama temprano, vuelve al estanque detrás de la barrera de turbidez.

SR. WILLIAM FETTER:

Así que eres un poco--bueno, es menos desperdicio. ¿Alguna programación de ampliación, o estás refinando esto primero antes de seguir adelante?

SR. DOUG CLOSE:

Nos gusta mucho la oportunidad que nos han dado de refinar esto. Me oíste hablar del cambio para ir al carbono. Es para, ya sabes, pesado en permitirnos lidiar con el sedimento. El sedimento es el verdadero desafío en Rec Pond --

SR. WILLIAM FETTER:


SR. DOUG CLOSE:

- la velocidad, la descarga de la caída o algas que crecen, es un estanque poco profundo y no se toma mucho para traerlo --
SR. WILLIAM FETTER:

Dale la vuelta, sí. ¿Hay una fecha en mente para pensar en escalar verticalmente? ¿Cuál es tu objetivo ahora para evaluar lo que estás haciendo?

SR. DOUG CLOSE:

Bueno, algo de eso podría estar fuera de mi nivel salarial, pero estaremos ejecutando el sistema para Stewart y el ANG durante todo el año, hasta septiembre. Cosas que suceden entre ahora y entonces, que serían para algunos otros tal vez abordar.

SR. WILLIAM FETTER:

Gracias.

SR. DOUG CLOSE:

De nada.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Creo que hay una pregunta de John Clarke.

SR. JOHN CLARKE:

Gracias. ¿Hiciste alguna prueba de compuesto policlorado de cadena corta antes y después de la filtración?

SR. DOUG CLOSE:
SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Y luego hay otros miembros de RAC, ya que nos quedan unos momentos, con preguntas adicionales?

SR. DOUG CLOSE:

Estoy mirando mis notas, y creo que fue Bill el que hizo la pregunta, la última pregunta. Se tomaron muestras de compuestos de PFAS de cadena corta, tanto antes como después de la filtración.

SR. JOHN CLARKE:

Gracias. Ese era John.

SR. DOUG CLOSE:

Lo siento, John.

SR. JOHN CLARKE:

¿La filtración es tan exitosa para la cadena corta como para el largo?

SR. DOUG CLOSE:

En cuanto a nuestros parámetros de trabajo, sí.

SR. JOHN CLARKE:

Me vino a la mente cuando mostraste los gráficos del antes y el después, y yo
Sólo -- Quiero decir, obviamente, tienes los químicos que probaste específicamente, pero no estaba seguro de qué específicamente estaba representado allí, si los cortos eran o simplemente el PFOA y el PFOS.

SRA. JESSICA FREHSE:
Doug, puedo hablar con eso. Creo que en el gráfico, sólo mencionamos específicamente PFOA y PFOS. Pero estamos siguiendo el método modificado por la EPA 537.1 según lo requerido por el New York DEC.

SRA. MARY WAGNER:
¿Podría señalarnos a -- en el informe final, hay un apéndice que incluya una lista de aquellos, el PFAS que se probaron? Es genial oír que también salió de cadena corta.

SRA. JESSICA FREHSE:
Así que para el sistema provisional de tratamiento de aguas pluviales, aún no tenemos un informe final, y no lo haremos hasta después de que hayamos terminado con todo el proyecto. Así que hemos estado viendo notas técnicas provisionales que tienen resultados de muestra. Quiero decir
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que el último fue el memorándum técnico Doug, puedes saltar si soy incorrecto. Pero eso tiene todos los datos y todo el método, hasta el estudio piloto. Todavía estamos trabajando en el memorándum de inicio que vamos a publicar.

SRA. MARY WAGNER:

Entiendo. Gracias.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Parece que se nos apete el tiempo de los cinco minutos de preguntas. Algunos de ustedes están agregando preguntas a nuestro módulo de preguntas, así que por favor continúe agregándolas para que podamos abordarlas durante el periodo de comentarios públicos al final. Así que vamos a seguir adelante, porque definitivamente quiero asegurarme de que tenemos suficiente tiempo para nuestra discusión abierta RAC.

Acabamos de recibir las diapositivas de los miembros de nuestra comunidad hoy. Gracias a todos ustedes por armar todo esto. Sé que fue mucho trabajo. Si podemos cambiar a esa presentación ahora. Se lo entregaré a
Chuck, Mary, Bill y John, que creo que serán nuestros presentadores esta noche. Así que gracias.

SR. JOHN CLARKE:

Hola. Buenas noches. Mi nombre es John Clarke. Estoy agradecido de poder participar en este esfuerzo. Como parte de cómo veo mi responsabilidad como miembro de la comunidad, he estado tratando de entender cuál es el proceso, cuál es el problema, y he estado tratando de llegar a mejores preguntas y una mejor manera de representar lo que he aprendido a las comunidades con las que, supongo, me entrecruzo. No soy un representante, pero soy un miembro activo en la comunidad. Así que intenté hacer algunas herramientas visuales para compartir eso, y llegar a algún lenguaje que pueda tener sentido para una persona de vocabulario no técnico. Así que no para hacer la luz de la situación o menospreciarlo, sino sólo para tratar de hacerlo comprensible. Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Así que el número mágico. ¿Qué número mágico estamos aplicando a nuestras
comunidades? Al leer a través de la investigación del sitio, la investigación ampliada del sitio, hay una gran cantidad de números y términos técnicos que se nos lanzan. Soy más una persona visual y entiendo que necesitamos usar un lenguaje que sea más reconocible. No se me ocurrió un término mejor que el número mágico. Así que la EPA de los Estados Unidos define el nivel máximo de contaminación en su página web. También asignaron un objetivo de nivel máximo de contaminación. El MCL, o el número mágico, es lo que es exigible según la EPA de los Estados Unidos. Nuestro estado acaba de aprobar recientemente una legislación para hacer ese número mágico 10 partes por billón. Y hay muchas referencias en la investigación de sitio extendido que hacen referencia, como, a un SL. No recuerdo muy bien qué SL--limite de muestra o algo así, nivel de muestra.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Nivel de cribado.

SR. JOHN CLARKE:
Nivel de cribado. Gracias. Es un número mágico para la mayoría de la gente. Realmente no lo entendemos hasta que realmente cavamos y luchamos con la terminología. Ninguno de nosotros pasará tanto tiempo como los profesionales que están involucrados en esto.

Así que no está muy claro que el número mágico esté relacionado con estudios médicos. Y ha habido algunos estudios médicos a gran escala asociados con el PFAS. Y la EPA dice que los objetivos son -- o los MCL se establecen tan cerca de los objetivos como sea posible utilizando la mejor tecnología de tratamiento disponible y teniendo en cuenta el costo. Así que eso no suena como que está estrictamente relacionado con la salud personal o efectos sobre la salud. Y conduce la pregunta, ¿cuál es la consideración de costo para contaminar mi cuerpo u otro miembro del cuerpo de nuestra comunidad? Y reconozco que no hay necesariamente una respuesta específica, y que a veces nuestras manos están atadas en
base a la regulación o litigio en cuanto a cómo podemos procesar esto. Pero mi esperanza es que podamos capturar parte de nuestro aprendizaje en las diapositivas y seguir presentándolos para poder comunicar quiénes son las organizaciones responsables, quién toma las decisiones y cuáles son los límites, de una manera comprensible.

