

PFAS ACTION TEAM OF  
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

\* \* \* \* \*

IN RE: PFAS ACTION TEAM MEETING

\* \* \* \* \*

TEAM PATRICK MCDONNELL

MEMBERS: DR. RACHEL LEVINE

ANTHONY CARRELLI

LESLIE RICHARDS

RUSSELL REDDING

JERRY OLEKSIK

BRUCE TREGO

GLADYS BROWN

TIM SCHAEFFER

DENNIS DAVIN

MEETING: Monday, April 15, 2019

6:04 p.m.

LOCATION: Abington Senior High School

900 Highland Avenue

Abington, PA 19001

Reporter: Jennifer Corb

Any reproduction of this transcript

is prohibited without authorization

by the certifying agency

1 SPEAKERS: Dr. Sharon Watkins, Ramez Ziadeh,  
2 Troy Conrad, Lisa Daniels, Rick Rogers,  
3 Christopher Crockett, Bill Walker,  
4 Gregory Nesbitt, Mike McGee,  
5 Michael Pickel, Danette Richards, Tracy  
6 Carluccio, Hope Gross, Joanne Stanton,  
7 Lisa Cellini, Mark Cuker, Jill Florin,  
8 Gary Scarpello, Joanne  
9 O'Connor, Kim Menard, Michael Thompson,  
10 Sarah Caspar, Earl Stamm, Larry Menkes,  
11 Samantha Chuco, Cakky Evans, Kathy  
12 Acosta, George Gauss, Rebecca Gushue,  
13 Kevin Spearing

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## I N D E X

1		
2		
3	OPENING REMARKS	
4	By Patrick McDonnell	6 - 11
5	COMMENTS	
6	By Dr. Levine	11 - 12
7	By Dr. Sharon Watkins	12 - 23
8	By Ramez Ziadeh	23 - 24
9	By Troy Conrad	24 - 26
10	By Lisa Daniels	26 - 32
11	By Rick Rogers	33 - 40
12	By Dr. Chris Crockett	40 - 46
13	By Bill Walker and Greg Nesbitt	46 - 53
14	By Mike McGee	53 - 61
15	By Michael Pickel	61 - 69
16	By Danette Richards	70 - 72
17	By Tracy Carluccio	72 - 78
18	By Hope Grosse	78 - 80
19	By Joanne Stanton	80 - 83
20	By Lisa Cellini	83 - 84
21	By Mark Cuker	84 - 85
22	By Jill Florin	86 - 88
23	By Phil	88 - 89
24	By Gary Scarpello	90 - 91
25	By Joanne O'Connor	91 - 95

I N D E X (cont.)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

COMMENTS

By Kim Menard	95 - 98
By Michael Thompson	98 - 100
By Sarah Caspar	100 - 103
By Earl Stamm	103 - 106
By Larry Menkes	106 - 110
By Samantha Chuco	110 - 112
By Cakky Evans	112 - 115
By Kathy Acosta	115 - 116
By George Gauss	116 - 117
By Rebecca Gushue	117 - 118
By Diane	118 - 119
By Earl Stamm	120 - 121
By Kevin Spearing	122 - 123

DISCUSSION AMONG PARTIES	123 - 124
--------------------------	-----------

E X H I B I T S

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

<u>Number</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u> <u>Offered</u>	<u>Page</u> <u>Admitted</u>
	NONE OFFERED		

## P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

-----  
MR. MCDONNELL: Good evening,  
everyone. My name is Patrick McDonnell. I'm the  
Secretary of the Pennsylvania Department of  
Environmental Protection. I want to thank you all  
for being here tonight.

As - as Chair of the Governor's PFAS  
Action Team, we need to continue to support other  
State agencies that lack data.

Let me introduce you to the rest of  
the Action Team who's with us here tonight.  
Department of Health, Dr. Rachel Levine. Department  
of Military and Veteran Affairs, Brigadier General  
Michael Regan.

I don't know if he's here.

GENERAL REGAN: I'm here. I'm on the  
phone.

MR. MCDONNELL: There he is.

Department of Transportation, Anthony  
Foxx. Department of Agriculture, Greg Hostetter.  
Department of Labor & Industry, Secretary - Jerry  
Oleksiak. Office of the State Fire Commissioner,  
Tom Cook. Fish and Boat Commission, Edward  
Mascharka and the Fish and Boat Commission, John

1 Hayes.

2                   So in addition to that, with me on the  
3 stage we have several Representatives from the state  
4 and some of them are local leaders.

5                   Dr. Rachel Levine again, from the  
6 Department of Health for the Secretary. Ramez  
7 Ziadeh, he's - he is Executive Deputy Secretary for  
8 Programs. Troy Conrad, who is the DEP Director for  
9 the Bureau of Environmental Cleanup and Brownfields.  
10 Lisa Daniels is DEP Director of the Bureau of Safe  
11 Drinking Water.

12                   Dr. - Sharon Watkins, Department of  
13 Health Director - Department of Health Director of  
14 the Bureau of Epidemiology. From EPA we have Rick  
15 Rogers, Associate Director for Drinking Water and  
16 Source Water Protection.

17                   From the community we have Dr. Chris  
18 Crockett, Chief Environmental Officer from Aqua  
19 Pennsylvania. Bill Walker, Horsham Township  
20 Manager. Gregory Nesbitt, Council President. Mike  
21 McGee, Deputy Director of the Horsham Land  
22 Redevelopment Authority. And Tina O'Rourke and Mike  
23 Pickel from Horsham Water and Sewer Authority.

24                   At DEP our entire Cleanup and  
25 Brownfields Program, Safe Drinking Water Program and

1 Source Water Programs are all overseen to make sure  
2 the public health is the top priority.

3           For issues that require priority, such  
4 as safe drinking water or discharge permits, DEP is  
5 committed to prioritizing and expediting, with  
6 certain limitations, pending permits and approvals.  
7 This team is about using our findings for action.

8           The items on the agenda today are  
9 intended to summarize the type and amount of legwork  
10 that is being performed statewide to address this  
11 issue holistically.

12           This includes gathering data from all  
13 corners of the state with our partners at the  
14 Department of Health and the Turnpike Commission,  
15 Department of Military and Veterans Affairs and the  
16 State Fire Marshal - or State Fire Commissioner,  
17 zoning in on areas that potentially have elevated  
18 levels of PFAS contamination.

19           We're investing in laboratory staff  
20 and specialized equipment to test for PFAS chemicals  
21 in-house. We're creating a sampling plan to  
22 determine the data find for contamination, capturing  
23 data that may not be recorded currently in the State  
24 agencies, developing appropriate regulatory cleanup  
25 standards for these chemicals, hiring a State



1 toxicologist to study the best data available and to  
2 recommend the standards to set a maximum contaminant  
3 level, monitoring the health impacts from exposure  
4 to these chemicals.

5                   We know that this is not a one-and-  
6 done effort. The Action Team will not have it for a  
7 year and then walk away. The expansive long-term  
8 use of these chemicals will require an active long-  
9 term solution.

10                   As of now we're reviewing what we  
11 know, gathering the information we need to move  
12 forward. And based on that data, we will then take  
13 action of where and what to do, make recommendations  
14 to the legislature for issues that require changes  
15 to existing laws.

16                   We will request adequate resources to  
17 clean up and treat these contaminants accordingly.  
18 This issue requires two-way communication.

19                   We're here tonight to show you our  
20 progress and to explain the steps we are taking to  
21 move forward to address these chemical exposures.  
22 It is important for us to share this information  
23 with the public, so that we are on the same page  
24 about what is developing across the state to address  
25 this issue.

1 We want to provide an ample  
2 opportunity for your voices and stories to reach the  
3 ears of those who work on this content every day.  
4 We are here tonight in Southeastern Pennsylvania  
5 specifically because we know this area has been  
6 impacted like nowhere else in the Commonwealth.  
7 You're an educated, active, involved community and  
8 your input is valuable to the success of this Action  
9 Team.

10 Finally, we need to recognize the  
11 weight of this issue. We will execute the Drinking  
12 Water Sampling Plan within the next month.

13 We hired a trained laboratory staff  
14 for PFAS in - in soil and water. We are moving  
15 forward with hiring a toxicologist to assess known  
16 research and recommend MCL for regulatory action.

17 We agree to work to successfully end  
18 the PFAS pollution cycle. This work includes  
19 pinpointing locations where pyrotechnic items are  
20 stored, updating all state contacts to - to require  
21 the use of chlorine-free chromosome, coordinating  
22 with fire departments and training facilities to  
23 properly dispose of hazardous biochemicals, keeping  
24 it out of landfills and preventing more pollution,  
25 and reviewing our legal and regulatory authorities

Commented [s1]: Not sure of this.

Commented [JC2R1]: I hear the same, I think it's right.

1 to curb the use of these chemicals which impact on  
2 us. We will continue to convene and plan long-term  
3 actions.

4 In terms of the process tonight, we're  
5 going to have a series of presentations. After our  
6 last presenter, we'll take a brief two-minute break  
7 before the open comment period.

8 That's so we can transition and bring  
9 out the Action Team, the rest of the Action Team -  
10 Action Team members on the stage. If you're  
11 interested in providing remarks, please make sure  
12 you provide your name on the correct list at the  
13 table when you walk in.

14 Now, I will turn it over to Dr. Levine  
15 for - for some comments.

16 DR. LEVINE: Good evening.

17 I'm Dr. Rachel Levine. I'm the  
18 Secretary of Health and I'm very pleased to be here  
19 and talking of health. I'm very pleased to be  
20 participating.

21 We have talked with Environmental  
22 Protection and the other departments that were  
23 listed in the Governor's PFAS Action Team.

24 The PFAS issue is a significant public  
25 health issue in Pennsylvania. And it is very

1 important to know that this is a national public  
2 health issue. Many other states are involved in  
3 this effort.

4 Dr. Sharon Watkins will go into more  
5 detail, but the Department has conducted a Pilot  
6 Program to study PFAS and the effects to its  
7 residents in the Bucks and Montgomery County area.

8 We have received some additional  
9 funding to do some follow-up testing, and we are  
10 applying for a national grant for a much larger  
11 testing project.

12 We are looking to hire a state  
13 toxicologist, and we are basically in the process in  
14 terms of doing that. We have also asked \$1.4  
15 million in this year's budget to - to hire more  
16 professionals, such as toxicologists and  
17 epidemiologists and other public health  
18 professionals to aid DEP and the other agencies in  
19 the Governor's Action Team.

20 So we're very pleased to be here and  
21 to state the progress. Thank you.

22 MR. MCDONNELL: Next up we have Dr.  
23 Sharon Watkins.

24 DR. WATKINS: Thank you.

25 I'm also very happy to be here. And

1 unfortunately my voice is not quite here with me, so  
2 bear with me.

3                   But I'm - I'm going to take a little  
4 bit of time to go over our results from - from a  
5 recent pilot study conducted. I think most of you  
6 are aware what I'm showing here on the map.

7                   We have - the exposure area in  
8 Southeastern Pennsylvania is quite large. We're  
9 estimating about 84,000 individuals and  
10 approximately 33,000 households which may have  
11 exposure primarily based on the location that is  
12 near the - two military establishments.

13                   So exposure in Southeastern  
14 Pennsylvania includes the former Naval Air Station  
15 Joint Reserve Base Willow Grove and Horsham Air  
16 Guard Station.

17                   And, of course, this involves the 28  
18 homes which had PFAS in them and PFAS levels in  
19 community drinking water that were elevated. And,  
20 to our knowledge, the community drinking water, the  
21 highest at one time, a lifetime health - health  
22 advisory record that set by the EPA.

23                   We were able to reach out to about 600  
24 households as part of this study. And when all of  
25 it was said and done, we had 235 individuals who

1 went through a full body monitoring process. So  
2 that's about a 40 percent participation rate. Or if  
3 you want to look at it by participation by  
4 household, that's a 20 percent participation rate.

5           So again, we reached out to 600  
6 households. That's at least 1,200 individuals. And  
7 of that, 235 went through the entire process, where  
8 you filled out the informed consent and filled out  
9 questionnaires for us. And then went on to have  
10 blood tests at one of our clinics.

11           So for that we're really grateful.  
12 Thank you for that participation.

13           So this was a very short time frame.  
14 It was a pilot study. And it was meant to get  
15 started and concluded in a very short period of  
16 time.

17           And I won't go over all the data, but  
18 as you can see that, we really get an understanding.  
19 In May, we were reaching out to you. And then by  
20 September, we mailed most of the results back to a  
21 lot of the participants.

22           And then by December, we had already  
23 met with members of the community with the interim  
24 results. And all of you who participated not only  
25 have your individual results, but also had

1 community-level results, where you could compare  
2 your results to the community.

3           So I think - oh, some of the comments  
4 we got at the public meetings were, you were a  
5 little bit concerned that the random sampling would  
6 not provide a type of participation of really those  
7 in the community.

8           And I will say that mostly - most of  
9 the adults who did reply are in the community. Most  
10 of you had at least ten years annualized tenancy,  
11 long-terms residents. And we're actually working  
12 still, we're comparing demographics of who  
13 participated with a larger area. And also with a  
14 national participation in the study, so you can kind  
15 of compare apples to apples.

16           We did provide some individual  
17 results. And we talked about the forming of  
18 compounds that we found. And that was for PFOA,  
19 PFOS, PFHxS and PFNA.

20           And the other serum levels were higher  
21 in this community compared to the NHANES average.  
22 And you can see here the percentages that they were  
23 higher.

24           And I would also say that about 79  
25 percent of participants had all four of those

1 compounds in their serum.

2                   So going down, I hope you can read  
3 this, but on average, PFNA tests are actually  
4 markedly higher than in the NHANES, and so is PFOS.

5                   PFOA was slightly average in PFNAs,  
6 just a little bit.

7                   So when we looked at this one by one,  
8 PFAS levels increased with age. I mean, the older  
9 you are the higher your PFAS levels were. Males had  
10 higher levels. Overall in the community, their  
11 levels were a little higher.