Así que una de las preguntas pendientes en mi cabeza después de leer la investigación ampliada del sitio fue, ¿qué número mágico va a ser el factor decisivo para una vía de migración para un receptor? ¿Es sólo agua potable? No está claro. Y espero que a medida que se haga más claro, pueda seguir compartiendo esa información. Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Así que Orange County ha creado varios mapas útiles. Y así, simplemente quitando los recortes de sus mapas, creé este gráfico, este gráfico de información aquí que muestra la ubicación aproximada de la Base y donde el derrame o el uso de los productos químicos han ocurrido. Y las líneas rojas
representan las vías fluviales, esas vías de migración en la superficie. No representan las aguas subterráneas. Pero este tipo de muestra el alcance de lo que soy consciente, y espero seguir mejorando estos para capturar lo que sí sabemos. Realmente no soy consciente de lo que, si acaso, se ve afectado al norte de la Base. Sé que se han detectado algunos niveles. Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Así que esas vías de migración, por lo general parecen aguas superficiales y subterráneas, y ambas son reconocidas en la investigación del sitio. Y un receptor es como el receptáculo. Es donde los productos químicos parecen estar acumulados, y creo que específicamente beber agua es un énfasis. Se nos mostraron niveles en Lake Washington, Browns Pond, el Kroll Well, el Butterhill Wells en New Windsor, y hay una referencia a pozos privados en el área de Beaver Dam Lake. Todo esto es agua potable. Pero lo que realmente no ha sido abordado o reconocido es la cadena alimenticia que los productos
químicos están entrando, y eventualmente,
todos nos convertiremos en receptores de los
productos químicos en nuestro medio ambiente.
Así que este gráfico es un intento de
representar los lugares que conocemos que son
de preocupación, y que no es sólo una
preocupación del Washington Lakey la ciudad
de Newburgh, pero esta es una preocupación de
varias comunidades a nuestro alrededor. Y
una gran cantidad de personas en el complejo
sienten que esto está siendo minimizado
diciendo que es solo un problema de la ciudad
de Newburgh porque es solo fuera fuente de
agua que se ve afectada por ella. Así que la
próxima diapositiva, por favor.

Entonces, ¿qué criterios y dónde?
Una vez más, volvamos al número mágico. Y
esto es algo así como lo que estaba
describiendo anteriormente, ¿cuál es el
número mágico para todos los diferentes
aspectos? Había un lenguaje como para decir
que hay algunos contribuyentes
insignificantes sin ninguna referencia a cómo
determinaron el significado. Un pozo a lo
largo de toda la costa, supongo, la orilla del Washington Lake no representa la contribución de las aguas subterráneas al lago. Y hay un cálculo específico hecho en la investigación del sitio expandido que muestra un flujo de productos químicos a través de las aguas subterráneas en el lago, una contribución, y creo que se puede hacer de manera similar al Washington Lake.

También -- no escuchamos mucho acerca de los productos químicos de cadena corta, y sabemos que los compuestos orgánicos polifluorados, los productos químicos de la cadena de carbono, se acumularán en nuestros cuerpos.

La gran pregunta es, ¿quién está pagando? ¿Quién va a pagar el agua limpia? Esto se trata específicamente sobre el costo y costo de los servicios públicos para los miembros de la comunidad y el costo para el estado, costo para nuestro municipio. ¿Quién paga la limpieza? Había alguna pregunta sobre la National Defense Authorization Act y las diferentes siglas que se echan
por ahí por gastos gubernamentales o memorandos y tales. No es inteligible para la gente a menos que estén realmente involucrados. Y nos gustaría poder decir que esta gente está pagando por ello, o esta gente no está pagando por ello porque no ha sido aprobado por un órgano legislativo. Y nos gustaría ayudar a dejar eso claro para que la gente pueda apelar a la gente adecuada para tratar de hacer de esto una prioridad.

El último allí: ¿Quién paga por la mala salud? Hay muchas maneras diferentes de representar esa pregunta. La mayoría de las personas que se ven afectadas dirían que están pagando por ello con mala salud.

Siguiente diapositiva. Y se lo pasará a Mary.

SRA. MARY WAGNER:

Gracias, John. Esa fue una gran visión general. Y lo que John aludieron es que estamos en esto, obviamente no somos la única comunidad con este tipo de contaminación del PFAS. Sé que Jack o Bill probablemente pueden compartir el número de sitios en todo el país que están lidiando con
RAC/STEWART ANG MEETING

esto. Pero estamos luchando por un conjunto limitado de fondos. Idealmente, todas las comunidades que han contaminado el agua potable se limpiarían. Pero queremos saber cómo se puntuará, y esta es la estrategia de evaluación del sitio de riesgo relativo o el proceso de puntuación que se mencionó anteriormente. Así que Nicole, fue genial escuchar que no seríamos penalizados por tener una fuente temporal de agua limpia. Sí, así que parece que respondiste a esa pregunta. Y doy la bienvenida a cualquier otro miembro de la comunidad de RAC para intervenir también.

Sé que tengo tiempo limitado, así que sólo quiero hacer una nota de que estas diapositivas están disponibles en nuestro sitio web, NewburghCleanWaterProject.org, en la pestaña RAC. Siguiente diapositiva, por favor. Gracias.

Así que estas son diferentes hojas de clasificación de muestra. Y como se puede ver en la parte inferior izquierda, esta hoja de trabajo de aguas subterráneas que se ve en
la naranja, la vía de migración y los factores receptores, por lo que esas son algunas de las cosas que se nos puntizó en que John estaba ilustrando en sus mapas. Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Así que aquí, para aquellos nuevos en la situación, esta es una especie de verdadera vista a vista de pájaro de los diferentes derrames que hemos tenido a lo largo de las pocas décadas a partir de 1990. Verás en la parte inferior derecha, 4.000 galones de la Base Aérea, y luego también tenemos derrames desde el aeropuerto, así como áreas de pruebas y un incendio. Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Así que el DEC, el regulador -- el Department of Environmental Conservation, el organismo regulador, sí determinó que la Air Base era la principal fuente de la contaminación en nuestras aguas. Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Y esto te muestra, si ves en amarillo, tenemos el aeropuerto y la Air Base, la Stewart Air National Guard Air Base, SANG. Este es
un mapa topográfico. Este es el punto más alto de nuestra tierra. Así que estas dos fuentes de contaminación, los contaminantes corren por la colina desde allí. Y como pueden ver, ahí es donde está Washington Lake, hacia el fondo, y luego Browns Pond hacia el fondo de la pantalla. Ese es nuestro depósito de respaldo. Para todos los residentes de Newburgh en la llamada, tenemos agua limpia en este momento que viene a través de Catskill acueducto. Una vez más, esta es una fuente de agua temporal que el New York State realmente paga -- o nuestra ciudad paga primero y luego el estado, ya sabes, nos reembolsa. Así que hay cierta preocupación allí. Todos sabemos que con COVID, el presupuesto del estado está muy afectado. ¿Cuánto durará nuestro acceso a ese suministro de agua? Así que ese es nuestro sentido de urgencia en este momento. Necesitamos un sistema de filtro provisional de trabajo que funcione por encima de un evento de lluvia de media pulgada. Y, ya sabes, tenemos -- nuestra ciudad tiene un
agua -- un sistema granular de filtración de carbono activado. Desafortunadamente, no saca todos esos químicos de PFAS de cadena corta que John estaba preguntando y hablando con. Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Estos son mapas del Orange County. Estas son más instantáneas. Como se puede ver, la contaminación del suelo y el agua, las áreas amarillas resaltadas, así que a la izquierda, estas son para el PFOS, el principal contaminante que hemos estado mirando. El PFOS es uno de los 5.000 productos químicos PFAS. Sabemos de 12 que han entrado en nuestro agua potable -- en Washington Lake, nuestro embalse. Así que se puede ver que es -- la parte inferior izquierda, 5.620 partes por billón, y eso es para -- el suelo está a la izquierda, y luego a la derecha es el agua -- ya sabes, diferentes salidas con los niveles de contaminación PFOS en el agua. Así que del informe DEC, el sedimento Rec Pond -- así que Rec Pond es el cuerpo de agua que está en nuestra cuenca hidrográfica. Nuestra agua
llega a través de eso y fluye a través de varios cuerpos en el Washington Lake. Y las muestras de sedimentos allí oscilan entre 2.140 partes por billón y 424.000 partes por billón. Así que es significativo. Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Y luego también tenemos que ver qué otras fuentes de contaminación hay. En este momento, la Port Authority no está sobre la mesa, pero como se puede ver, y creo que esto podría haber estado relacionado con el derrame, pero en la parte inferior izquierda, de nuevo, el número resaltado, es decir, casi 2 millones de partes por billón de PFOS. Corrijeme a mí, a cualquiera, si estoy leyendo estos números mal. Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Contaminación corporal. ¿De qué estamos hablando? Así que el New York Department of Health, en su primera ronda de bio-monitoreo, tuvimos casi 4.000 personas probadas. De esos participantes, las personas que estaban en el agua de la ciudad de Newburgh, por lo que presumiblemente
residentes de Newburgh, 1.917 personas fueron probadas. Y no sabemos cuánto tiempo, necesariamente, habían estado viviendo en la ciudad y expuestos a la sustancia química, pero como se puede ver aquí, esas personas, sus tasas, la acumulación en su cuerpo de estos tres contaminantes es más alta que la media nacional. Así que PFOA es dos veces mayor; el PFOS es tres veces. Y esta de la que no hemos oído hablar mucho, PFHxS, fue siete veces. Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Y luego, si profundizamos un poco más en eso, podemos ver eso, de esas casi 2.000 personas, así que nuestro promedio nacional es de 5,20 y 18,5. Lo siento, esto es un poco denso. Si vas a la siguiente diapositiva, puedo mostrarte los números. Así que el 91% de nuestros residentes de la ciudad probado por encima del promedio nacional para el percentil 50\(^{th}\) de PFOS. 53% de nuestros residentes de la ciudad eran muy altos, por lo que estaban en el percentil 95, 53% por encima del promedio nacional.
Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Así que sólo nos queda un minuto.
Muchos de ustedes pueden estar familiarizados con estos riesgos para la salud, y pueden aprender más en nuestro sitio web, pero obviamente son muy preocupantes. Esto está en la parte superior de los residentes que ya han sido - nuestro departamento de agua de la ciudad está haciendo un gran trabajo. Como usted sabe, nuestra ciudad es antigua y tiene tuberías de servicio de plomo, así que la gente ha estado expuesta a plomo, PFAS, y PCPs en el río. Así que esta es una comunidad de justicia ambiental, y obviamente, nuestro sitio necesita ser una prioridad para la limpieza. Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.

Este es un testimonio de Cynthia Mack, quien es una ex miembro de RAC y trabaja en el sistema escolar. Su propio hijo murió de cáncer. Vivía frente a la Base Aérea. Otro niño ha llegado con un cáncer raro. Y ha testificado que innumerables estudiantes están luchando actualmente contra
el cáncer infantil, y otros están experimentando deficiencia neurológica e inmune, por lo que esto necesita ser visto. Siguiente diapositiva, por favor.
Voy a parar ahí. Puede encontrar nuestras diapositivas, de nuevo, en nuestro sitio web. Sólo quiero pasárselo a Bill. Gracias por su tiempo.

SR. WILLIAM FETTER:

Hola a todos. ¿Puedes oírme?

¿Pueden oírme todos?

Sra. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Podemos, Bill. Y sólo quería decir muy rápido, quiero darle el tiempo para hablar de sus diapositivas, pero si usted puede ser lo más breve posible para que podamos pasar a la siguiente sección, se lo agradecería.

SR. WILLIAM FETTER:

No necesitamos hablar a través de las diapositivas. La gente puede mirarlos por su cuenta. Se han presentado los comentarios técnicos. Así que sólo un par de preguntas ampliadas. No te preocupes por las
diapositivas en este punto, en realidad. La gente puede leerlo en su — son más técnicos que informativos, creo.

Un par de cosas, sin embargo. En el informe de monitoreo a largo plazo de la sección 4, se habla de cómo determinados componentes han afectado a la calidad de las aguas subterráneas. Creo que eso debería ser un poco más claro, y decir negativamente afectado como mínimo, si no peor. Creo que es un poco demasiado amortiguado para decir afectado, que, ya sabes, está en tu competencia. Pero volvamos a la sección 3.6 y algunos de los gráficos. Al examinar los MDL de supervisión a largo plazo, cambia la secuencia media (o alguien lo hizo) a mitad de curso, en los MDL para ciertos parámetros. Se plantearon los MDL. Me preguntaba por qué cambiarías los métodos si estamos buscando estos compuestos y vas a lo que parece ser un tipo analítico menos sensible. No sé si tienes una respuesta a eso en este momento o no. Siento no haber notado el gráfico. He estado trabajando mi camino a través de estas
cosas por un par de días.

De vuelta al vertedero, no al vertedero, sino al aeropuerto. Durante el trabajo de la cámara que hiciste, miles de pies dijiste que habían terminado, ¿había una razón para no perseguir el drenaje sospechoso en el clima seco cuando dijiste que tenías -- detectó el flujo húmedo en condiciones climáticas secas? No parece que se persiguieran los laterales durante el trabajo de la cámara basado en el gráfico que se proporcionó en el informe. Parece que acabas de hacer el perímetro alrededor del delantal, con los muchos puntos que están flacidez y abiertos. Es muy bueno verlo. Me detendré cuando alguien quiera tener alguna información aquí, o si quieres esperar hasta que todo esté hecho.

Hay un análisis en la carga saliendo del estanque de detención, Rec Pond. Creo que usas 400 gramos por minuto -- y Kerry, correcto si me equivoco aquí, no quiero llevar esto demasiado lejos -- de PFOS/PFOA pasando el vertedero, supongo. 400 -- 400,
si, creo que fueron gramos por minuto.
Espero que no sean galones por minuto ahora.
No, tenía que ser gramos por minuto. Eso se traduce en 1.200 libras al día. No sé si era sólo un modelo que ejecutaste, o si eso se basa en números reales, resultados. Si hay 1.200 libras al día derramando sobre esa represa, eso tiene que ser encontrado bastante rápido. Y si me equivoco, tienes que corregirme ahora mismo para que no vaya más allá. Con eso, creo que he dicho demasiado. Es todo. Sí, gracias.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Gracias, Bill. Muy rápido, Kerry, no sé si estabas prestando atención a esa última pregunta sobre si eran gramos o galones pasando por encima de la presa. ¿Tienes una respuesta rápida para eso?

SR. KERRY TULL:

Eso suena extraño, en la parte alta, como Bill sospechaba. Si Nicole y yo leemos eso -- ciertamente querríamos ver cualquiera de estas preguntas, son preguntas muy buenas y relevantes, Bill, pero nos gustaría verlas
por correo electrónico o como usted podría transmitirlas.

Responderé rápidamente a su pregunta con respecto al límite de detección del método. Nadie eligió el límite de detección del método. El límite de detección del método se establece en el laboratorio del instrumento. El límite de detección del método está por debajo del nivel de notificación real del límite de detección, que de nuevo está muy por debajo del estándar establecido por el estado o la entidad gubernamental. Así que el límite de detección del método -- de nuevo, no soy un químico, no soy una persona de laboratorio -- pero la configuración superficial básica es configurar un MDL que luego a su vez dará al laboratorio la capacidad de ver si está por debajo o por encima del límite de informes, que de nuevo está muy por debajo del estándar con el que están trabajando.

SR. WILLIAM FETTER:

No tuve la oportunidad de ver los informes de laboratorio reales para ver eso,
si se cambiaron los métodos. Pensé que tal vez el método menos costoso se empleó para ahorrar dinero para otros esfuerzos.

SR. KERRY TULL:

No, no. El método --

SR. WILLIAM FETTER:

El mismo método durante veinte años.

SR. KERRY TULL:

Claro, sí. Así que el método se acuerda en el plan, en el plan de muestreo y análisis, que es revisado por el estado, que todo el mundo firma y está de acuerdo. No hay variación allí.

SR. WILLIAM FETTER:

Entendido. Gracias. Creo que el resto de mis comentarios y preguntas están claros en el papeleo. Sí, gracias.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

En este momento me gustaría pasar a nuestro período de preguntas y comentarios públicos para que tengamos esos 20 minutos para abordarlos. Una vez más, si por favor envíe esas preguntas en el módulo de preguntas, abordaremos todas las que podamos
llegar a esta noche. Si no podemos abordar
todas las preguntas, las descargaremos y
responderemos a las preguntas por escrito
después de la reunión. También habrá una
oportunidad -- vamos a poner la diapositiva
en un minuto. Si hay preguntas que parecen
después de la reunión, María ha sido tan
maravillosa para recoger las de la RAC y
presentarlas a nosotros. Con suerte, ella
estarán dispuesta a hacer eso de nuevo para
esta reunión. Realmente lo apreciamos. Así
que por favor continúe enviando esas
preguntas.