12                   If you had a high body mass index, a  
13 little heavier, then your levels were higher. If  
14 you were a private well owner - well user, your  
15 levels were a little bit higher.

16                   The amount of - the quantity of tap  
17 water you consumed also matters. And then which  
18 water service system you would've received your  
19 water from also mattered in this analysis.

20                   What we're also hoping to do is to  
21 look at these levels by the actual value after  
22 monitoring of the water system monitoring level, and  
23 just make sure that they correlate.

24                   So what we're moving on to do, which  
25 is not necessarily connected with the community, is



1 let's do what is something called a multivariate  
2 analysis. And that's where you throw all the  
3 variables into the analysis tooling. And what  
4 typically comes out is what's actually really  
5 important when we consider all things at the same  
6 time.

7                   And so the analysis determined that  
8 average serum levels for PFOA, PFOS, PFHxS and PFNA  
9 were positively associated with the drinking water  
10 source. So we need to be considering all those  
11 things

12                   It didn't matter what - which water  
13 system you were getting a drinking water from. It  
14 also said it had to do with your total length of  
15 residence in the area. So that was also pertinent.  
16 So those who were living in residence in these  
17 communities longer did have higher levels.

18                   So we're going to continue on with  
19 that multivariate analysis. With this - and I know  
20 this is a little bit much to take in, but this is -.

21                   Looking at the map you can see the  
22 highest serum PFAS levels were in the portion of the  
23 water which is closest to the portion that's in our  
24 petition. So proximity to - to the military base  
25 did turn up to be important. And it's also very

1 real.

2 I think equally important is that  
3 lowest levels were found in the Northwest Warrington  
4 Township water system, so the system that was  
5 farthest away from the two bases.

6 So we're doing a lot more than a  
7 multivariate analysis, but I wanted to just share  
8 that, as definitely the multivariate analysis did  
9 turn out to be something that mattered.

10 Additionally, participants with more  
11 than ten years' of residence time generally had  
12 higher PFAS mean serum levels. And their mean PFHxS  
13 levels are higher in men than women. And PFHxS  
14 serums levels were higher in those who were employed  
15 in the area.

16 Also mean - sorry about that. Mean  
17 serum levels of PFOA, PFOS and PFNA were positively  
18 associated with age. So the older you got, the  
19 higher your levels were showing.

20 How much tap water you drank, it  
21 mattered.

22 And I want to say that we're  
23 presenting more on this at the public meeting  
24 April 29th. And I'll have a little more about that  
25 in a minute.

1                   But we were able to present these  
2 interim multivariate analyses as well as our  
3 thoughts about the entire process to the CDC, and to  
4 ATSDR - A-T-S-D-R, in Atlanta on March 18th to 19th.  
5 And that was actually - actually where we really  
6 went over - went through the pilot study, and made  
7 sense of where improvements could be made. Went  
8 over the study - a larger study.

9                   Department of Health here in  
10 Pennsylvania and in New York saw similar results to  
11 ours. And I - I will say that New York - New York  
12 had multiple resources available to the state, a lot  
13 more than we were able to do with our limited staff.

14                   So as you know, I mentioned we're  
15 having a community meeting. And this is to present  
16 a multivariate analysis. This is for our next  
17 version, next generation of these results.

18                   And it'll be April 29th from 6:30 to  
19 8:30 at the Horsham Township Public Library. And  
20 that will be the opportunity for you to listen to  
21 more data. We'll go over - we'll talk about our  
22 results in detail, and you'll have an opportunity to  
23 ask questions. And we'll see if we can get all the  
24 questions answered.

25                   I also want to mention that we're

1 participating in the - the toolkit expansion  
2 exposure assessment. So you may remember we did a  
3 kickoff in order to do a full exposure assessment.

4                   And I'm a little bit confused, because  
5 sometimes Pennsylvania was mentioned and sometimes  
6 it was not, but we are participating.

7                   Ever since we did do the pilot study,  
8 we're participating in findings and health findings,  
9 since we already have collected serum -. And we  
10 will be participating - and they called - and we  
11 will be collecting urine, dust and water samples  
12 from those 235 current participants.

13                   We will analyze ten percent of the  
14 urine samples. And then depending on the criteria  
15 of that, all samples for urine will also be analyzed  
16 for participants.

17                   And we'll be collecting dust and water  
18 sampling - samples I think on ten percent of the  
19 current participating households.

20                   And this is under the state  
21 assessments that are going on across the country.  
22 So we wanted to make sure that Pennsylvania data,  
23 Pennsylvanian residents were included in this  
24 exposure assessment.

25                   And so that's where we are. And it'll

1 be happening in the next - starting in the next four  
2 months to moving forward for possibly - I think it  
3 may be in a year or less.

4                   Again, the CDC will keep the urine  
5 stored and analyze the urine reports at no cost.  
6 And we will be contracting with a lab, and we will  
7 be in touch with them, but they will be collecting  
8 the dust and the water.

9                   Again, we'll talk about this more in  
10 the community meeting on the 29th.

11                   But I also wanted to mention that  
12 there's a third National Center for Environmental  
13 Health study opportunity. And the CDC will put out  
14 a release, I believe it's April 1st. Applications  
15 are due May 30th.

16                   This study will address the health  
17 implications of exposure in drinking water. I know  
18 that's a question that many of you have in the  
19 community.

20                   We believe that they'll be coming to  
21 about six sites and will be giving these grants.  
22 It's about a million - it's an actual five-year  
23 project. It's a very complex, medically monitoring  
24 biologically sampling kind of study. Very  
25 prescriptive.

1                   Each sites is given a very detailed  
2 and complex outline of what they need from - from  
3 the community. The goal is to enroll at least 6,000  
4 adults per site and 2,000 children per site. So  
5 very public.

6                   It also is an historical  
7 reconstruction of water and serum PFAS concentration  
8 using modeling techniques. In other words, trying  
9 to say in a community if - if this is what your  
10 water is testing now, what would it have been five  
11 years ago, ten years ago, 15 years ago? Which is a  
12 complex modeling technique that we're going to be  
13 working - all - all sites will be working with CDC  
14 experts on.

15                   It also will be able to reconstruct a  
16 person's PFAS level. So if your levels were X  
17 today, what would they have been ten years, five  
18 years ago, assuming a certain level of exposure?

19                   The study will look at health  
20 conditions, such as high cholesterol, immunity  
21 issues, thyroid function. And it's also looking at  
22 neurobehavioral issues in children. And is an  
23 opportunity for numerous participants to propose  
24 additional research questions that could be added  
25 into the application.

1                   Again, it's due May 30th and we are  
2 working with some partners to - to apply for that.  
3 And again, I'm sure it'll be very competitive and  
4 we're hopeful that we'll be able to do that.

5                   I'd like to thank, again, our partners  
6 and just to - oops, wrong button. My partners - and  
7 again we'll be out back. I'll be in my - the team  
8 will be here in the community again April 29th and  
9 we'll be able to answer your questions then.

10                   PUBLIC MEMBER: What time on the 29th?

11                   DR. WATKINS: It will be, sorry - 6:30  
12 to 8:30.

13                   MR. MCDONNELL: Okay. Thank you very  
14 much.

15                   We'll move on to Ramez Ziadeh,  
16 Environmental - or Executive Deputy Secretary of DEP  
17 for - for - for the - for an update on laboratory  
18 instrumentation and personnel.

19                   MR. ZIADEH: Good evening, everyone.  
20 My name is Ramez Ziadeh. I'm the Executive Deputy  
21 Secretary of DEP.

22                   I'm happy to report the DEP acquired  
23 and installed instruments for PFAS testing in our  
24 labs in Harrisburg in February 2019. Three  
25 employees formal onsite and off-site training on

1 instruments in March, last month.

2 DEP is also in the process of hiring a  
3 new staff member subsequent to PFAS testing.

4 I can also report that today staff  
5 attended a symposium in Baltimore on the best  
6 practices for analyzing PFAS chemicals.

7 And by the end of this month, DEP will  
8 assemble a data package that is required in the  
9 substantive process accredited in Pennsylvania,  
10 which will allow testing to commence as early as May  
11 2019.

12 DEP is also working to get the process  
13 accredited at the national level. My own staff has  
14 been participating in - in sampling training for  
15 PFAS chemicals.

16 And my colleague, Troy Conrad, is  
17 going to discuss that next, along with an update on  
18 the cleanup regulatory package. Thank you.

19 MR. CONRAD: Good evening.

20 The Department's Land Recycling  
21 Program is tasked with developing and implementing  
22 remediation framework standards for contaminated  
23 properties across Pennsylvania.

24 As part of that process, we are  
25 required, by designation, to review and propose



1 those standards at least once every three years,  
2 with the Environmental Quality Board.

3           It is our intention that in the fall  
4 of 2019 to present the newest round of revised, what  
5 we are anticipating, cleanup standards to the  
6 Quality Board. We will include proposed cleanup  
7 standards for PFAS as well as revised standards for  
8 PFOA and PFOS.

9           These cleanup standards will be used  
10 for contaminated soils of industrial and commercial  
11 properties. The information is derived from the  
12 same technical documents that have been used in what  
13 the EPA has called advisors' notes.

14           In addition to the revisions to our  
15 cleanup standards, we're also going to be using a  
16 private contractor, who's going to be used to sample  
17 contaminated wells during sellout. So it would be a  
18 health developing sampling plan, as well as sampling  
19 training for each new staff.

20           The first round of the staff will be  
21 trained later this month, and they'll be used as  
22 part of the drinking water sampling plan that Lisa  
23 will describe next.

24           After the initial round of training,  
25 we will be rotating that through our system's mutual

1 offices, to the staff members, such as drinking  
2 water program, environmental program, emergency  
3 response. And these standards programs will have  
4 similar training to be prepared to collect samples  
5 where appropriate. Thank you.

6 MR. MCDONNELL: Thank you, Troy. Next  
7 we have Lisa Daniels, who's the Director of our  
8 Bureau of Safe Drinking Water, Pennsylvania DEP,  
9 providing a statement on the Drinking Water Sampling  
10 Plan.

11 MS. DANIELS: Thank you. And I  
12 thought - everybody can see, that's fine. So -  
13 yeah. I want to give you an update on where we are  
14 with the Bureau's Drinking Water Sampling Plan.

15 So the plan itself was posted to our  
16 website this past Friday. So those who haven't had  
17 a chance to go ahead and look at the plan, it's on  
18 the webpage for everybody to see.

19 And what the plan talks about is the  
20 first phase of sampling. And - and this Sampling  
21 Plan was really intended to help us prioritize the  
22 sampling in the first place and really in generating  
23 that occurrence data, to really help us figure out  
24 how big of a problem we might have in Pennsylvania.

25 And as we progress forward with some

1 of the other actions in our plan, the data is really  
2 necessary to help support the work that we're going  
3 to be doing, in terms of looking at setting a  
4 statewide plan up. We need additional occurrence  
5 data in order to support that effort.

6                   When we looked at the Sampling Plan,  
7 there were a couple of basic factors that were built  
8 into the plan to really help us prioritize that  
9 work. Some factors that we considered include the  
10 location of what we call potential sources of PFAS  
11 contamination.

12                   And throughout the plan, you'll see  
13 that we talked a lot about these PSOCs and sort of  
14 what the thought in terms of what were selected.  
15 Then we took that sort of a coverage layer and  
16 located any common water supply sources across the  
17 state that were within a half mile of the PSOCs.

18                   And then - then we also were  
19 interested in a looking at a control group. These  
20 would have been public water supply sources that are  
21 not rendered a potential sources of contamination.  
22 And in fact, we were looking at this same modeling  
23 and the scores.

24                   But we were also primarily looking at  
25 our forested area, so - at least 75 percent of

1 forested areas, in order to really confirm what that  
2 control group was in terms of what the background is  
3 across the state.

4                   So just to talk a little bit about the  
5 different PSOCs that went into this data. So I'll  
6 tell you right off, and there are several things  
7 throughout the plan, that this is based on  
8 information that we know today.

9                   And certainly some of this information  
10 could contain things as we learn more about  
11 industries and really the use of these chemicals.  
12 But certainly we were looking at military bases. We  
13 were looking at fire training schools on the list,  
14 airports. Those facilities were mostly associated  
15 with the use of fire-fighting -.

16                   We also added landfills to that area  
17 there. And then a sea of what we'll call  
18 manufacturing faculties that based on perimeter  
19 research that was done by the EPA and others that we  
20 were led to believe that they might be using some of  
21 these chemicals.

22                   So apparel, so treated clothing,  
23 treated fabrics, electronics use. You - you can see  
24 the list up there. But quite a few. Maybe adjunct  
25 facilities as well.

1                   And then one of the last things we  
2 wanted was add was really the data layer that's  
3 looking at existing hazardous sites, cleanup sites  
4 and potentially the Superfund sites.

5                   You can see now and a lot of keeping  
6 those sites, looking at our stats for the use of  
7 PFAS. So we wanted to go through those as well.

8                   And then we also took at a look at the  
9 known contamination sites that we've already become  
10 aware of. And if folks have had a chance to look at  
11 the information on our webpage, they'll see that  
12 we're tracking those for the public.

13                   Folks can go in and take a look at  
14 known sites as we become aware of them. And these  
15 are added to that - the webpage as well.

16                   So adding to potential sources, we  
17 wanted to look at the highest risk water systems.  
18 And so we wanted to really focus on those activities  
19 that we thought would be most associated with it.

20                   If you had a chance to look at the  
21 plan or when you go ahead and take some time to do  
22 that, what you'll see is a lot of those maps  
23 throughout the plan. Because we wanted to give  
24 folks a sense as where these facilities were  
25 located.

1                   And they wanted you to get a sense of  
2 sort of the scope of the sampling. So this is just  
3 an example of one of the maps that's in the plan.  
4 It is not, as you can see, the very industrial ---  
5 facility layers that were used. And that built us  
6 this, there was a layer that they put together using  
7 EnviroMax data, really searching on and sorting out  
8 those facilities that we thought were associated.  
9 And then there were a couple of areas that were  
10 built by EPA and shared with the State.