Primero, Anthony Grice, quiero que
sepas que no perdimos la noción de tu
pregunta. Tú serás el primero. Su pregunta
es: ¿Significa eso que Washington Lake estará
de vuelta en la lista para la corrección para
el próximo año? Creo, Nicole, que esa
pregunta es para ti o Keith.

SRA. NICOLE WIREMAN:

Yo me quedo con eso. Una vez más, no
estoy seguro por la pregunta. Remediarr el
Washington Lake en sí no sería parar. Una
vez más, el proceso para abordar la contaminación y limpiar la contaminación está más adelante a medida que avanzamos en el proceso CERCLA a través de la investigación de remediación y el estudio de viabilidad. Lo que creo de dónde puede venir esa pregunta es porque entró, creo, justo después de que estaba hablando de esa diapositiva que tuvimos con respecto a la investigación de remediación y cuándo sucederá. Y una vez más, quiero decir que el propósito de esa diapositiva era decir que el proceso RRSE considera la fuente de agua potable original, y por lo tanto, la comunidad no es penalizada por elegir una fuente alternativa. Pero nuestras evaluaciones de RRSE están en curso. La Air National Guard está utilizando este proceso para evaluar todas nuestras instalaciones donde se han completado los SI para PFOS y PFOA. Y a medida que desarrollemos información, podremos compartirla con usted. Pero en este momento, no podemos decir qué instalaciones tendrán las RIs ejecutadas en el año fiscal 21.
SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Gracias, Nicole. Y el concejal Grice, le he desatado. ¿Tiene alguna otra pregunta relacionada con eso?

SR. ANTHONY GRICE:

Así que eso era parte de ello. Realmente se basó en ese artículo, porque, ya sabes, si hubiera una oportunidad para Washington -- bueno, no Washington Lake -- para que Rec Pond fuera reparado, eso sería preferible, especialmente si fuera el año que viene. Si bien entendemos que hay un proceso para ello, que uno nos dio cierta preocupación inmediata. Y así, creo que John y Mary realmente hablaron bien a este sentido de urgencia que tenemos para Washington Lake -- y no sólo para Washington Lake, sino para todo el área circundante. Así que eso fue todo.

Y luego mi otra pregunta, mientras tengo el micrófono, estaba en el filtro provisional que está en Rec Pond. ¿Por qué es provisional? Si parece estar funcionando bastante decentemente, ya sabes, o mejor que
el primero, ¿por qué no puede seguir continuando?

SR. ROBERT SUBASAVAGE:

Yo me quedo con esa. Así que es provisional, así que se puso antes de que la inspección del sitio se completó, obviamente antes de la investigación de remediación. Así que no es la solución definitiva para limpiar el PFAS en la Stewart Air National Guard Base. Es una solución provisional para retenernos para hacer algo para mitigar los impactos del PFAS por un momento dado. Como se ha discutido, no está capturando todo. Por eso es una solución provisional hasta que se pueda implementar una solución completa más desarrollada. ¿Eso ayuda?

SR. ANTHONY GRICE:

Sí.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Gracias. En este punto, me gustaría seguir adelante y asegurarme de llegar a algunas otras preguntas. En el módulo de preguntas, el siguiente es de Rick Shoyer. ¿Podría la Air National Guard proporcionar
gráficos de tendencias históricos para los
compuestos de aguas subterráneas de interés
reportados por encima de los límites y las
concentraciones de gas en vertederos para el
Sitio 3?

SRA. NICOLE WIREMAN:

Así que Kerry, corrígeme si me
equivoco en eso, pero sé que hay esos tipos
de gráficos históricos en el informe de
monitoreo a largo plazo que se remontan a
cuando comenzó el monitoreo a largo plazo. Y
así Kerry, ¿esos gráficos hablan de esta
pregunta?

SR. KERRY TULL:

Los gráficos, o cualquiera de esa
información de fondo, tendríamos que
reunirnos. No tengo eso disponible. Pero sí,
tienes razón, Nicole.

SRA. NICOLE WIREMAN:

Así que están en el informe que
actualmente están siendo revisados por los
miembros de RAC. Bien. Y eso me da la
oportunidad, por cierto, de que un comentario
que había querido decir antes era que sí
recibimos comentarios de los miembros de la RAC. Bill, muchas gracias por sus extensos comentarios sobre el informe LTM del Sitio 3. Los recibimos el 19 de octubre y hemos preparado respuestas a esos comentarios. Sin embargo, el período de comentarios es hasta - para las partes interesadas como los miembros de la RAC - hasta el día 30, y no estábamos seguros de si ese era el conjunto completo de comentarios de DEC en el informe del Sitio 3. Creo que la forma en que llegó, dijo, comentarios personales con su nombre. Y así- ya sabes, después del 30, responderemos con respuestas escritas, y cubrirá todas las preguntas, Bill, que ya has presentado. Y para aquellos que se preguntan en el futuro, siempre ponemos nuestras respuestas a los comentarios en un apéndice en el reverso del informe final. A eso me refería anteriormente sobre el informe SI ampliado. Por lo tanto, responderemos a la RAC sobre ellos específicamente, pero luego se incluirán en el informe que está disponible para el público.
SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Gracias. Nuestra siguiente pregunta es también de Rick Shoyer. He dice: New York State DEC, en octubre de 2020, proporcionó sus directrices actualizadas del PFAS. Las directrices requieren el análisis de 21 compuestos de PFAS. La presentación sólo analiza PFOS/PFOA. ¿La Air National Guard cumplirá con las pautas actualizadas del New York DEC para reportar 21 compuestos del PFAS? Creo que fue un poco abordado. No sé si Nicole, Jessica o alguien más quería, ¿quizás Robert quería comentar eso? –

SRA. NICOLE WIREMAN:

Seguro. Yo me ocuparé de eso. Así que seguiremos las directrices del Department of Defense en cuanto a los métodos analíticos que se utilizan, por lo que 537.1 modificado, y el número de analitos asociados con eso. Así que cuando comience la investigación correctiva, seguiremos esa política.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Gracias. También de Rick Shoyer: El carbono
es eficaz para PFOA y PFOS, pero mucho menos eficaz para el PFAS de cadena corta. El uso de carbono por un segundo recipiente que sustituya una resina será engañoso para el público. Proporcione una lista completa de los compuestos de PFAS analizados. ¿Alguien quiere comentar sobre eso?

SRA. JESSICA FREHSE:

Así que esta es Jessica Frehse. Creo que revisar toda la lista completa de esta llamada sería un poco mucho. Podemos proporcionar eso por escrito cuando respondemos a preguntas. Puede Google el método EPA 537.1, o mirar nuestras notas técnicas y ver la lista completa de analitos allí.

SR. ROBERT SUBASAVAGE:

Me gustaría hacer un seguimiento de eso también. Vale la pena señalar que había una resina de carbono, ahora hay carbono-carbono-resina. Así que todavía tiene la resina en su lugar como la ronda de pulido, eliminando el PFAS de cadena corta. Así que
todavía hay una resina en su lugar.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Gracias, Robert. Entonces tenemos algunas preguntas viniendo de Gina Calderón. Y uno es sobre la ubicación del registro administrativo. Gretchen, que está dirigiendo nuestras diapositivas, te voy a pedir que vuelvas a esa diapositiva administrativa. Esa diapositiva en la parte superior proporciona la ubicación del registro administrativo. Así que pondremos eso en la pantalla para ti, Gina. Puede tomar unos minutos, así que danos tiempo, y pasaremos a tu siguiente pregunta. ¿Cuál será el nivel de activación final para cambiar los medios filtrantes -- actualmente son 35 partes por billón- dado que el New York State ha establecido niveles máximos en 10 partes por billón?

SR. ROBERT SUBASAVAGE:

Yo me quedo con eso. Actualmente, el nivel de activación para el cambio de medios va a ser de 35 partes por billón, pero eso está entre el GAC y la resina. Y eso,
obviamente, también pasa por la resina. Así que para nosotros, el cambio seguirá siendo de 35, pero el efluente, como hemos visto, ha estado bastante por debajo de 5 partes por billón todo el tiempo.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Gracias. La siguiente pregunta, creo que es de Tamsin Hollo. ¿Cuál será el nivel de activación final para cambiar los medios filtrantes -- actualmente 35 partes por billón -- dado que -- creo que acabamos de cubrir eso? Lo siento. Karen Johnson.

Beaver Dam tiene afluentes que vienen directamente de Moodna Creek, y el lago tiene un nivel muy alto de fósforo, y en las secciones profundas del lago, hay un problema con la oxigenación. ¿Qué se está haciendo con los contaminantes que siguen llegando a nuestro lago?

SRA. NICOLE WIREMAN:

En este momento, en la inspección del sitio y la inspección ampliada del sitio, nos hemos centrado en el Washington Lake porque esa es la fuente de agua potable que Rec Pond
alimenta desde Silver Stream. Nosotros, en
la investigación de remediación, haremos un
análisis completo de la naturaleza y la
extensión para determinar si hay otras vías
que podrían estar conduciendo a las otras
fuentes de agua potable que se están
mencionando. Pero quiero dejar claro que eso
es sólo si determinamos que hay actividades
relacionadas con la misión ANG que condujeron
a esa contaminación. Así que hemos hablado
antes de cómo esto es un problema nacional y
hay múltiples fuentes de contaminación por
PFAS. El propósito de nuestra investigación
correctiva es examinar las fuentes derivadas
de la actividad de la Stewart Air National
Guard.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Gracias. Y luego nuestra siguiente
pregunta. ¿Cómo se gestiona y elimina la
eliminación de los medios, la arena, los
filtros de bolsas, el carbono y la resina?

SR. ROBERT SUBASAVAGE:

Entiendo. Así que lo tomaré. En
este momento, en cuanto a la arena, ya sabes,
la arena se está reutilizando. Filtros de bolsa, lo aplazaré a Doug. Y luego gastó los medios, así que el carbono y la resina gastada de la -- vamos a ver, que fue el final de -- o el cambio de principios de septiembre. Creo que fue por incineración. ¿Puedes confirmarlo, Doug?

SR. DOUG CLOSE:

Los tres flujos de residuos primarios, los filtros de bolsa, el carbono, la resina, están siendo enviados a una instalación de incineración, Covanta. Y estamos usando una ubicación en el estado de Indiana en este momento.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Gracias. Nuestra siguiente pregunta es de Dan Shapley. En relación con las pruebas del sistema interino de aguas pluviales y los niveles de cribado utilizados en la inspección ampliada del sitio, ¿puede explicar la razón para el uso del método 537 modificado de la EPA? El método 537 de la EPA incluye 18 PFAS, mientras que el método modificado incluye sólo 6 PFAS. La EPA tiene
otros métodos validados, pero no puede medir eficazmente 29 PFAS, particularmente cuando se trata de la eficacia de un filtro y el hecho de que las espumas de extinción de incendios AFFF han incluido varias formulaciones a lo largo del tiempo con múltiples PFAS. Es importante medir el mayor número posible de PFAS.

SR. KERRY TULL:

Esta pregunta surge con frecuencia. Lo que está pasando en el mundo comercial frente a lo que puede pasar en el mundo del Departament of Defense son dos cosas diferentes. La U.S. Navy, entre otros, lidera el camino para el Departament of Defense para la administración y la detección de nuevos métodos a medida que salen. En pocas palabras, estos nuevos métodos no han cumplido con todos los estándares de prueba como se requiere en el DoD. Puede que eventualmente, pero esa es la razón por la que me proporcionaron hace tres meses cuando esto surgió.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:
Gracias. Así que nuestra siguiente pregunta -- Creo que están empezando a alejarse de mí un poco. Los vasos de tratamiento instalados por la ciudad de Newburgh -- en realidad, no sé si esa es una pregunta. Seguimos adelante. Este es de Tamsin Hollo. ¿Qué tan transparente será el proceso de puntuación? ¿Podremos ver nuestra puntuación o tener información de nuestra comunidad? Y para que conste, odio la idea de competir con otras comunidades afectadas por recursos para remediar nuestro sitio y proteger a nuestros residentes.

SRA. NICOLE WIREMAN:

Puedo responder a eso. Creo que está hablando del proceso de evaluación del sitio de riesgo relativo, y eso es algo que eventualmente informaremos a la RAC en la medida en que específicamente cómo se completó para Stewart. No podemos decir en este momento exactamente cuándo sucederá, pero sucederá en una reunión de RAC.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Esta será nuestra última pregunta.
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Una vez más, vamos a descargar y responder a las preguntas adicionales en nuestro módulo. Así que si tienes alguna pregunta final, por favor hazlas entrar. Nuestra última pregunta viene de Rick Shoyer. La guía de la New York State DEC en octubre de 2020 tiene 2 partes por billón para el agua y 0,5 partes por mil millones para el suelo. ¿Fueron estos los límites de notificación obtenidos por el laboratorio?

SRA. NICOLE WIREMAN:

Creo que Doug necesita hablar con eso. No sé los límites específicos de la presentación de informes.

Sr. KERRY TULL:

No, no estoy al tanto de lo que Doug está trabajando en este momento. Los límites de presentación de informes en los que trabajamos, nuestro trabajo es el que es -- de nuevo, necesita coincidir con la metodología aprobada por la EPA.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Gracias, Kerry. Doug o Jessica, ¿tienes algo que añadir? Eso termina
nuestros 20 minutos para nuestros
comentarios. Gracias de nuevo a todos los
que vinieron y participaron en la reunión de
esta noche. Como acabo de mencionar, vamos a
descargar las preguntas y proporcionar
respuestas por escrito. También puede
comunícarse con María y formular preguntas a
través, creo, el 15 de noviembre para
nuestras preguntas que pueden llegar después
de la reunión. Me gustaría abrirlo de nuevo
al coronel Kelly o al coronel Cook y a Chuck
Thomas si quieren hacer algún comentario de
cierre antes de que terminemos por la noche.

COL. EDWARD COOK:

Sólo quería darles las gracias a
todos por su participación y su tiempo esta
noche. Sé que hay muchas cosas que están
pasando que compiten por nuestro valioso
tiempo, pero esto es importante para nosotros
como comunidad e importante para nosotros
como el ala 105th Airlift Wing. Queremos
hacer todo lo posible para seguir abordándolo
e impulsar el problema lo mejor que podamos.
Gracias a todos, y los mejores
deseos para unas felices fiestas. Sí, gracias.

SRA. HEATHER PFEIFFER:

Volveré a recordar a todos, por favor inserte sus preguntas o envíelas a Mary. Una vez más, me gustaría dar la bienvenida a nuestros dos nuevos miembros de la RAC que comenzarán en febrero en nuestra primera reunión del Año Nuevo. Una vez más, eso será en febrero de 2021. Y luego me gustaría dar las gracias a todos nuestros miembros por su servicio aquí. Y para los miembros salientes, realmente, de nuevo, apreciamos su tiempo y comentarios. Doy las gracias a todos por estar con nosotros y pasar el tiempo. Gracias a Chuck por su servicio como copresidente del año. Gracias a los miembros de la comunidad de RAC por la presentación. Creo que estos son definitivamente temas que vamos a recoger, incluso en futuras reuniones. Una vez más, esperamos recibir esos comentarios sobre la supervisión a largo plazo de RAC para el Sitio 3. Cualquier otra pregunta de la presentación de esta noche,
por favor envíelas junto con sus otras preguntas para que podamos asegurarnos de responder a esas preguntas. Que tengan una buena noche, y los veremos a todos, con suerte, en febrero.
Advertising Tear Sheets
Maloney Lobbies For Wastewater Testing For Covid

NEWBURGH - Federal, state, and local officials from Newburgh, Wednesday, urged the federal government to move forward with stimulus funding, specifically for waste-water treatment testing for COVID 19.

Following a four-week pilot program by the state in September, utilizing the technology in four areas including Newburgh, the testing was found to be successful for detecting the RNA in COVID within large populations. According to Representative Sean Maloney (D- NY18), the testing can find a single case of COVID 19 within a population of two million people.