11                   Now, just to give you a forward - to  
12 talk about the phase one of the scheduled plan, as  
13 the Secretary says, we're going to be starting next  
14 month. So the schedule will be in - in May. We  
15 think it's going to take us a full year to do the  
16 sampling, because we're doing all of the sampling  
17 out of my office, out of the Central Office.

18                   We want to make sure that we're doing  
19 it in such a way that everybody's properly trained,  
20 that we have the potential for communication and so  
21 we - all the sampling is going to be done out of  
22 Central Office.

23                   We - the source of the target is we're  
24 looking at a total of about 400 samples. If the  
25 money - we're looking at about \$150,000. Once we

1 reach that 400 mark, if there's funds left over,  
2 we'll keep going and do as many as we can. But at  
3 least while we're looking at is random associated  
4 samples in the public water systems, with about 40 -  
5 of that control group that I mentioned before.

6                   When we looked at the communities and  
7 nontransient noncommunities, because those are the  
8 folks we really wanted to pull with the sampling, a  
9 lot of folks are familiar with where the communities  
10 are. Those are the recommended facilities, but we  
11 wanted to include the nontransient noncommunities as  
12 well.

13                   Those are the schools, the places of  
14 business, where we have those particularly Monday  
15 through Friday, so there's quite a bit of  
16 opportunity for exposure. So we have counted those  
17 facilities nearby, for the opportunity for them to  
18 present as well.

19                   You'll see that we're looking at at  
20 least 40 sites in the control group. And we're  
21 going to try to do one surface water and one  
22 groundwater, so testing and information there. And  
23 then this group that ends up, that we would  
24 potentially have the source as we come - become  
25 aware of more planned sources of contamination.

1                   And then this map is to assess the  
2 sampling that we will be doing. So certainly we're  
3 sampling all across the state. We have some samples  
4 collected in each of our six regions.

5                   And when you look at the planning and  
6 type of the breakdown and sort of what that means -.  
7 So we talk about how many are located near each of  
8 the potential sources of contamination. So you have  
9 sort of a - you know, how many we're looking at for  
10 airports and so forth.

11                   We also see the breakdown down of how  
12 many are in each county. We have that information.  
13 But I think it'll give us a really diverse type of  
14 sampling points for us to take a look at, in terms  
15 of occurrence across the state.

16                   And the intent then is once the  
17 sampling is completed, all of the results will be  
18 shared with those on the websites. So folks will  
19 have access to that information.

20                   So that is the plan for phase one.  
21 Thank you.

22                   MR. MCDONNELL: Thank you, Lisa. And  
23 then finally of the state and federal updates, Rick  
24 Rogers, Associate Director of Drinking Water and  
25 Source Water Protection, with the U.S. Environmental



1 Protection Agency so, Rick.

2 MR. ROGERS: Thank you, Secretary  
3 McDonnell.

4 It's a pleasure to come and update the  
5 Action Team on the PFAS Action Plan that was  
6 finalized by the U.S. Environmental Protection  
7 Agency back in February of this year.

8 First, I want to get into a little bit  
9 of the previous work that's been going on leading up  
10 to the plan. Some of it which is still going -  
11 ongoing.

12 We advanced - did a lot of research on  
13 PFAS chemicals, and our understanding of health  
14 impacts, exposure to PFAAs and also some treatment  
15 and removal. We've issued direct toxicity  
16 assessments for a chemical called GenX, which was a  
17 - a replacement for PFOA in certain processes, as  
18 well as PSDF - PFBS, sorry.

19 We announced the initiation of  
20 additional assessments, processed the assessments.  
21 We're developing for five tests. and that includes  
22 PFBA, PFHxS, PFHxA, PFNA, PFDA.

23 So these are a lot of acronyms for a bunch of  
24 different chemicals. But what this means is between  
25 the PFOA, PFOS, we already have the information for

1 GenX is PFBS that we're - we're finalizing soon. We  
2 will have toxicity information on a number of  
3 compounds, ranging from a smaller chain, C3 or three  
4 carbon atom chain, all the way up to a ten carbon  
5 atom chain.

6                   So it gives us a range of compounds  
7 that - and they all do act a little bit differently.

8                   We have issued enforcement Orders in  
9 our oversight of some of these sites. Most of them  
10 have been issued here in Region 3, two in - two in  
11 Pennsylvania and one in West Virginia facility.

12                   We will continue to issue and use  
13 enforcement tools as necessary, as the situation  
14 arises, that - based on - with any of these,  
15 possibly using our authority to - to get public  
16 health protected.

17                   We're also providing a lot of  
18 technical assistance to state and local agencies on  
19 a number of facilities and sites across the region.

20                   So a little bit on the background. We  
21 did - did a full two-day PFAS test. And some of  
22 which invited state and federal departments to the  
23 EPA.

24                   Using that information and also  
25 information gathered from I think eight community

1 and nation events that were held last summer, one of  
2 which was here in - in the Horsham area, we used  
3 that information to produce the PFAS Action Plan.  
4 It also included over 120,000 comments submitted to  
5 a public docket.

6                   So the purpose of the plan is really  
7 to lay out what EPA and other federal partners will  
8 be working on completing. Most of which EPA has the  
9 lead for, but many federal agencies are going to be  
10 a part of or -.

11                   This definitely will be a multi-media,  
12 multi-program approach to research, risk  
13 communication and developing information and  
14 recommendations for challenges like PFAS treatment  
15 in drinking water, soil and any further contaminated  
16 wastes.

17                   It does respond to the public interest  
18 that we receive, as I mentioned earlier. And really  
19 it's an unprecedented plan that - that incorporates  
20 a cross-agency approach to these chemicals.

21                   Because these chemicals are truly  
22 creating and presenting a cross agency, cross  
23 program challenge in many ways.

24                   So some of the actions that we wanted  
25 to highlight is under the drinking water arena, the

1 PFAS Action - PFAS Action Plan. And our  
2 administrator has announced our intention to create  
3 a maximum contaminant level for PFOA and PFOS.  
4 These are two of the most well-known and more  
5 prevalent compounds.

6 That process is moving forward through  
7 our - out of the Safe Drinking Water Act  
8 requirements, the law that lays out how we have to  
9 proceed to develop regulations.

10 We are expecting to issue a regulatory  
11 determination by the end of - this draft regulatory  
12 information by the end of this calendar year. And  
13 once - once we got a - get public input, public  
14 comment on that, we would expect to probably issue a  
15 final determination by the end of 2020.

16 So then moving forward, the  
17 determination is to go forward and see how much -  
18 what we need to do. That may take another several  
19 years of input and process. But it would include -  
20 it would include assessing all the initial new  
21 information that - that's going to be available,  
22 that is available that was not part of what we had  
23 available when we produced these health advisories  
24 for PFOA and PFOS.

25 It will also include all the

1 additional information being generated by states  
2 like Pennsylvania and others that are collecting  
3 occurrence data. We are also going to be gathering  
4 information to determine whether or not we should  
5 also regulate, at the same time, other PFAS  
6 chemicals.

7                   And it's a probably a possibility that  
8 we would look at or at least consider regulating  
9 them as a class of chemicals instead of one by one.  
10 I think that that is something that we will be  
11 considering to enable access to the report faster to  
12 cover a greater host of these kind of compounds.

13                   So the actions of the cleanup arena  
14 include developing groundwater cleanup  
15 recommendations. They would propose internally  
16 interagency review They're still undergoing that  
17 review.

18                   EPA's addressing comments received by  
19 other federal agencies before we finalize those -  
20 the groundwater cleanup recommendation values for  
21 PFOA and PFOS. We're also initiating a regulatory  
22 development process of listing certain PFAS as a  
23 hazardous substance under the Superfund Law. It's  
24 called CERCLA.

25                   That just kicked off a couple weeks

1 ago and that has - under very tight deadlines we  
2 expect to have a draft - or a proposal out by I  
3 think later this summer. So that's going be through  
4 a very tight space compared to anything else we  
5 would have done in that -.

6                   We're also proposing to add PFAS  
7 compounds to nationwide sampling under our  
8 Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Rule, cycle five.  
9 That will begin in several years.

10                   And it would include using laboratory  
11 methods and capabilities that have much lower  
12 detection limits than the - than the - the U - UCMR  
13 pre-cycle, which looked at the PFOA, PFOS and  
14 several other compounds.

15                   We're rapidly expanding our scientific  
16 foundation in determining and managing risks of the  
17 toxicities and other risks in these compounds, and  
18 working on understanding the - the exposure  
19 assessments and developing effective treatment and  
20 remediation methods. So a lot of work is going on  
21 to our offices to develop and to accomplish that.

22                   Under the toxic slide -.

23                   MR. MCDONNELL: It's not -.

24                   MR. ROGERS: Oh, thank you.

25                   There we go. So under toxic slide, we

1 are considering the addition of adding PFAS to our  
2 Toxics Release Inventory, which is a regulation. It  
3 requires industries and others to report on any  
4 released compounds to the environment.

5                   And we're also making a supplemental  
6 proposal to guard against unreviewed reintroduction  
7 of chemicals or any new uses of new chemicals in the  
8 PFAS family, to help control further use and spread  
9 of these chemicals in the country.

10                   I've already mentioned enforcement.

11                   Moving to risk communication. We are  
12 still working on developing a risk communication  
13 toolbox for state and local governments to use to  
14 help try to convey the - the risks of these  
15 compounds to the public and - and to water utilities  
16 and - and any other facility that's dealing with  
17 community contamination or - or release of these  
18 compounds.

19                   The next step is that we'll continue  
20 to work in close coordination with multiple  
21 entities, including state governments, other federal  
22 agencies, tribes, local governments across the  
23 county and the local water utilities and other  
24 industry. We'll provide updates on accomplishments  
25 of this plan.

1                   The tracking system is being developed  
2 right now to track - and - and provide to the public  
3 the status of carrying out this Action Plan as we  
4 move forward.

5                   So that's a summary. The full plan is  
6 available on the EPA's website, [www.epa.gov/pfas](http://www.epa.gov/pfas),  
7 simplified links to the Action Plan and a host of a  
8 lot of other information, too. So with that I'll  
9 end.

10                   MR. MCDONNELL: Thank you. With that  
11 we'll move on to some - some of the representatives  
12 of the local community, starting with Aqua  
13 Pennsylvania, Chris Crockett.

14                   DR. CROCKETT: Can everybody hear me?

15                   MR. MCDONNELL: All right.

16                   Yeah, it's set here.

17                   DR. CROCKETT: All right.

18                   Good evening, Secretary, committee  
19 members of the Task Force and the community. First  
20 I want to thank you for giving us the opportunity to  
21 share what Aqua's been doing in our experience and  
22 perspective on this subject.

23                   We appreciate the chance to work within  
24 the Task Force, the members of the federal and state  
25 agencies, the local community. And hopefully our



1 comments will provide some light on what needs to  
2 get done.

3                   First, what are we doing -. Well,  
4 first we need to make sure that everybody knows that  
5 none of our water systems have measured levels of  
6 PFAS over the EPA health advisory limit.

7                   Second, however, due to a lack of  
8 adherence to state and federal guidance regulations,  
9 and the constantly evolving science behind PFAS, we  
10 have taken prudent action regarding monitoring,  
11 treatment, source identification, health  
12 communication, and transparency with our customers  
13 regarding this issue.

14                   In terms of treatment, we've taken  
15 core systems. Two already have treatments  
16 installed, a third will have treatment running in  
17 May and a fourth is already started, Highland  
18 Project Group, studying high-end exchange. We'll  
19 have a treatment system there.

20                   We are adding large amounts of  
21 powdered activated carbon at our 10,000,000  
22 Neshaminy water treatment plant. Nearly  
23 approximately half of the PFAS that arrives there  
24 from the Willow Grove Naval Air Station.

25                   We are continuing to look at all of

1 our systems in the area, using the latest  
2 information plan for future needs.

3           We've been monitoring our systems  
4 since 2016 and we've been posting our data on  
5 waterfacts.com for the eastern Montgomery County  
6 area. We've sent bill inserts for our customers in  
7 January and we share our information to the public.

8           We attended numerous meetings like  
9 this, met with your state, federal and local  
10 officials and continue to update them regarding our  
11 issues for our customers.

12           But one thing that we also have not  
13 really spoken about much is the monitoring part.  
14 And believe it not, Aqua was the first water utility  
15 in Pennsylvania to develop the ability for inhouse  
16 testing for PFAS monitoring instead of waiting two  
17 months for the samples to come back from the labs in  
18 California. We started that back in 2016.

19           So what do we need? We need the EPA,  
20 DEP and other federal agencies to take a more  
21 involved leadership role with the communities  
22 affected by this chemical. You need a science and  
23 health HMCL, even if it's interim, regarding the  
24 nature of the subject. And we need to make sure  
25 that all systems are sampled and investigated for PA

1 by DEP for PFAS monitoring.

2                   There's no simple and accurate way to  
3 determine the vulnerable system for PFAS. And all  
4 systems statewide need sampling, otherwise sampling  
5 programs immediately advised against some  
6 communities.

7                   We need the military to clean up the  
8 pollution at the Willow Grove - and they need to  
9 stop now. Customers and the public should not bear  
10 the cost of cleanup and community private wells need  
11 assistance. It's always cheaper and more effective  
12 to clean up the pollution at its source.

13                  The last few years while we've been waiting for  
14 the military to start cleanup of the base we  
15 continued to monitor the levels of PFAS from the  
16 base at the Willow Grove Naval Air Station in  
17 Horsham International Guard.

18                  In fact, even within the last several  
19 months the levels leaving that base have been up to  
20 a hundred times the health advisory limit. We need  
21 the base and other community sites to pump - treat  
22 the PFAS that's in the groundwater. We need to  
23 contain PFAS onsite and treat it so it doesn't  
24 spread throughout our communities.