Maloney shared an example of how the testing has been used on college campuses and how if utilized in other targeted populations can greatly reduce the spread by identifying asymptomatic individuals who would likely go untested.

“If you were testing the wastewater, you would know immediately when somebody who has this genetic material and is shedding it is in the population. You could do that for the City of Newburgh. You could do that for a nursing home. You could do that for a meatpacking plant. You could do that for a college dormitory and in fact, this has been done and it has been done successfully,” said Maloney.

He likened the testing to a tsunami warning system.

“Instead of waiting to see the tsunami come onshore, you know hours ahead of time because there’s a buoy out in the ocean that tells you it’s coming. That gives you the time to evacuate and save lives. It’s exactly the same thing,” said Maloney. “If we had days, or weeks, of notification on things like nursing homes, or meat packing plants, or prisons, or a whole community we will save lives,” he said.

The entire pilot program cost $500,000 to implement across Newburgh, Albany, Onondaga County and Buffalo. The funding came from the state; however, now that the pilot is over, federal funding would be required. This funding could come from the Hero’s Act, or another form of federal stimulus, should a compromise be made. There is also the fact of deadlines being as far out as December, when a second wave of COVID is expected to reach the state and nation.

Newburgh Mayor Torrance Harvey, along with his state and federal colleagues, asked the feds to not treat something like COVID prevention funding as a political issue.

“This is, again, not about partisan politics. This is about human lives, human lives that we’ve lost,” said Harvey. “We’ve lost over 200,000 people to this virus, here in the United States of America and we’re in our second round of this Coronavirus and we’re seeing the test positives tick up and we’re starting to see that there’s another situation here in the fall of 2020,” he said.

During the pilot program, COVID 19 positive results were found from the wastewater testing; however, officials said the numbers are very low in Newburgh and the rest of the Hudson Valley.
Hollander Named to the NWH Foundation Board

MOUNT KISCO - Seth H. Hollander has been named to the Board of Directors of the Northern Westchester Hospital (NWH) Foundation. The announcement was made by NWH Foundation Board Chair Angela Kessel.

“Seth Hollander brings the Foundation extensive expertise in investment management and has a longstanding relationship with Northern Westchester Hospital, and deep roots in the community,” says Ms. Kessel. “He has been an enthusiastic supporter of the hospital for more than a decade and, most recently, gave generously to the COVID-19 Emergency Response Fund.”

Keeva Young-Wright, President of Northern Westchester Hospital’s Foundation added, “Having dedicated members of the community like Seth step forward to represent the hospital and the hospital’s Foundation in the community is so important. Seth and his peers on the Foundation Board help us to raise millions of dollars each year which go directly towards creating patient programs, purchasing lifesaving clinical equipment and making important capital improvements.”

Hollander works for Kohlberg & Company, where he serves as a member of the firm’s investment committee, and is responsible for leading the execution and monitoring of certain new and existing Kohlberg investments. He joined Kohlberg in 2001 and was named a Partner in 2008.

Prior to joining Kohlberg & Company, Hollander was with Bear, Stearns & Co.

He is a member of the board of directors of Nelipak; Nellson; Sara Lee® Frozen Bakery; and Stanadyne Corporation.

Hollander received a B.B.A. from the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. He lives in South Salem with his wife Cassie and their son and two daughters.

About Northern Westchester Hospital

Northern Westchester Hospital (NWH), a member of Northwell Health, provides quality, patient-centered care that is close to home through a unique combination of medical expertise, leading-edge technology, and a commitment to humanity. Over 650 highly-skilled physicians, state-of-the-art technology and professional staff of caregivers are all in place to ensure that you and your family receive treatment in a caring, respectful and nurturing environment. NWH has established extensive internal quality measurements that surpass the standards defined by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) and the Hospital Quality Alliance (HQA) National Hospital Quality Measures. Our high-quality standards help to ensure that the treatment you receive at NWH is among the best in the nation. For more information, please visit www.nwhc.net and connect with us on Facebook.

About Northwell Health

Northwell Health is New York State’s largest health care provider and private employer, with 23 hospitals, nearly 800 outpatient facilities and more than 14,200 affiliated physicians. We care for over two million people annually in the New York metro area and beyond, thanks to philanthropic support from our communities. Our 72,000 employees – 17,000-plus nurses and 4,500 employed doctors, including members of Northwell Health Physician Partners – are working to change health care for the better. We’re making breakthroughs in medicine at the Feinstein Institutes for Medical Research. We’re training the next generation of medical professionals at the visionary Donald and Barbara Zucker School of Medicine at Hofstra/Northwell and the Hofstra Northwell School of Nursing and Physician Assistant Studies.
GREENWOOD LAKE - Senator Jen Metzger recently announced a $400,000 award secured by her office for Rumshock Veterans Foundation (RVF) to acquire the land for “Victory Village,” a tiny home community that will be built to serve veterans confronting housing insecurity and homelessness. Senator Metzger made the announcement at the Greenwood Lake Elks Lodge 2067, and was joined by U.S. Congressman Sean Patrick Maloney, Assemblyman Karl Brabenec, and local leaders and veterans organizations.

Beyond offering a self-sustaining residential community for veterans, Victory Village will also offer employment and profit-sharing through hydroponic farming, a veterans transportation service, an e-waste recycling program, and an education center within Victory Village for veterans to learn energy technology and business skills. RVF, the non-profit organization leading this project, is dedicated to supporting veterans facing challenges as a result of military service. Senator Metzger said, “The best way to honor the service of our veterans, who sacrifice so much for us, is to make sure they have the resources they need to lead healthy and prosperous lives. This innovative initiative of the Rumshock Veterans Foundation not only meets a critical housing need for veterans facing homelessness, but also creates the kind of supportive community that will help our veterans thrive. I am so excited about this project and thrilled to announce this grant to help move it forward.”

Rumshock Veterans Foundation President Bill Whetsel said, “Veterans defend the definition of what it means to be an American. When their tour of duty is over, they need to know we are there for them like they were there for us. Rumshock’s mission is to let our veterans know we care and support them. We are very grateful for Senator Metzger’s support of Rumshock’s vision; she has provided us with a tremendous leap forward.”

U.S. Representative Sean Patrick Maloney (NY-18) said, “We owe our veterans so much, and when they come home after serving our country it’s up to us to serve them. It’s an honor to be here today celebrating the Rumshock Veterans Foundation, and the great work Senator Metzger has done securing $400,000 for the Victory Village. This project will be integral in helping veterans here in Orange County, and will improve access to reliable housing, health care and job skills.”

New York State Assemblyman Karl Brabenec (AD-98) said, “Our veterans deserve the best from all of us in honor of their sacrifices to defend our freedoms. The Victory Village project’s receiving $400,000 for a tiny home community gives veterans a second chance. I’m thrilled that these veterans are being given an opportunity to be members of a supportive community.”

Orange County Executive Steven M. Neuhaus said, “Those serving domestically and overseas provide critical national security services. When military service ends, having new opportunities in housing, education, and career choice is so important for our veterans. I want all who served to know there is opportunity for them here in Orange County and look forward to continuing to work with officials at all levels of government to create them for these brave men and women.”

New York State Senator Jen Metzger (SD-42) said, “We owe our veterans so much, and when they come home after serving our country it’s up to us to serve them. It’s an honor to be here today celebrating the Rumshock Veterans Foundation, and the great work Senator Metzger has done securing $400,000 for the Victory Village. This project will be integral in helping veterans here in Orange County, and will improve access to reliable housing, health care and job skills.”

New York State Assemblyman Karl Brabenec (AD-98), U.S. Representative Sean Patrick Maloney (NY-18), New York State Senator Jen Metzger (SD-42), Rumshock Veterans Foundation Board President Bill Whetsel, Rumshock Veterans Foundation Board VP Frank Messina, Orange County Veterans Services Agency Director Christian Farrell, and Commander Tom Mulcahy of the Greenwood Lake American Legion Arthur Finnegan Post 1443.
OBITUARIES
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Y New Paltz with her Bachelor of Science degree in education. She was graduated from Shelly Bittoli, and Kristi Filinigan.