25                  We need PA to more supportive in

1 advanced technologies to remove PFAS that's in the  
2 water. Currently anything other than granulated  
3 activated carbon treatment requires a nearly one  
4 year pilot effort before a system can be installed.

5 This delays deployment of treatment to communities.

6 So what does the road ahead look like  
7 for Pennsylvania with PFAS? We can predict, like  
8 many people in the past, that PA does not come up  
9 with a clear -. To one, require utilities in areas  
10 adjacent to known areas of contamination to sample  
11 for PFAS.

12 Two, to let them customers know what  
13 the concentration of PFAS are in the water. And to  
14 know what concentration is safe. And three, what  
15 action is required. And four, to hold polluters  
16 accountable for the cost of cleanup.

17 First, there'll be more public  
18 pressure on systems, so communities can increase  
19 monitoring for PFAS and CA of concern. They might  
20 find low levels in many of these communities that  
21 anticipate it. However, these communities will not  
22 know what to do with the results without state and  
23 federal leadership. They will all embark on  
24 different recording solutions that will lead to  
25 varying levels of drinking water protection

1 throughout the Commonwealth.

2                   Some people hearing the effects of  
3 PFAS might choose not to monitor it, potentially  
4 putting their customers at risk.

5                   Second, where sources of these people  
6 have identified the suspected - there's - there will  
7 be no framework on cleaning - cleanup of pollution.  
8 They'll leave these local communities the very  
9 burden addressed, like we've seen already.

10                   And third, the financial impact of  
11 PFAS contamination on communities will have long-  
12 term economic impacts on those communities that are  
13 already struggling.

14                   So overall this is what PA is doing in  
15 protecting public health and the environment, which  
16 will also have an impact upon attracting businesses  
17 and residents.

18                   Aqua has been welcome to meet with  
19 members of the Task Force in person in Harrisburg  
20 any time at their request to spend the hours that  
21 are necessary to discuss the technical, scientific  
22 and other solutions that are required. Thank you.

23                   MR. MCDONNELL: Next we have the  
24 Township, Billy Walker and Gregory Nesbitt from  
25 Horsham.

1                   MR. WALKER: Good evening, Secretary

2 McDonnell. Thank you and your - your team at the  
3 state and federal agencies and the staff here this  
4 evening for coming to - locally to our region.

5                   Horsham Township, we are 17 square  
6 miles, 26,000 residents and 32,000 people working in  
7 the Township throughout the day. We are home to the  
8 entire Willow Grove Naval Air Station and the  
9 Horsham Air Guard Station, totaling 1,200 acres.

10                   We first found out in 2014 about  
11 PFCs and what PFCs stood for. That shut down two of  
12 our wells in July of 2014. And the newspaper  
13 started - newspaper articles started coming out,  
14 high - highlighting Horsham as a community with PFC  
15 problems.

16                   In the summer of 2016, after the EPA  
17 introduced the health advisory level to 70 parts per  
18 trillion, Horsham Council, the Water and Sewer  
19 Authority and the residents have lost faith in  
20 following an EPA standard. Instead Horsham Council  
21 and the Horsham Water and Sewer Authority took  
22 decisive and proactive steps to enact the Horsham  
23 Standard of nondetect levels PFOS and PFOA in our  
24 public water supply.

25                   We came up with a short-term plan in

**Commented [s3]:** I believe Walker and Nesbitt switch speaking during this presentation. I don't know which one was which and tried my best to distinguish between the two speakers by the tone of the poor audio.

1 six weeks. In May of 2016, Horsham Council directed  
2 its staff and the consultants tasked with -  
3 consultants to come up with a short-term plan. We  
4 came up with a plan in six weeks.

5 We gave the adoption to Township  
6 Council. They adopted them and the short-term plan  
7 started implementation immediately.

8 I'm happy to report since April of  
9 2017 Horsham had achieved this objective of  
10 nondetect in our public drinking water.

11 In - right after - following that, in  
12 June of 2016, the Council directed its staff and  
13 consultants to establish a long-term plan. And in  
14 three months we were back in front of Council in  
15 September 2016 and they adopted the long-term plan  
16 that would be completed by the end of this calendar  
17 year.

18 Our plan had four distinct components.  
19 Education, first we had to educate ourselves and  
20 then we had to educate our residents.

21 And then we had to communicate  
22 everything to our residents. All the bad news as  
23 well if there was any good news. We were open and  
24 transparent, have been since day one.

25 The short-term and long-term plans

1 were part of our remediation to make our community  
2 safe and our public water supply safe.

3           The fourth, compensation, is what  
4 we've been seeking. Since it was implemented, it  
5 has been a high cost to our ratepayers.

6           Some reminders, our citizens have -  
7 have been unfairly impacted. The Water and Sewer  
8 Authority was forced to add a PFAS surcharge for all  
9 the customers' bills. The lack of the redevelopment  
10 of the former base due to the contamination has  
11 negatively affected the Township's credit rating.  
12 And the former base is eight percent of our  
13 community. It's highly visible. It is fast  
14 becoming an 862 acre abandoned, decaying property.

15           Our concerns. Lack of organized  
16 coordination. There should be one coordinated  
17 response from the U.S. Department of Defense.  
18 Currently we are dealing with the Navy, Air National  
19 Guard and the Air Force on different things.

20           This contamination has no barrier.  
21 This contamination does - does not consider fence  
22 lines, property lines, township lines. There should  
23 be one plan to clean this contamination up.

24           Private well owners have also been  
25 affected and hit hard and most affected in our



1 community. Our veterans and former base employees  
2 must not be forgotten in this process.

3 Our recommendations. DEP should  
4 permit alternative treatment, such as resin, for  
5 permanent treatment systems.

6 MR. NESBITT: Additionally, as it is  
7 mentioned by the - the Department of Health, in the  
8 prior blood study, there's an upcoming study. It's  
9 imperative that Horsham, Warrington and Warminster  
10 should be a part of that study and be made part of  
11 the first round of testing for this study.

12 And it's imperative because we have  
13 been exposed to - long-term high exposure of these  
14 chemicals that this - these tests be done promptly,  
15 because with the nondetect standards our blood  
16 levels may show artificial lowering that skews the -  
17 the study.

18 I understand extrapolation, but there  
19 should be a mechanism in place for the residents to  
20 get their blood tested now rather than have to wait  
21 for grants, processing and studies.

22 MR. WALKER: Stormwater. So we've  
23 been asking the same question for three years, that  
24 the stormwater leaving the Naval Air Station and  
25 affecting the communities downstream to be

1 addressed. As Dr. Buckley said, the - the amounts  
2 leaving the base are very, very high.

3           And although the Navy did implement  
4 some things, we believe there are different things  
5 that can be done on the more short term immediate  
6 horizon. And we continue to ask - we routinely  
7 request that from the military, that they address  
8 the stormwater and groundwater currently leaving the  
9 Navy base.

10           MR. NESBITT: Importantly if this was  
11 Dow Chemical, if this was other - some other major  
12 corporation was polluting our waterways, we would  
13 expect the Department of Environmental Protection to  
14 step in and stop the pollution.

15           And we know it exists when there's  
16 heavy rainfall. We know it exists on a regular  
17 basis, as has been indicated by Aqua. We are a  
18 small community and township. We have engineers,  
19 but we do not have environmental engineers to the  
20 level that the State has.

21           We are asking the DEP to step in and  
22 hold the military - the Department of Defense, to  
23 the highest standards to prevent further  
24 contamination of the waterways.

25           MR. WALKER: We are also asking the

1 DEP to work more promptly in permitting filters, so  
2 that the public wells can get online - well, back  
3 online faster, providing a positive immediate direct  
4 impact.

5 MR. NESBITT: While we appreciate the  
6 Action Team, the Action Plan and these proposed  
7 plans, I'm still hearing tonight that they're in the  
8 process of hiring, not hired, hiring toxicologists  
9 still.

10 There are - and obviously those who  
11 are paying attention to this realize other states  
12 have already led the - led the way years ago in this  
13 same process. Let's not reinvent the wheel and  
14 perhaps partner better with other states such New  
15 Jersey, Michigan, New York and Vermont, who's  
16 practically already ahead of you folks.

17 And collaborate better so as we don't  
18 have duplication. So we don't have to wait to hire  
19 somebody when another state may have already licked  
20 that trouble for you.

21 We're all in this together and this  
22 isn't a party issue. This is - this is a pollution  
23 that affects everybody. So the - we just want  
24 speed, we want urgency, we want results. Perhaps  
25 more collaboration would be cheaper and more

1 efficient with these other states and again with the  
2 EPA, as everybody knows.

3           MR. WALKER: We want to establish -  
4 we'd like you to establish a statewide standard, not  
5 a Horsham standard, not a Montgomery County  
6 standard, not a Southeast PA standard, but a State  
7 standard for everyone, all Commonwealth citizens.

8           We need your voice. We need your  
9 voice to join us to get the federal government to  
10 reimburse our citizens, to pay for all future costs,  
11 to control the stormwater coming off the base, to  
12 clean up the contamination 100 percent and to test  
13 and study our residents and former workers of the  
14 base.

15           Other areas that we are looking for  
16 help on, we - a lot of discussion, a lot of looking  
17 at the public water - public water supply. But  
18 soil, surface water and groundwater cannot be  
19 forgotten.

20           We need to start that process now also  
21 and not after a drinking water standard has been  
22 established. They need to start running at the same  
23 time.

24           Of course we want to thank everyone on  
25 behalf of the citizens. It's a bipartisan effort in

1 Horsham, this contamination effort. Everyone's been  
2 working hard. But as Mr. Nesbitt just said, we're  
3 getting tired of meetings. We're getting tired of  
4 meetings.

5 We understand and we understand that  
6 these meetings must take place, but in the meantime  
7 any action, some type of action, we would like to  
8 see. Help your Commonwealth. Thank you.

9 MR. MCDONNELL: Next, we have Mike  
10 McGee, the Executive Director of Horsham Land  
11 Redevelopment and redevelopment of the former  
12 military base.

13 MR. MCGEE: Good evening, everyone and  
14 thank you, Mr. Secretary and members of the Task  
15 Force. We certainly appreciate the opportunity to  
16 be here these evening and also echo everything Aqua  
17 said as well as the Township, Mr. Walker and Mr.  
18 Nesbitt.

19 The Horsham Land Redevelopment  
20 Authority is recognized by the Department and tasked  
21 with specific points of contact with redevelopment  
22 of the former Naval Air Station and Joint Reserve  
23 Base in Willow Grove. As was pointed out  
24 approximately 862 acres of vacant land in Montgomery  
25 County.

1                   PFAS issues continue to delay the  
2 redevelopment of the former base in Horsham. We  
3 cannot possibly move forward with any rebuild -  
4 redevelopment with all the unknowns in place.

5                   It - there we go. We're good.

6                   So the former Naval Air Station-Joint  
7 Reserve Base is located in Horsham, as was pointed  
8 out. The size and location provide unique  
9 opportunities for economic development and job  
10 creation that will benefit the entire region.  
11 Perhaps the - this is the largest single piece of  
12 property in the Philadelphia area available for  
13 redevelopment.

14                   As pointed out previously, there are  
15 two bases on board the property, Horsham Air Guard  
16 Station as well as the former Naval Air Station and  
17 Joint Reserve Base.

18                   The background. In 2005 the BRAC  
19 closed the Horsham Naval Air Station. There was a  
20 whole group of Naval Air Stations. And eight  
21 percent of the Township has been vacant since  
22 December 2011. It has created an economic void in  
23 our community.

24                   Its location along Route 611 is a  
25 highly-visible reminder that the Navy was once here

1 and is now gone. The property is a national  
2 Superfund site.

3                   Probably the - it's also probably the  
4 highest-contaminated property in the Commonwealth of  
5 Pennsylvania with PFAS.

6                   The Redevelopment Plan was developed  
7 by the community with lots of input. And we're  
8 anxious to move forward with that Redevelopment  
9 Plan. We have a - a number of commercial, 1.7  
10 million square feet of commercial space, 40 acres  
11 for educational use, continuing care or the  
12 community, a town center, 1,486 residential units, a  
13 hotel and conference center, aviation museum,  
14 regional recreation center and lots of parks and  
15 open space.

16                   A highlight of all that, though, is  
17 7,000 new jobs will be created once the property is  
18 redeveloped.

19                   Any development involves risks and we  
20 can manage the risks. However, it has to be known  
21 risks. We cannot move forward not knowing what the  
22 - the standard will be for PFAS issues. The Navy is  
23 currently doing an investigation on the nature and  
24 extent of the PFAS contamination on the base.  
25 They're removing the topsoil and replacing some

1 spots of topsoil.

2                   But any cleanup action requires  
3 comparing the levels of contamination at the base  
4 with the established standards. And there are no  
5 standards for PFAS contamination for soil, surface  
6 water, sediment or air. The drinking water standard  
7 is only a recommended health advisory from the U.S.  
8 EPA.

9                   Moving forward with the redevelopment  
10 without established standards may result in future  
11 landowners and residents occupying property which  
12 may put them at risk in an environment which is  
13 unsafe. We - again, I'll repeat what was said. We  
14 need to have standards for all PFAS in the soils and  
15 contamination of the water as well.

16                   While the redevelopment of the former  
17 base is essential to the economy of the region, the  
18 number one priority must continue to be the health  
19 and safety of our current and future residents.

20                   LRA concerns include impacts of PFAS  
21 contamination on the Redevelopment Plan are  
22 currently unknown and may include deed restrictions  
23 and land-use controls, all of which are unknown.  
24 The ability to establish property values and the  
25 feasibility of the Redevelopment Plan may need to be



1 reevaluated. And probably we'll have to start once  
2 again for a good portion of our Redevelopment Plan.

3           The government should retain liability  
4 for all PFAS contamination resulting from past use  
5 or spills on military property. At this point they  
6 have no obligation to maintain that liability. And  
7 we've been told at this point they will not retain  
8 that liability.

9           Sources of PFAS remain on the base in  
10 the water and the soil and must be mitigated. The  
11 former Naval Air Station and Joint Reserve Base and  
12 the Horsham Air Guard Station should have one  
13 remedial plan with the same expedited schedule.  
14 Both bases are on different schedules.

15           The Navy obviously consented to move  
16 forward more quickly as they can possibly can to -  
17 to - to get rid of the property. They want a  
18 transfer of the property. Their mission is to  
19 offload the property.

20           And they're anxious to do that, but we  
21 need to - we need the Air Guard as well to follow  
22 their same schedule, so that we can move forward  
23 knowing that entire property is addressing  
24 remediation in the soil and the water.

25           Given the impact to the Township and

1 its residents, the federal government should  
2 transfer ownership of the property at no cost, once  
3 the remediation plan has been approved. They  
4 actually still think we should pay them a lot of  
5 money for the - for the property after they  
6 contaminated - created a Superfund site and  
7 contaminated the property with PFAS.

8                   Recommendations, you need to establish  
9 - and all of this been said before, was said at  
10 various meetings over the course of many years.  
11 Establish standards for soil, surface water and  
12 sediment and require remediation.

13                   Current focus on drinking water does  
14 not fully address the problem. PFAS in the soil  
15 continues to leach into the groundwater. Standards  
16 must be uniform for all, not just targeted to  
17 military bases.

18                   And you could hope that the State,  
19 when - when you do move forward with regard to  
20 establishing a standard, it's not to be directed at  
21 just the Navy or the Air Guard or Horsham Township.  
22 Because we've seen across the country where that has  
23 been attempted by local states - by states. The  
24 Department of Defense has challenged that as being  
25 discriminatory.

1                   Government standards should be  
2 consistent and resolve the differences between EPA,  
3 ATSDR, and the states. It's amazing because if you  
4 listen to all the states and - and this - well,  
5 other former - they're coming through, the standards  
6 are not uniform. And certainly there's no  
7 difference between a resident in Maine and a  
8 resident in Pennsylvania.

9                   So the standards - the federal  
10 government really needs to move ahead and, you know,  
11 we hope that they do. But actions deserve action.  
12 They should be held accountable. They should show  
13 that leadership.

14                   All PFAS key factors should be  
15 evaluated for listing and - instead of sporadically  
16 -. And I realize that there's thousands of them,  
17 but we need to step forward. And we need to study  
18 these impacts on our residents.

19                   The EPA - they need - need to establish standards  
20 for the best available technologies for PFAS  
21 treatment and the appropriate permitting strategies.

22                   A reminder to all, good stewards leave  
23 a situation or property in a better condition than -  
24 when they depart. We can all be part of the  
25 solution to ensure these PFAS issues are

1 appropriately addressed for the long-term use of the  
2 property at the former base.

3           Nothing I said should lead anyone to  
4 believe that - that anyone is not trying to do their  
5 best. We have met - I've been involved with the  
6 local government for over 35 years and I have never  
7 been involved with so many different government  
8 organizations that are addressing this issue.

9           And I believe when we do the math -  
10 you're dealing with a different person - they all  
11 are - are doing the best that they can. But again,  
12 it's just - there's a standard of having that and  
13 having it consistent that we need to do a better job  
14 of.

15           And - and it is fair to say - or it is  
16 needed to be said that all the folks on this last  
17 slide had been providing us with lots of support,  
18 with lots of information. And we are grateful for  
19 that.

20           But it is time to conclude the  
21 discussion and move forward with standards that are  
22 enforceable and particularly enforceable by the  
23 United States Government. Where, you know, this -  
24 this town - this is Horsham. We've been involved -  
25 is - is at a standstill and has been at a standstill

1 since 2014, when we found out about PF - PFAS.

2                   And it's just a - it's just - why that  
3 property couldn't be taken -. And a real concern,  
4 in addition to the public, health, safety and well-  
5 being, is the feasibility of any development on that  
6 base.

7                   God only knows what's going to happen  
8 if the standards of the soil and sedimentation are -  
9 are so strict and all of that property has to be  
10 evacuated, the soils have to be evacuated for the  
11 entire property. We need standards. We need  
12 leadership and we need it fast. Thank you.

13                   MR. MCDONNELL: And finally for this  
14 segment we have Tina O'Rourke, Manager at Horsham  
15 Water and Sewer Authority and Michael J. Pickel,  
16 Director of Compliance.

17                   MR. PICKEL: Yeah, sorry. Tina could  
18 not be here tonight. Can you hear me?

19                   MR. MCDONNELL: Yes.

20                   MR. PICKEL: So the Horsham -.

21                   PUBLIC MEMBER: Can't hear you.

22                   MR. PICKEL: The background, of course  
23 is - you heard some of it already from Bill, is that  
24 in 2014, the UCMR we had sampling done. At the time  
25 Horsham uses 14 groundwater wells and has entered

1 and exited two neighboring systems, a water supply  
2 of about 2.2 million gallons a day average to  
3 customers.

4           The sampling determined in 2014 that  
5 five of the wells had detections for PFAS. Two of  
6 them were over the then provisional health action  
7 level of 400 for PFOA and 200 for PFAS and were shut  
8 down. They were wells 26 and 40.

9           And immediately public notice was  
10 given. As time would go on, the analytical  
11 capabilities were lowered down to about 2.5 parts  
12 per trillion. It was determined that all 14 wells  
13 in Horsham actually had some levels of PFAS in them.

14           By 2016, though, the EPA lowered the  
15 health action levels, and - up to the 70 level of  
16 PFOA and PFOS. And that impacted three more wells  
17 that were immediately shut down.

18           Once again, notice was given to the  
19 customers. And at that time, as Bill mentioned, the  
20 Township Council got together and said, enough. We  
21 - we need to have - to do better than this and  
22 develop a plan, a short-term plan and a long-term  
23 plan.

24           Very wisely they gave us that  
25 direction and a short-term plan was developed.

1                   The short-term plan essentially they  
2 attempt to maximize - optimize the current PFAS-  
3 containing sources while we were installing  
4 treatment on other sources. The five Navy wells  
5 that were impacted by the 70 parts per trillion, we  
6 will have permanent GAC, that's granular activated  
7 carbon treatment. That's 26 and 40.

8                   They also have two of those wells up  
9 that came in the second round of 2016 that are  
10 temporary granular activated carbon, 17 and 21. And  
11 we've installed a pilot and ion-exchange resin on  
12 well 10.

13                   We also had suspended eight wells from  
14 service. That three - five of these wells didn't  
15 have the installation of GAC treatment. And that  
16 temporarily increased with our purchased water  
17 supply as part of the optimization. And that, of  
18 course, has a cost to it. And that surcharge had to  
19 be placed to the customers.

20                   We are happy to say right now the  
21 system-wide average for - for Horsham systems,  
22 around four parts per trillion, in which we consider  
23 to be nondetected. So nondetect would be around two  
24 to five parts per trillion, based on a 2.5 detection  
25 of the 32 contaminants. A short-term plan costs

1 about a million dollars for the short term, for the  
2 customers when we add the charge.

3           Just a couple pictures. We have a  
4 picture here of the temporary facility at 17 GAC and  
5 a picture of our ion-exchange resin in our well 10.

6           So long-term plans we were in the  
7 midst of, is to construct treatment on five  
8 additional wells that are below the 70 parts per  
9 trillion. So in addition to the five that the Navy  
10 are putting into a cooperative agreement, we have  
11 five other wells that we are installing treatment  
12 on.

13           Our well 22 was just placed in service  
14 at the end of February. We have another well we're  
15 waiting on a permit from DEP. We expect to have  
16 three more wells, 2, 4 and 19, here by the end of  
17 the summer back online. Once they come back online,  
18 we will take - we will install treatment on an  
19 interconnect, one of the neighboring suppliers, and  
20 we will take the three wells that have the temporary  
21 treatment out of service for a permanent treatment.

22           We also constructed an interconnect -  
23 a separate interconnection and they are doing a  
24 connection with another utility. And that's in  
25 service now.



1                   We've also constructed 1.8 miles of  
2 new water mains, in order to serve private wells.  
3 There have been private wells impacted by this.  
4 Ninety-seven (97) private wells have been identified  
5 greater than 70 parts per trillion.

6                   Today we have 88 of them hooked up to  
7 the public water supply, five of them in progress,  
8 two, unfortunately rejected our offer and two have  
9 not responded.

10                   So the long-term plan also will have,  
11 as I mentioned, permanent treatment on the three  
12 wells that were impacted in 2016. And four wells  
13 will be placed in reserve status at this time.

14                   We of course have higher commitment to  
15 purchased water. At the end of the day we have a  
16 total of 11 PFAS treatments, either GAC or ion  
17 exchange here in Horsham.

18                   The capital O and M costs for five  
19 wells funded by the Navy, capital costs for a number  
20 of the other wells below 70 are - are being funded  
21 by ten million gallon - or a \$10 million PENNVEST  
22 grant from the State and then the rest is being  
23 borne by the customers.

24                   Real quickly, PFAS is not just a  
25 drinking water issue. We have a base water plan and

1 we do monitor for PFAS there.

2                   We do have about right now I think 25  
3 parts per trillion coming to the plant and coming  
4 out, that wastewater treatment does not do anything  
5 to reduce the levels.

6                   Our new permit that we have to get  
7 every five years actually has now a PFAS requirement  
8 in it to monitor on a quarterly basis, which is  
9 rather interesting. Because right now there's  
10 really only one method for PFAS and that's for  
11 drinking water only, but we have one requirement to  
12 do the wastewater.

13                   So challenges real quick. Not only  
14 are the capital costs for installing GAC expensive,  
15 these wells are big. In order to house the - the  
16 vessels for the carbon, it requires a bigger  
17 footprint than previous wells.

18                   Not every well we have plenty of space  
19 available for the footprint for this. Some Navy  
20 wells are rather intrusive, altering neighborhoods.

21                   The changes are quite substantial, as you can see  
22 from some of the pictures.

23                   The O and M is - is intensive,  
24 expensive for the GAC. We have a carbon change-out  
25 repeatedly, a big truck coming into the neighborhood

1 and changing it. A lot of times we have the wells  
2 out of service for long periods of time now for part  
3 of the treatments, as we got more and more  
4 requirements put on us from DEP, for sampling, to  
5 add their changes.

6                   The - putting on the GAC and ion  
7 exchange, this is a transformative change for a  
8 small or large or medium-sized water system. To go  
9 from having no advanced treatment to 11 - advanced  
10 treatment, not even a couple years, is quite a  
11 change.

12                   And as mentioned before, by Dr.  
13 Crockett, permitting for the new treatment is -  
14 sometimes it's just taking too long. It's, you  
15 know, GAC and ion exchange, I've been around 40-some  
16 years in the water industry. These are not new  
17 technologies.

18                   You know for PFAS, yes, but then,  
19 again, PFAS doesn't even have a water standard for  
20 it. So why do it?

21                   Some quick recommendations. Water  
22 authorities impacted by this need collaboration,  
23 cooperation and assistance from regulators for  
24 putting in these new -. The technologies are  
25 difficult and there's more and more burdens being

1 put on us all the time as a result, unintended  
2 consequences, so to speak.

3           We need help with communication. I  
4 know Rick said that EPA's working on a toolbox. I  
5 look forward to communication tools coming out of  
6 EPA.

7           As mentioned before the citizens of  
8 Horsham, Warminster, Warrington should not be  
9 bearing the cost for removing PFAS from their  
10 drinking water. They didn't put it there, it's not  
11 naturally-occurring. They shouldn't have to do it.

12           The - the impact of past exposure, as  
13 we mentioned before, cannot be ignored. The support  
14 - the State financial health study, we're looking  
15 forward to that being done.

16           And lastly, the raw water in the  
17 aquifer is contaminated. It's still there under the  
18 base. We are proud with what we've done to treat  
19 it, to treat the water supply, to get the drinking  
20 water to where it is now, but the groundwater is  
21 still contaminated.

22           We cannot be the sole remediation for  
23 that groundwater. It has to be remediated at the  
24 base. Thank you.

25           MR. MCDONNELL: Thank you very much.

1 We're - we're going to take a couple minute break,  
2 just to transition into the public commenting  
3 period.

4 I'd - I'd like to thank everyone who -  
5 who presented here tonight so far.

6 ---  
7 (WHEREUPON, A SHORT BREAK WAS TAKEN.)

8 ---  
9 MR. MCDONNELL: Go ahead and present  
10 commenters as we can. We're needing to leave the  
11 school at 9:00. I'm going to call names in the  
12 order you signed up at the door.

13 We ask that you keep your remarks to  
14 three minutes, to ensure as many people have the  
15 opportunity to - to speak as possible. If you don't  
16 get the chance to speak tonight or we run out time  
17 or think of something later, we - we are continuing  
18 to accept comments through May 1st, 2019 through  
19 DEP's website through our e-comment coil.

20 We're also capturing your remarks and  
21 information shared this evening through an audio  
22 recording and a stenographer. The PFAS webpage will  
23 be updated - updated accordingly as soon as we  
24 receive copies of the report of this.

25 With that I will invite the first

1 speaker up. I just ask that each person who comes  
2 to the podium state your name and - for us and if  
3 you are representing any particular community or  
4 organization, please say. I will apologize in  
5 advance for - for the - any names I get wrong. I'll  
6 read your handprinted - the names here.

7 So we will start Danette Richards.

8 MS. RICHARDS: Thank you. And you did  
9 pronounce my name correctly, so that's good. That's  
10 a good start. Good, good.

11 Yeah, I am a Horsham resident and I  
12 put my thoughts together. I mean, this has been  
13 going on, certainly, for quite a long time. As we  
14 know 2014 it was first identified in Horsham.

15 And the blood sampling that has  
16 already happened in Horsham, Warminster and  
17 Warrington communities, as we are aware, has shown  
18 elevated levels of PFA - PFAS and also PFHxS greater  
19 than the general population. That itself concerns  
20 me.