Karen "Karinski" Sullivan

Karen "Karinski" Sullivan, known throughout our family as "Fifi," died on October 30, 2009, at 8:45 a.m. at Golden Gate Nursing Home, Newburgh.
**Meadow Hill**

Kids go on a pumpkin-picking adventure!

I remembered that the real world was wide,
And that a varied field of hopes and fears,
Of sensations and excitement, awaited those who had courage to go forth into its expanse.”

Charlotte Bronte

Students in Miss Kathy’s class, at Miss Cindy’s Nursery School were excited to visit Lawrence Farms Orchards and go apple picking on a perfectly beautiful autumn day. The prize treat for every boy and girl was making apple sauce in their classroom, and it was a merry-making success, and a little lesson on Johnny Appleseed. Every school child knows about Johnny Appleseed and his great love of apples, and what he liked to do best in the whole world was to plant an apple seed. He knew the seed would grow into a sturdy apple tree, because he had been doing this down trees and build homes. Soon, the wagons were gone, and he said to himself, “I wish I could go.”

Now, Johnny had a little scare, when he heard his Guardian Angel speaking to him, and telling him he was really needed in the West. Not to cut down trees, but to plant them because the pioneers will need apple trees. And as a little nudge, his Guardian Angel said, “Why Johnny Appleseed, you just think of the things that apples make, and be sure to hum or sing this merry little song, as you go along. There’s apple pies and apple fritters, apple coes to feed the critters, tasty apple cider in a glass. There’s apples baked and boiled and frizzled, and there’s always good old apple sauce.”

However, the dear man was afraid because he had no knife or gun, but the good angel reminded him that all he needed was a little pot to cook in, a stalk of apple seed, and the Good Book to read. And the rest is history, as Jonathan Chapman, the real Johnny Appleseed, made friends of all the animals who guided him on his way, and every man, woman, and child knew about Johnny Appleseed and his good angel.

The Restoration Advisory Committee for Stewart Air National Guard Base will hold a meeting on October 28, 2020 at 6 p.m. The meeting will be held virtually and is open to the public. Use the link below to register for the meeting and receive your unique access link and call-in information. For more information call 845-563-2075.

**Meeting Registration Link:**
https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/508390798066870539

Mid-Hudson Chapter of the Adirondack Mountain Club will enjoy an easy, four-miles walk around Chadwick Lake Park on Saturday, Oct. 31. The walk is on a beautiful trail around the perimeter of Chadwick Lake in the Town of Newburgh during the peak of the Fall foliage season in our area.

Chadwick Lake is a reservoir supplying water to the Town of Newburgh. It was created in 1936 by damming the Quassaick Creek. The reservoir is used as a backup to the NYC water supply. It is located immediately to the northwest of the junction of State Routes 32 and 300 in the Cronomer Valley section of Newburgh. Please contact leader, John Ragusa, (917) 692-1169 or jjoy1869@msn.com, for time and meeting place. Hike will be canceled if there are no takers. Bring a picnic lunch, Max of eight people.

May you always have an angel at your side.
Judicial seats up for grabs

Continued from page 1

She also practiced civil law for four years at a Hudson Valley law firm and worked at the Orange County Attorney's office for 13 years where she made her way to being the chief assistant county attorney.

More recently, Kim serves as the court attorney for Orange County Court Judge William L. DeProspo and has been since 2013.

She has also served on the Critique Faculty within the New York State Bar Association's Trial Advocacy Program at Cornell University School of Law.

She resides in Newburgh, although she is an immigrant who came here when she was three years old. Her family moved to Philadelphia originally, but Kim relocated to Orange County over twenty years ago with her husband, who is a fourth-generation Orange County resident.

If elected, Kim would be the first woman sitting as an Orange County Court Judge.

“I want to stress that I’m asking people to vote for me based on my qualifications because I do have extensive skills and legal knowledge that I do want to bring to the judiciary,” said Kim. “With that being said, if history is made by my election because I am the most qualified, I would be very proud of that as well.”

Family court judge

For the position of family court judge, Democrat Maria Patrizio is challenging the incumbent Republican Family Court Judge Carol Klein for re-election. The family court judge differs from the county court judge in that this judge makes decisions around foster care, where children are placed, divorce and other family-related issues.

Klein was first elected as Family Court Judge in 2006. She has served for two terms now. She describes her courtroom as “a place where the rights and protection of children come first, and each individual is treated with dignity and respect.”

Klein prioritizes not only knowing the person completely but also holds herself to being knowledgeable on the available programs that support children and families to help guide people to the best solutions.

During her time as Family Court Judge she has worked on the reform of Juvenile Justice through the Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative. She is also an Acting Justice of the Supreme Court and heads Orange County’s Juvenile Treatment Court.

Additionally, she started the Family Treatment Court.

Before serving as the Family Court Judge she served as the Town of Chester justice for 12 years. She has also been a Family Court civil prosecutor, defense attorney, child’s
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TOWN OF NEWBURGH RESIDENTS

LEAF & BRUSH PICKUP

FALL OF 2020

Town trucks will pick up bagged leaves and brush (which must be less than 4 inches in diameter & no longer than four (4) feet in length & tied in bundles).

Leaves will be in CLEAR BAGS ONLY BY ORDER OF TOWN BOARD. CLEAR BAGS are available at many retail outlets & stores in the Greater Newburgh area.

Leaves bagged with DIRT & STONE or MIXED with wood chips, Pine Cones or Pine Needles will NOT be picked up.

Towns trucks will not return to any area once they have picked up in the area.

Leaves & Brush must be curbside throughout the entire Town on Monday, November 16, 2020 no later than 7 A.M.

We wish to THANK YOU for your cooperation.

A leaf and brush recycling bin is available to the public at the Town of Newburgh Highway Department at 90 Gardnertown Road, Newburgh. Hours are Monday thru Friday 7 a.m. to 3 p.m.

BY ORDER OF THE TOWN BOARD, Joseph P. Peddi, Town Clerk

The Restoration Advisory Committee Virtual Meeting for Stewart Air National Guard Base

The Restoration Advisory Committee for Stewart Air National Guard Base will hold a meeting on October 28, 2020 at 6 p.m. The meeting will be held virtually and is open to the public. Use the link below to register for the meeting and receive your unique access link and call-in information. For more information call 845-563-2075.

Meeting Registration Link: https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/508390790666870539

Freedom Road Bible Church

860 State Rte 52, Middletown NY 12701


Sunday Worship: 10:30 am
Sunday School: 9:45 am

Youth Group: Wednesdays 6:00 pm
Bible Study & Prayer: Wednesdays 7pm

Olympians: Friday 6:00 pm
Ministries for all ages

Union Presbyterian Church

In Christ, all are welcome!

Do you want meditations that inspire spiritual growth?
Visit NewburghPresby.org for At-Home Worship and Activities
Or Facebook-Union Presbyterian Church, Newburgh NY

Our worship suspended but we look forward to seeing you soon!

44 Balmville Road, Newburgh, NY 12550 • 845-562-9054
Americans in the pandemic than died in the Korean, Vietnam, Iraq and Afghanistan wars combined.

Among the most serious lapses:
Money for public health had been cut steadily for decades.
The cuts became critical because America’s leaders ignored warnings about the dire consequences should the federal government abandon its central role in a pandemic, and leave states to fend for themselves.

When this scenario occurred, some states were forced to compete with one another in order to purchase scarce medical supplies. Further, in the absence of detailed federal guidelines, states imposed a hodgepodge of lockdown policies, only to have some undermined by politicians, including the president.

Despite more than a decade of scientific warnings about the specific threat posed by coronaviruses, the government and drug companies allowed a potential vaccine to be shelved for three years instead of testing it in human trials.

Trump routinely dismissed the advice of his own health experts, downplaying the severity of the pandemic. The president told journalist Bob Woodward, as recounted in the book “Rage,” that he played down the pandemic to avoid triggering panic.