21 But also on the slide tonight, it was  
22 shown that New York has really rallied a lot of  
23 their resources to really deal with this issue. I  
24 noted that because I think that's really important.

25 I can't help but think back on all of

1 the family events and gatherings that we had for  
2 years in Horsham. Little did I know that my family  
3 was drinking, bathing in and cooking with  
4 contaminated water. We had no idea.

5 I worry each day that my family will  
6 be confronted with some of the findings of the C8  
7 study science panel results on the health issues  
8 that we know follow this kind of contamination, such  
9 as kidney cancer, testicular cancer, thyroid  
10 disease, high cholesterol. And that's just to name  
11 a few.

12 I think about that every day. I have  
13 two daughters and the only thing I wish for them is  
14 good health and a long healthy life. And I worry.  
15 I do know that my home water department has  
16 installed or is in the process of installing, as  
17 we've seen tonight, a nutrient treatment system.  
18 But problems with cost, mapping the pollution,  
19 identifying the initial sources of the pollution,  
20 cleanup of groundwater and surface water and a  
21 persistence - and this scared me too - of the  
22 chemicals in the environment, dust, the ground, the  
23 - the - the dirt that I walk in and live in every  
24 single day -. I don't know what I'm being  
25 confronted with.

1 I do agree that Horsham residents  
2 should not have to pay for this. I strongly agree  
3 with that. We didn't ask for this. We had nothing  
4 to do with this.

5 As part of the Pennsylvania  
6 Constitution, we're entitled to clean water. These  
7 issues really need to be tackled in a more direct,  
8 robust and systematic way.

9 And I have one question, why isn't  
10 this an emergency? I don't get it. It seems to me  
11 as if it were a flood or another catastrophe, such  
12 as a flood -. And that's my - that's my comment for  
13 tonight. Thank you.

14 MR. MCDONNELL: Next we have Tracy  
15 Carluccio.

16 MS. CARLUCCIO: Thank you. Tracy  
17 Carluccio, Staff Director of Delaware Riverkeeper  
18 Network, representing our members in Horsham  
19 Township and throughout the rest of the county and  
20 the affected region.

21 Delaware Riverkeeper Network concerns  
22 - considers the Pennsylvania DEP Sampling Plan to be  
23 a critically important first step towards stiff  
24 regulation of PFAS, for which we have all waited far  
25 too long. Regarding the - Sampling Plan I'd to -



1 suggest all of our concerns and recommendations.

2                   First, the plan applies only to public  
3 water systems, leaving a large number of  
4 Pennsylvanians out of the sampling. About 3.5  
5 million people get their water from private wells.  
6 And an unknown - unknown additional number use  
7 springs and other types of waterway not connected to  
8 public systems.

9                   Penn State Extension reports that  
10 about 20,000 new water wells are drilled each year.  
11 Excluding private well users from the plan means  
12 that about one-quarter of the population of  
13 Pennsylvania will continue to be in the dark about  
14 whether or not their drinking water contains PFAS.  
15 This is a huge oversight and is simply not just,  
16 especially considering that there are many private  
17 wells where sources of contamination could be  
18 located.

19                   For instance, many oil and gas wells  
20 which are stated in the DEP's plan as having used  
21 PFAS and proprietary fracking formulas are located  
22 in rural areas where individual water wells are the  
23 main supply.

24                   And you learn from the study here that  
25 private water supplies, people using private water

1 supplies have a higher levels of PFAS in their  
2 blood. A plan should be enacted to include private  
3 water supplies.

4                   Secondly, the plan is going in its  
5 phase 1 in maybe 2019 or 2020. We heard tonight it  
6 is expected to take a year. Will there be a phase  
7 2? And how long will that take?

8                   Why is phase 1 being stretched out  
9 throughout 2019 and 2020? The goal, according to  
10 Secretary McDonnell, is to adopt a maximum  
11 contaminant level for PFOS that will finally require  
12 the removal from our drinking water of PFASs. The  
13 plan should be revised to complete all sampling as  
14 quickly as possible, less than a year.

15                   Most states are adopting regulations  
16 for PFAS less than year. After all these things to  
17 complete to write the regulations than another year  
18 after to review and revise. At this pace it could  
19 be three years or more before we will finally get  
20 the protection we need; the removal of PFAS from  
21 drinking water sources and the cleanup of  
22 contamination from the environment at the expense of  
23 the responsible parties.

24                   DRN submitted an arbitration to the  
25 Pennsylvania Environmental Quality Board two years

1 ago for an MCL to be set for PFLA. And it was  
2 accepted in August of 2017 by the HUD. We actually  
3 would be at the point of adopting that MCL today if  
4 action had started then.

5                   Enough time has been wasted. All  
6 actions should be on urgency, recognizing that we  
7 are in nothing less than a water crisis here.

8                   Thirdly, we are very troubled by what  
9 sources of contamination are not included in the  
10 plan. Although those - even though these potential  
11 sources are acknowledged by DEP. Municipal and  
12 industrial stormwater and wastewater treatment  
13 plants are both known to carry the PFAS compounds in  
14 the environment. And the military bases, as we  
15 heard here, in Bucks and Montgomery Counties, are  
16 just a large part of the storm - stormwater, with  
17 high concentrations of these contaminants.

18                   It's uncontrollably - it leaks into  
19 the creek's below the bases, making their way to the  
20 Neshaminy Creek and downstream water intakes from  
21 where Delaware Riverkeeper Network gets it water.

22                   Sludge and biosolids from the sludge  
23 are identified by scientific reports as significant  
24 pathways of contamination, because PFASs do not  
25 break down in the sludge. That they're then applied

1 on farm fields and other land, sometimes far away  
2 from the original source.

3           The Sampling Plan should be revised to  
4 cover more locations, because these highly toxic  
5 compounds, from a wide variety of environmental  
6 media, move, such as air, surface water, effluents,  
7 sediments, sludges and - and dust. A more robust  
8 plan should be funded and executed now.

9           Finally, we urge that more information  
10 about the Sampling Plan be made public, such as the  
11 exact locations of sampling, the detection limits  
12 that will be used and the reporting levels that will  
13 be reported.

14           Questions should be answered, such as  
15 why is DEP only testing for six compounds when using  
16 EPA method 531 (sic) issued on November of 2018 by  
17 EPA allows 18 PFASs to be sampled for?

18           Will DEP gather that data? Why won't  
19 that data be included in the report?

20           Additionally, we strongly reject a  
21 statement in the plan that, quote, there remains a  
22 lack of knowledge to the public of these compounds,  
23 how they affect the human body and what lasting  
24 long-term health effects may be realized as a result  
25 of exposure, end quote.

1 PFOA and PFOS, the most recently found  
2 perfluorinated compounds in Pennsylvania so far  
3 across the nation, have a wealth of information  
4 that has been developed regarding the correlation to  
5 certain adverse health effects. States across the  
6 nation, looking right across the river, in New  
7 Jersey, are using that body of data to set statewide  
8 MCLs and adopt other regulations to control their -  
9 to limit their release and control and cleanup the  
10 sources.

11 To state at this point that there is  
12 very little known sounds like frankly subterfuge and  
13 --- and/or denial and discredits your effort.

14 We advocate that the PFAS team revise  
15 the Sampling Plan, conduct the sampling  
16 expeditiously and involve the Pennsylvania  
17 Environmental Quality Board in its efforts. That's  
18 their job. So there will be produced MCLs sooner  
19 rather than later, -

20 MR. MCDONNELL: Your time is up.

21 MS. CARLUCCIO: - to report adverse  
22 health effects. Thank you.

23 MR. MCDONNELL: Next we have Hope  
24 Grosse.

25 MS. GROSSE: Hi, I'm Hope Grosse,

1 Buxmont Coalition for Safer Water and PFAS  
2 contamination - the National PFAS Contamination  
3 Group.

4                   Mr. McDonnell, I'd like thank you all  
5 for coming. And I'd like to thank you for giving  
6 the - giving us your breakdown on what's going to be  
7 happening for the Task Force. I'd love to see that  
8 in writing, your statement - your initial statement,  
9 at some point, via on - on the site or somewhere.

10                   I'd also like to see dates. I really  
11 feel like today - I was listening a little bit to  
12 the EPA. We have this great plan in place, but I'm  
13 - I'm not sure that I have too many dates or heard  
14 too many dates.

15                   So I'd love to see a timeline on your  
16 website of precise, punctual times of the accidents,  
17 emergencies, other than what I learned today. I'd  
18 love to see a timeline on the MCL hazardous  
19 substance. These are really important things that  
20 we need as community members to help our community  
21 survive this horrific disaster.

22                   I'd also like to say that I'd also  
23 like to see soil also be added to this MCL. I mean,  
24 this is - this isn't anything new. We're seeing it  
25 all around the country, like we talked about.

1                   And other states very close to us are  
2 making changes promptly. And Pennsylvania, as far  
3 as I can see, is really dragging and lagging behind.  
4 I'm really a little disturbed that Naval Reserve  
5 wasn't represented here today. This is two of the  
6 sites, two of the Superfund sites.

7                   I'm not really sure why one of your  
8 group was not invited, from what I understand. And  
9 I feel like they've been forgotten.

10                   They redeveloped their land and all of  
11 their - it's all been redeveloped and it's a toxic  
12 cesspool. There's PFAS that we don't even know  
13 about yet, because the redevelopment has happened.  
14 And there's, you know private communities and parks.  
15 There's food, industries.

16                   Again, time is of the essence. And  
17 the polluters need to pay for this. Our - our - our  
18 people in our communities have already exceeded -  
19 far exceeded the lifetime limits of PFAS in our  
20 blood. We deserve blood testing today by the  
21 Department of Health.

22                   The Pennsylvania Department of Health  
23 needs to step up. We're going need national health  
24 days that are going to take place that are -  
25 probably you're not going to see results for years,

1 but we need our blood tested and we deserve it  
2 tested for free by the Department of Defense. Thank  
3 you.

4 MR. MCDONNELL: Next speaker is Joanne  
5 Stanton.

6 MS. STANTON: Hi. My name is Joanne  
7 Stanton. I'm with the Buxmont Coalition of Safer  
8 Water. I'm also in the National PFAS Coalition.  
9 Thank you very much to the Navy for being here and  
10 for allowing us to speak.

11 We need safer drinking water for our  
12 entire lives. The Health agencies have spent time  
13 on the topic. Each sip of contaminated water puts  
14 chemicals in our body for eight to ten years.

15 We are just beginning to learn the  
16 health effects of PFAS chemical individually. We  
17 have no idea how these chemicals combine with all  
18 the other contaminants we are exposed to from those  
19 sites such as TCB, PCB, hexanol, chromium and many  
20 others, all the other contaminants in the  
21 environment that have inhabited drinking water over  
22 the years.

23 As concerned residents, as parents who  
24 spoke with doctors, who spoke with toxicologists,  
25 who spoke with epidemiologists -. And no one will



1 give us a real clear answer on what the health  
2 effects are of what we're exposed to. Make no  
3 mistake that health is first and foremost on all  
4 the minds of affected families.

5           We really shouldn't have to wait for  
6 multi-million dollar health studies and to apply for  
7 them. We should have free blood testing, because -.  
8 And we should - the water levels and we should all  
9 have the ability to know what has happened to our  
10 body and what will we do about it.

11           Myself and several other members of  
12 the National PFAS Committee have had a chance to  
13 look at the national - to review the ATSDR national  
14 multi-site study protocol. We were very  
15 disappointed in the study design.

16           \$33 million is a heck of a lot of  
17 money to spend without buy-in from the invested  
18 communities. We want health studies that answer the  
19 questions that weigh heaviest on us every day.

20           And the biggest of those questions is  
21 cancer. It is unfathomable that this study will  
22 look at the worst sites across the country and does  
23 not include cancer as one of the end points or at  
24 least allow evidence on it across all sites.

25           This is the most important health

1 question that the community members want answered.  
2 We understand the importance of health effects  
3 additional to cancer. But - and we do have that on  
4 any standard research in any of these areas.  
5 However, this is the elephant in the room that needs  
6 to be addressed.

7                   In my opinion, it's unforgivable to  
8 waste this opportunity to study this community and  
9 not build from the existing science that already  
10 relates PFAS to cancer. You will never get an  
11 answer to a question if you choose not to ask.

12                   We will keep relying on the state as  
13 well as the federal agencies to get additional  
14 funding we deserve, so that we can - can do some  
15 real studies that focus on the existing science with  
16 regards to cancer in our community. Okay?

17                   We need to move with a sense of  
18 urgency. And in this panel over here - just look at  
19 the - look up here, and some of them have - have  
20 stepped down. They had a lot of members of our  
21 community.

22                   You have to have some sense of  
23 urgency. Time is of the essence. Every day that  
24 goes by that there isn't transparency to what we're  
25 drinking and what the health effects are lives are

1 at stake. Thank you.

2 MR. MCDONNELL: Thank you. Next we  
3 have Lisa Cellini.

4 MS. CELLINI: Lisa Cellini, Horsham  
5 resident for 20 years, a little more than 20 years.  
6 I raised my two sons in Horsham and I came to  
7 Horsham because it's a good place to live. And I  
8 gave them poisoned water for 20 years.

9 And I'm mad. And I want to know why  
10 nothing's being done about it.

11 I don't feel the urgency. This is  
12 called Action Group, Action Plan. You're all good  
13 people. I can - I can see that, but where is the  
14 action?

15 We can't wait years. I heard years.  
16 What - children are drinking this water. If you  
17 look at our water and test - look at our test  
18 results of our water before it hits our filters,  
19 they're just as contaminated as the day as - I think  
20 I've revealed those problems I think. We need  
21 action, that's all.

22 I think of my sons every day, my  
23 little boys that I gave this water. I want you to  
24 think you about your children and how you would feel  
25 if you gave them this water, please. Thank you.

1                   MR. MCDONNELL: Next is Mark Cuker.

2                   MR. CUKER: Mark Cuker, Buxmont

3 Coalition for Safer Water and National PFAS

4 Coalition.

5                   No state has been harder hit than  
6 Pennsylvania by PFAS contamination. That's why the  
7 Governor has formed this team. That's why your work  
8 is so important and that's why you must act swiftly  
9 and decisively. I was intending in talking about  
10 Mr. Walker, what federal meetings he's been to.

11                   I was at a meeting of this team in  
12 November in Harrisburg five months ago. Five months  
13 ago you heard what other states were doing. You  
14 heard from Minnesota about all the work they've done  
15 in developing toxicity diagrams well below EPA's  
16 health advisory level.

17                   You heard about the work New Jersey  
18 has done. New Jersey has generated literally  
19 thousands of pages of scientific analyses about the  
20 toxicology, epidemiology and the feasibility of  
21 treatment that resulted in MCLs of 13 and 14 and a  
22 cleanup level of 10.

23                   Since that meeting in November, New  
24 York has recommended an MCL of 10. Michigan has  
25 included the EPA's level is not safe and will

1 announce an MCL recommendation on July 1st. All  
2 these states are acting because EPA is not.

3           As recently as last week Linda  
4 Birnbaum, on behalf of the National Institute of  
5 Environmental Health Science, spoke here about the  
6 most recent studies, the most recent research  
7 showing immune system problems, metabolic problems  
8 all caused by PFAS.

9           The next meeting we had to be the  
10 meeting in which you announced an MCL was being set  
11 for PFAS and it is being classified as a hazardous  
12 substance so the -.

13           MR. MCDONNELL: Thank you. Next we  
14 have Jill -.

15           MS. FLORIN: Florin.

16           MR. MCDONNELL: What's it?

17           MS. FLORIN: Florin, F-L-O-R-I-N.  
18 Florin.

19           MR. MCDONNELL: Florin, yes. Jill  
20 Florin.

21           MS. FLORIN: I also want to thank you  
22 for being here today and having us comment. My name  
23 is Jill Florin and I'm a resident in Upper Dublin, a  
24 neighboring community.

25           Upper Dublin may not ring any bells

1 for you since Horsham and Warminster have been the  
2 areas most affected by the PFAS issue - issue. I'm  
3 here to tell you that it's not just Warminster and  
4 Horsham, but also surrounding areas like Upper  
5 Dublin, Abington, Jenkintown and Springfield and any  
6 - many additional areas in Montgomery and Bucks  
7 County communities.

8                   What baffles me is after we're dealing  
9 with this for about five years now, we still seem to  
10 be no closer to doing what needs to be done, which  
11 is setting an MCL and declaring PFAS as a hazardous  
12 substance. Because frankly it is.

13                   As other states, most recently  
14 Michigan, are moving quickly to protect their  
15 residents, Pennsylvania is still, well, looking for  
16 a toxicologist. There's no reason why PA cannot do  
17 what New Jersey and Michigan are doing, setting more  
18 strict powers with a goal of set MCLs. It's great  
19 to have a committee, but we need a committee to do  
20 what needs to be done as to MCLs, that will force  
21 the removal of the toxins from our water.

22                   How many studies do you need to show  
23 that PFAS are toxic? What exactly are we waiting  
24 for?

25                   Science - and science in New Jersey

1 has done many studies that have led them to seek  
2 action. PA should do the same immediately.

3 We are far from the beginning, and it  
4 needs an end, which includes MCLs for close to  
5 nondetect, and declare PFAS a hazardous substance to  
6 get the polluters to pay for the mess they have  
7 caused.

8 It is actionable. Yes, simple.

9 The Governor has received letters and  
10 - petitions, and I do not understand why he has not  
11 stepped up the way the Michigan Governor has done  
12 when the Michigan Governor has been in office for  
13 much less time than our Governor has.

14 I do not want another meeting to end  
15 without a definite plan to accomplish what needs to  
16 be done and not in a year, months, not tomorrow but  
17 today.

18 I appreciate that you're doing a lot  
19 of listening and you have been doing a lot of  
20 listening, but now we need to be heard. Thank you.

21 MR. MCDONNELL: Thank you. Next and  
22 this one's a little faded on here, Phil -.

23 PHIL: 1:45:19 Hi, my name is Phil.  
24 I'm a Cheltenham resident. And like Jill just said,  
25 residents of Cheltenham, Abington, Upper Dublin,

1 which those - those townships themselves number more  
2 than the counties - communities surrounding the  
3 base, are getting contaminated water from Aqua out  
4 of -.

5                   The only - the only common sense  
6 statements we've heard tonight were from the - the  
7 gentlemen from Horsham. They heard that their water  
8 was contaminated and they quickly made a plan and  
9 brought those contaminants to zero, to nondetect.

10                   Those of us with Aqua as a water  
11 supplier, we - we have no recourse to any action of  
12 this and they have no incentive to take action while  
13 you drag your feet. They're only loyal to their  
14 shareholders.

15                   All of us who live in Cheltenham and  
16 Abington, we're - we're helpless in this situation.  
17 It - it doesn't make financial sense for Aqua to do  
18 anything with our water until you make them do  
19 something. And we have no way of making that  
20 happen.

21                   They - they seem to be saying that  
22 they're doing a lot. They have more resources and  
23 technology to achieve this. And there's like 20,000  
24 people in Horsham. Their water department has very  
25 - very few employees. They've been able to tackle



1 this problem.

2                   Instead, Aqua's spending billions in  
3 buying up infrastructure. They're - they're  
4 currently buying Cheltenham's sewer system, which,  
5 as the Delaware Riverkeeper Network spoke tonight,  
6 is another source of these contaminants that's  
7 bleeding and getting into our water.

8                   They're - they're using this situation  
9 to prey upon the helpless public. We have the  
10 constitutional right to clean water, but those of us  
11 who have private water supplies rather than a public  
12 water authority, have literally nothing we can do to  
13 ensure that we're not drinking contaminated water.  
14 Thank you.

15                   MR. MCDONNELL: Thank you. Next we  
16 have Gary Scarpello.

17                   MR. SCARPELLO: How you doing? I'd  
18 like to thank the Action Team for - and local  
19 leaders for having this forum tonight.

20                   I'm Gary Scarpello. I'm a Township  
21 Commissioner for Upper Dublin for the Aidenn  
22 Lair/Willow Manor sections of Upper Dublin.

23                   Upper Dublin is downstream from the  
24 Naval Air Base. In 1956 my family moved into Upper  
25 Dublin. I was three years old, we moved into North

1 Hills.

2                   By 1965 we moved into Aidenn Lair,  
3 where I currently live. In 1993 I came down with  
4 Graves' disease, which is a thyroid disease, which  
5 has been linked to PFAS. And I have high  
6 cholesterol.

7                   I've lived most of my life except for  
8 20 years in Upper Dublin. Three of those 20 years  
9 were lived in Warminster, and that's like jumping  
10 from the frying pan into the fire.

11                   But PFAS levels have been so high in  
12 Upper Dublin that Aqua was compelled to take two of  
13 the wells, the Aidenn Lair well and North Hills well  
14 offline.

15                   So that should be some indication that  
16 Upper Dublin should be included in the blood tests  
17 that are going on - coming up I guess in a couple of  
18 months, I think you were - you were saying. But  
19 there's no reason why Upper Dublin should be  
20 excluded from those - those upcoming ones and any  
21 tests in the future.

22                   We are feeling the effects of PFAS and  
23 we should be included in those blood tests. Thank  
24 you.

25                   MR. MCDONNELL: Thank you. Next we

1 have Dave Bering. Am I mispronouncing it?

2 I'm not seeing Dave. Moving on, next  
3 is Joanne O'Connor.

4 MS. O'CONNOR: Hi. My name is Joanne  
5 O'Connor. I'm from Jenkintown, on their  
6 Environmental Advisory Committee. I'll probably  
7 ramble a little, because I lost my script here.

8 I attended the meeting in Harrisburg.  
9 I went out to Harrisburg on my own dime and sat and  
10 learned a lot about PFAS. It was the first time I  
11 realized that there's - my area was affected.

12 I always knew that a portion of War -  
13 Warminster, that it was impacting the - the people  
14 there. And so I - I was determined to learn about  
15 this. And besides attending your meeting, I  
16 listened to New York State's drinking water quality  
17 past meeting.

18 So what you're doing here I sat  
19 through their meeting, so - via the computer. I've  
20 also called a gentleman on their research team and  
21 he took me step by step how MCL is established,  
22 okay, so I could understand this.

23 I know that - I know that this is  
24 important. I know that things take time, but I  
25 remember being so pleased hearing in November that

1 we were hiring toxicologists, that there were going  
2 to be some associates.

3                   And here it is in April and I feel  
4 like, well, if you can't hire a toxicologist - let  
5 me tell you what I learned by reading the papers.

6                   I read in December of 2018 the  
7 research that Dr. BiCiccio about his endocrine  
8 disruption on young males and their development.  
9 And that's - that's trouble. That's a red flag.

10                   I learned that Dr. - I may be  
11 pronouncing his name wrong, Grandjean of Harvard  
12 Public School of Health doesn't think their - the MC  
13 - he believes the MCL should be one or lower. He  
14 has done research where - that demonstrates the  
15 immune interference with young children.

16                   I learned - I read Dr. Lori Post's  
17 papers and also learned about how they came to their  
18 MCL of 14 - I think 14 or 13.

19                   And one thing was interesting. I know  
20 that MCLs have to be legally defensible. And you're  
21 very cautious and people are conservative in  
22 establishing them. But there was one - they listed  
23 it but it was okay for the - they didn't - it was  
24 research that they include.

25                   There was - it causes delays in memory

1 development. And the reason why they didn't include  
2 it is because it wasn't released as a precedent of  
3 MCLs.

4                   Which to me that's a red flag.  
5 Endocrine - so you have all these things. That you  
6 have what - what's been established with the thyroid  
7 and cancer risks, endocrine development, immune  
8 interference.

9                   Nothing that I'm reading is saying  
10 that we really need to be above seven and we really  
11 need to be above even 15. Everything that I'm  
12 reading, as a person with a Master's degree in  
13 Science, and what I take out I - I looked at  
14 research and I looked at the blood levels and I  
15 compared it to the blood levels that I - that -  
16 well, everything I'm saying is meeting the MCL now.

17                   And I - I - what - sorry if I don't  
18 have the names here, but somebody - Mr. Crockett  
19 suggested having initial remedies, MCL. And I felt  
20 that - in children that would be wise.

21                   And let's see - and Mr. Nesbitt  
22 mentioned how these other states with the  
23 toxicologist have so much research done and we're  
24 not relying on that.

25                   You know, we need something now if we

1 are -. In the meantime, while the EPA is doing  
2 considerations and thinking and developing -. We're  
3 still drinking water. Well, actually I'm not,  
4 because - I mean, I'm drinking water but I have a -  
5 a household filter. But what that means is that  
6 clean water will only be for people who can afford  
7 it. And I don't understand that.

8                   So we need an MCL. I think some other  
9 things that need to be done and I think I'm - I  
10 don't think Neshaminy fish tissue has been sampled.  
11 We need that to be done.

12                   We need - we need - when you establish  
13 an MCL, I urge you to establish an MCL that meets  
14 the needs of all populations. Like when New York  
15 did theirs, they had a chart, adults, lactating  
16 women, infants. And I think our water and our  
17 drinking water in our faucets shouldn't have a  
18 warning label on them.

19                   We should be able to safely drink as  
20 much as we want of what comes out of that faucet.  
21 So I - and I - I believe it should be - I - what the  
22 - a gentleman sitting - what the gentleman said  
23 about the next team meeting they would be - that it  
24 would be nice to hear about toxicologists or an MCL  
25 being established. Thank you.

1                   MR. MCDONNELL: Thank you. Next we  
2 have Delisa Roman. No? Kim Menard.

3                   MS. MENARD: Hi. I'm Kim Menard from  
4 Upper Dublin Township.

5                   I was here about seven years ago. And  
6 I - and my son was born five years ago. By - my  
7 son, he has consumed water that has elevated for  
8 1,769 days so far, according to the stats that I -  
9 according to the subject matter that was provided to  
10 us.

11                   I'm worried about another birthday  
12 that he had this water his entire life. He is  
13 healthy, but he is among over - 22 kids in our  
14 neighborhood. It's right across the line that DOD  
15 deemed the enforcement catchment zone.

16                   And we live literally on the borders  
17 of Horsham Township and Upper Dublin Township. And  
18 as others have described, the water does not know  
19 those boundaries. And so every time a well gets  
20 pulled offline, our water goes up. If you see the  
21 stormwater impact, the water - I mean, Aqua has an  
22 opportunity of putting regularly that - you can  
23 start to see the pattern.

24                   I was like to ask for a few things.  
25 One, include beyond the DOD base zone, the catchment

1 area. It's not a need for a thousand residents.  
2 It's higher than that. That that water, that they  
3 are now either replacing on their own dime or pray  
4 that they don't sick from it.

5           Two, I still don't understand why they  
6 can't be stopped - or why there could be - where the  
7 enforcement is, in term - in terms of getting the  
8 base to stop contaminating the water further.

9           It - it seems like every meeting that  
10 we come to, which I think we go to one every other  
11 month -. I know it's been a few. But still - but  
12 that is still the problem. And that the water  
13 continue to come to our waterways contaminated. I  
14 don't understand why that can't be stopped.

15           Three, an interim MCL sounds like a  
16 grand idea for the EPA that - where'd you go? I  
17 understand and I agree that they're intending for  
18 and I appreciate that. I understand planning takes  
19 time.

20           However an interim level for the state  
21 would be very helpful to get it to the point where  
22 were can all, on a federal basis, get together. And  
23 until then, as others have said, Aqua won't change  
24 our water. Our water providers won't necessarily  
25 feel like they can justify the cost of testing water



1 on their own dime, so that some of our neighbors  
2 don't have water tested at all.

3 I mean, what is it, once every year  
4 that they're testing it? Whereas Aqua is testing it  
5 once every other week, as far as we can gather.