While leaders of other countries united their citizens behind the idea of collective sacrifice through lockdowns and other measures, U.S. leaders, especially the president, politicized the pandemic.

When Americans most needed to pull together, they slipped deeper into bitter polarization.

With its pandemic playbook, “The U.S. was very well prepared,” said Eric Toner, senior scholar at the Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security. “What happened is that we didn’t do what we said we’d do. That’s where everything fell apart. We ended up being the best prepared and having one of the worst outcomes.”

In disasters, Americans have grown accustomed to looking down with pity at other countries that have fared worse and need our help. COVID-19 shattered that image.

“The U.S. accounts for less than 5% of the world’s population, but more than 25% of total COVID-19 cases reported across the globe, and it currently ranks among the top 10 countries in COVID-19-related deaths per capita,” wrote the authors of a Sept. 16 commentary in the Journal of the American Medical Association.

“During the years to come,” the authors predicted, “the U.S. undoubtedly will undergo national-level reviews to understand how its strong capabilities were squandered when the country needed them most.”

When the Journal Sentinel asked the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to provide evidence that officials used the pandemic playbook, a spokesperson offered none. Instead, she said the Trump administration’s response “was informed” by three more recent plans.

One of those plans, “The National Biodefense Strategy” from 2018 is not a step-by-step guide for responding to a pandemic, but more a list of goals. Trump departed from one of those goals when he chose to downplay the virus rather than provide “accurate, timely and actionable public messaging.”

---

**NOTICE**

To All Village of Harriman Water Customers...

HYDRANTS WILL BE FLUSHED ON THE FOLLOWING DAYS:

**MONDAY, October 19, 2020**

**FRIDAY, October 23, 2020**

WATER MAY BE CLOUDED OR DISCOLORED, BUT IT IS SAFE TO DRINK

Village of Harriman DPW

---

**Restoration Advisory Committee Virtual Meeting for Stewart Air National Guard Base**

**Wednesday, October 28, 2020**

6:00 pm

Meeting Registration Link:
https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/5083907980666870539

The quarterly Restoration Advisory Committee meeting for Stewart Air National Guard Base will be held virtually and is open to the public. Learn about environmental projects at the base. Use the link above to register for the meeting and receive your unique access link and call-in information.

For more information call 845-563-2075.
McConnell: Pelosi-Mnuchin deal would get Senate vote

Andrew Taylor
ASSOCIATED PRESS

WASHINGTON — Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell said Tuesday that he’ll schedule a vote if House Speaker Nancy Pelosi and the Trump administration are able to seal an agreement on a huge COVID-19 relief bill.

The Kentucky Republican’s remarks came as Pelosi and Treasury Secretary Steven Mnuchin have arrived at a critical phase of their talks — a deadline day of sorts — if any relief is going to be enacted by Election Day. The contours of a potential deal are taking shape behind the scenes even as President Donald Trump’s GOP allies are recoiling at the administration’s tolerance for a $2 trillion package.

Despite GOP opposition, McConnell said if such a bill passed the Democratic-controlled House with Trump’s blessing “we would put it on the floor of the Senate.”

Pelosi and Mnuchin were slated to talk again Tuesday amid signs that they are continuing to narrow their differences. Pelosi said Tuesday that they remain at odds over refundable tax credits for the working poor and families with children, the size of a Democrat-sought aid package for state and local governments, and a liability shield for businesses and other organizations against lawsuits over their COVID preparations.

The Pelosi-Mnuchin talks also involve pandemic jobless aid, a second round of $1,200 direct payments, and money for schools, testing and vaccines.

Pelosi has said Tuesday is a deadline day, but clarified in an interview with Bloomberg News that the aim is to spur the two sides to exchange their best proposals on a host of unresolved issues, not to close out all of their disagreements or have final legislative language at hand.

“Let’s see where we are,” Pelosi said Tuesday. “We all want to get an agreement.”
Maine’s historic ranked vote could play big role in election

Patrick Whittle
The Associated Press

PORTLAND, Maine — The presence of ranked choice voting on the ballot in Maine is a new wrinkle in a state famous for its own Yankee brand of political independence, and could play a role in deciding the presidency.

Voters in the state approved the adoption of ranked choice voting in a 2016 referendum drive. After withstanding numerous legal challenges, the method appears on ballots in a presidential race for the first time in U.S. history this fall.

Maine’s vote this year is a test case for whether the system can work elsewhere, said Craig Burnett, a Hofstra University political science professor and ranked choice voting expert.

"This is nice for those proponents to see it in action and say look at the results — it worked," Burnett said. "Or it didn’t, depending on what your perspective is."

The potentially lengthy process of counting ranked ballots also has prognosticators wondering if the election could come down to Maine’s four electoral votes. It’s a longshot, and it would take a very close election, but it’s within the realm of possibility, Burnett said.

The method works like this: First, voters can rank the candidates on their ballot in order of preference. If no candidate breaks 50% of the popular vote, the bottom finisher is eliminated, and voters’ second choices come into play. The tabulations continue until a candidate achieves a majority of the total votes.

"Ranked choice voting arrives on Maine’s presidential ballots in a year when three of the state’s four electoral votes could be in play. The state is one of only two that apportions electoral votes — one each — by congressional district, of which Maine has two. The statewide vote, which is worth two electoral votes, could also be up for grabs."

Neither Republican President Donald Trump nor Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton managed to crack 50% statewide in 2016, although Trump cruised to victory in the state’s rural 2nd Congressional District. Most polls show Democratic former Vice President Joe Biden holding a statewide lead this time.
20 arrested in Sullivan County welfare fraud sweep

Mike Randall  Middletown Times Herald-Record  USA TODAY NETWORK

MONTICELLO - Sullivan County’s Welfare Fraud Task Force arrested 20 people during a 13-day fraud sweep earlier this month, Acting District Attorney Meagan K. Galligan announced.

In addition to welfare fraud suspects, those arrested included an alleged deadbeat parent who is accused of failing to pay more than $80,000 in child support, Galligan said.

The task force includes members of the county’s Division of Health and Family Services, and the sheriff’s and district attorney’s offices.

Twelve people were accused of fraudulently obtaining Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits. They included:

- Michael J. Bryant Jr., 36, of Parksville
- Melissa G. Gabriel, 39, of Bloomingburg
- Carolanne A. Margillo, 45
- Rosalyn J. Crandall, 38
- Tron L. Snowden Sr., 41
- and Yvonne E. Payton, 49, all of Monticello
- Angeline C. Schwartz, 29, of Burlingham
- Angelica G. Waszakowski, 29, of Parksville
- Melissa D. Reynolds, 28
- and Jason A. Jones, 29; both of Liberty
- Audrey L. Steiger, 45, of Woodridge

All were charged with first-degree offering a false instrument for filing, a felony, except Payton, who was charged with third-degree grand larceny, a felony.

Jones also was charged with fourth-degree grand larceny, a felony. Schwartz and Waszakowski also were charged with third-degree welfare fraud, a felony, while Bryant, Gabriel, Margillo, Crandall, Snowden, Steiger and Gibson were all charged with fourth-degree welfare fraud, a felony.

Two people were accused of fraudulently collecting Medicaid benefits. Leonard O. Jacobs Jr., 37, and Melinda M. Conklin, 45, both of Monticello, were charged with four counts each of fourth-degree health care fraud and one count each of third-degree grand larceny, both felonies.

Jacobs also was charged with two counts of first-degree offering a false instrument for filing and while Conklin was charged with four counts each of fourth-degree health care fraud and one count of third-degree grand larceny.

Two people were accused of using Medicaid-funded transportation for non-medical purposes. Derek V. Keysaw, 43, of Liberty, and Isaac I. Moshe, 33, of Monticello, were charged with first-degree offering a false instrument for filing.

Lisa E. Harrison, 59, of Liberty, Rosa A. Palmares, 27, of Loch Sheldrake, and Theresa M. Ziegler, 27, of Woodbourne, were charged with misuse of food stamps, a misdemeanor.

Kyle T. Manny, 36, of Walden, was arrested on an outstanding Sullivan County Family Court warrant for allegedly failing to pay $80,187.59 in child support.

For more information call 845-563-2075.