6 And then the last thing I'm going to  
7 say is that I really encourage the - the county to  
8 take - an active role in helping with some of the  
9 risk communities. And I said this is a lot. But I  
10 don't think the doctors in our area understand this.

11 It took two years from - for a bunch  
12 of us to try and get the CDC toxicology expert to  
13 get him into Abington Hospital for a plan of action.  
14 I don't understand why it took two years.

15 So I would like the community as a  
16 whole to be able to understand the problem that  
17 we're dealing with and start working on it together.  
18 We're - we're essentially township to township to  
19 township trying to figure this all out. And that's  
20 going to be important in the state level to help us  
21 go through those waters together. Thank you.

22 MR. MCDONNELL: Thank you. Next is  
23 Michael Thompson.

24 MR. THOMPSON: Hello. My name's  
25 Michael Thompson. I'm an Abington Township

1 Commissioner.

2 I just want to thank you all for  
3 coming here tonight. It's really helpful to us to  
4 see you in Abington.

5 As mentioned by a few of the speakers  
6 before me, this - this isn't just a Horsham problem.  
7 It's not just a Warminster problem. I'm in  
8 Abington. I am a Commissioner of Ward 6, which is  
9 North Hills. I have spoken to the North Hills well  
10 man at Aqua PA and they got fined when they realized  
11 that the levels they're keeping up is a little too  
12 high. Aqua now is working on putting a filter on  
13 that well, but we are now stuck in that public  
14 highway.

15 Which means that my children,  
16 including the residents sitting here tonight before  
17 you, and the children of, you know, family members,  
18 friends, their - their children are still drinking  
19 water that contains PFAS. And they don't have to.

20 We have modified that, we can put a  
21 filter on that source while we're waiting for the  
22 time period to expire on that well.

23 So I guess what I'm asking for tonight  
24 is - is more expedience to the process. You know,  
25 how can we streamline the process? How can we make

1 it easier for a water provider that wants to provide  
2 clean water for its customers to provide that clean  
3 water?

4                   And also, you know, as far as the MCL  
5 concern, following up on the one thing I just said,  
6 what's the - what is the issue with the interim -  
7 interim MCL? How is it making anyone less safe at  
8 this point? The research is there. We know what  
9 the numbers are.

10                   Why can we not come to terms with  
11 setting an interim MCL and finalizing it with the  
12 last batch of research? Thank you for your  
13 information. Thank you.

14                   MR. MCDONNELL: Next is Sarah Caspar.

15                   MS. CASPAR: My name is Sarah Caspar.  
16 I live in Chester County, Pennsylvania. And thank  
17 you to the ACP.

18                   Sixty (60) percent of the people that  
19 live in Chester County have private wells. They  
20 need to be sampled even more than the public systems  
21 do.

22                   So comparing tonight to August 1918 at  
23 Horsham, we have come forward, but not enough. So  
24 let me present some facts.

25                   1999, as an EPA removal enforcer, I

1 responded to a call and went to Parkersburg, West  
2 Virginia, where I did some sampling and identified  
3 what the problem was, what the source of  
4 contamination was that was killing a farmer's  
5 cattle.

6 I came back to EPA and I said, this is  
7 what the problem is, which is a PFOA. And they said  
8 yes, we know. And it's a pollutant to the public  
9 water in Parkersburg. But we can't do anything  
10 because we don't have it listed as a hazardous  
11 substance, nor have we established an MCL.

12 So there is no excuse for sick people.  
13 Earlier 70 was said parts per trillion was proposed.  
14 At Horsham, at the meeting, it was clear that people  
15 were suffering health effects from PFOAs and PFOS at  
16 levels way less than 70 parts per trillion.

17 Europe has established one part per  
18 trillion for PFOAs and two parts per trillion for  
19 PFOS. This is a global problem. Everybody is  
20 stepping up to the plate.

21 Pennsylvania must, too. We have so  
22 many sources of PFOAs and - PFOAs and PFAS and all  
23 their little derivatives that we can't just say,  
24 well, this is what we're going to do and it will  
25 take us this long. I mean, you can do it now.

1                   We can establish an MCL very easily.  
2 It's been done by other states, so that they could  
3 step up to the plate and act.

4                   We need to talk to the Governor and we  
5 need to tell him he needs to step up to the plate  
6 and he needs to provide funding for DEP, which has  
7 been so drained over the past two years that it's  
8 just horrible. In order for them to do their job,  
9 they have to have the funds so they can hire the  
10 toxicologist.

11                   Incidentally - I'm not a toxicologist,  
12 but I am a member of the National Sierra Club Tox  
13 Committee. And working with them, I learned a lot  
14 about toxicology, because you have people around you  
15 telling you.

16                   And I'm sure the DEP does, too. So  
17 take it to heart and say, this is what we're going  
18 to do. And please, Governor Wolfe, support us and  
19 support the people of Pennsylvania, the  
20 Commonwealth.

21                   There isn't any excuses for going on  
22 with this where people are exposed to contaminated  
23 drinking water. And we don't even know the extent  
24 of it, because it's a very limited area that has  
25 been dealt with.

1                   One and two, as has been said over and  
2 over of this evening, the townships have nobody to  
3 go to, to be recompensed for the spending that they  
4 have had to do. And that's not right either.

5                   And that's because it has not been  
6 declared. Either it has to be a substance by EPA or  
7 an established MCL.

8                   So that's what I'm leaving with you  
9 tonight. Go for it. Don't sit there and say, oh,  
10 well. Get up and get really mad and screaming and  
11 yelling. Because these are your families that they  
12 are being exposed and those that we care about.

13                   So that's it. Thank you.

14                   MR. MCDONNELL: Next is Kathleen  
15 Joyce. Next is Earl Stamm.

16                   MR. STAMM: My name is Earl Stamm and  
17 I'm going to start my presentation with a line from  
18 a movie. I'm mad as hell and I'm not going to take  
19 it anymore.

20                   Who do I represent? Well, nobody  
21 initially but I think I represent the people in my  
22 township, my county, my state, which happens to be  
23 Pennsylvania and my country. I'm going to tell you  
24 what I've done, what the results are and what I'd  
25 like you to do.

1                   And this is something that you don't  
2 have to think about. It's something you could do  
3 tomorrow.

4                   First thing, I wrote to the Attorney  
5 General and I said, let's join with other states,  
6 take an action against the United States, not the  
7 military, the United States, ask for mandatory  
8 injunctions to clean this up. Ask for damages to  
9 help us clean it up and for those who have been  
10 injured.

11                   I never heard anything. Will this  
12 panel direct that they go and write a letter to the  
13 Attorney General of Pennsylvania and ask that they  
14 do this? And I'd like an answer yes or no?

15                   MR. MCDONNELL: Nobody up here is a  
16 lawyer. We're only taking - we're only taking  
17 comments right now. Sorry, I - I - I can't answer  
18 your question. I - I - I can go look at -.

19                   MR. STAMM: I'm asking you to write a  
20 letter.

21                   MR. MCDONNELL: I think you need - you  
22 need to look into the legal law in some of that.  
23 We're addressing these very general.

24                   MR. STAMM: Okay. So you can't tell  
25 me you can write a letter?

1                   The next letter I wrote to him I said,  
2 let's bring an action for damages with other states  
3 against all those people who manufactured styrene  
4 foam, Styrofoam that made this problem. And I heard  
5 nothing. And I expecting that you're - I'm - I'm  
6 not going to get a letter from you to the Attorney  
7 General like that?

8                   MR. MCDONNELL: Again - it's - it's a  
9 comment to heard back. And we'll figure out if  
10 there's some - something we can do there.

11                   MR. STAMM: Okay. I actually wrote to  
12 the committee and I - I had given sources and  
13 there's an indication that at least PFOS and PFOA  
14 should not be 70 parts per trillion, should be more  
15 like seven parts per trillion. And that came close  
16 to nothing, five parts per trillion I think is  
17 undetectable.

18                   What I'm going to ask is that soon as  
19 possible - I know there's a problem with the  
20 politics in Pennsylvania. The politics are - we  
21 already had a Bill that was introduced into the  
22 Pennsylvania Senate and that was that we lowered the  
23 50 parts per trillion. That was caught in bidding  
24 and never came out.

25                   The reason I found that it didn't come



1 out was because there were politicians in  
2 Pennsylvania whose constituency was not affected by  
3 this. They don't care about this, but they're  
4 concerned that this is going to set a precedent.

5                   They want - don't want to be told what  
6 to do. I think this is terrible. I would like the  
7 committee to write a letter to the Governor saying  
8 that there should be an executive order that the  
9 level should be five parts per trillion. Will you  
10 do that?

11                   MR. MCDONNELL: Again, it's - we  
12 appreciate the comment what - and we can evaluate  
13 during that time.

14                   MR. STAMM: Okay. All I can say is I  
15 feel this way and I hope everybody else feels this  
16 way. Mad as hell. I'm not going to take it  
17 anymore.

18                   MR. MCDONNELL: And Larry Menkes.

19                   MR. MENKES: Hi. My name is Larry  
20 Menkes. I've been a Warminster resident for over 20  
21 years.

22                   And I think this is about the people.  
23 I was the founder of Warminster Township  
24 Environmental Advisory Council and we were really  
25 the first municipal body testing the -. And I can

1 provide this all in writing here.

2                   This is about people, as far as I'm  
3 concerned. And this is a crisis and it's a  
4 national -. I was responsible for 32,000 residents  
5 and now that I'm involved with the committee of  
6 several ex federal representatives who have put you  
7 under attack.

8                   So I would, write many of these when  
9 we first started this almost four years ago, it was  
10 a fast learning process. And found out that there's  
11 a lot that's not being told, a lot that's being  
12 omitted

13                   I've had a chance to talk to Richard  
14 Schropp and we thought that there should be an event  
15 in Warminster. The only one that was held in our  
16 area and we're at ground zero with the highest wells  
17 in the country.

18                   This is really a national crisis. The  
19 military has known about this since 1995. In  
20 regards to so many of these, it's definitely  
21 warranted.

22                   I have bladder cancer. My  
23 father-in-law died of cancer to the bone. My wife  
24 has cancer into the bone and she almost died several  
25 years ago.

1                   The EPA's not an individual body here.  
2 They are working for the federal government. And  
3 the basic problem is cost.

4                   If you do this right, and I don't  
5 really expect it to happen soon, this will be done  
6 at a very high cost, not billions but trillions of  
7 dollars. Because there are a lot of people  
8 affected.

9                   And it is not going to be just an  
10 issue locally, what it is, but this - this is  
11 sidetracking, but my employees have been getting  
12 sick by coming here.

13                   Ahead of every risk there's usually a  
14 compromise. And every - and I'm really speaking of  
15 veterans. They should be all notified. The  
16 veterans who have passed through these bases into  
17 other bases where this has occurred, I believe  
18 there's something like 644 military bases and a  
19 thousand airports, were tested with this foam, had  
20 it going on. Every veteran should be notified.

21                   And this is a matter of cost, plain  
22 and simple. Divide and conquer and keep the cost at  
23 a minimum. I know what it costs to do blood  
24 testing. The more you do it, the lower the cost is.

25                   But in all of this, the EPA is

1 complicit. And the EPA is not a agency. I believe  
2 they set standards that they have really no  
3 authority or business to set, needless standards;  
4 has perpetuated the problem.

5                   And I'm greatly aware of them changing  
6 standards, which lead us to believe they don't know  
7 what they're doing or they're doing something else.

8                   I believe the EPA should be  
9 investigated. I would like to see all manufacturers  
10 related to this, with other agencies, including the  
11 military. I really believe that if you're serious  
12 about this, you will want to start testing everybody  
13 in this area as a bare minimum, before the level  
14 drops.

15                   Because we keep this in our body for  
16 as long as 17 years. The half-life of PFOS is  
17 eight-and-a-half years. The longer we wait, the  
18 less we're going to find.

19                   Our veterans have a right to know  
20 about this. If they transfer from base to base to  
21 base with the same problem, and they should all be  
22 notified.

23                   So I think that the way this is being  
24 done amply demonstrates that the powers to be do not  
25 care that much about the people. They care more

1 about trying to remove the unremovable, the land,  
2 about allowing things to happen, continue to happen,  
3 like discharge off of the base.

4                   And the dividing of Horsham from  
5 Warminster and other communities, this should all be  
6 in a centrally-located place. And I think that we  
7 need to really look at the effect on people, because  
8 we're hurting.

9                   I got bladder cancer. My wife almost  
10 died. My father-in-law did die and everybody I  
11 talked to has someone in their family that's been  
12 affected.

13                   So this is the time to do something.  
14 This is the time - it has to be, we have the people  
15 and can you start that tomorrow.

16                   The funds are there. The funds are  
17 available. I know because I'm raising funds to do  
18 the same thing for my veterans. Thank you.

19                   MR. MCDONNELL: Just to - to verify,  
20 going back and - Dave Behring? No? Delisa Roman -?  
21 Don't see. Is there anybody who would like an  
22 opportunity to address this -?

23                   MS. CHUCO: Hello. We've heard from  
24 the local media. My name is Samantha Chuco and I'm  
25 an environmental science student. I'm a volunteer

1 with the Sierra Club and I am also speaking on  
2 behalf of current and previous residents of the  
3 area.

4                   The main thing that I want to say that  
5 - in detail that tonight is that water is a  
6 responsibility. And it seems like there's a new  
7 threat to water every day. And between illegal  
8 dumping and littering, the runoff from agriculture,  
9 industries polluting in manufacturing -. And this -  
10 this probably feels like a small piece of the grand  
11 puzzle that we've all been trying to figure out.

12                   And how we can solve the issues that  
13 the people, the country and the planet to be healthy  
14 and happy and prosperous. And it just - basically  
15 we cannot rely on just consumers, how to get the  
16 burden of these issues. We have to hold leaders  
17 accountable.

18                   And I really realized this through  
19 personal experience, where I would clean up trash  
20 along the roadways and think, oh, we have to blame  
21 the person that threw out this from the window of  
22 their car, but we also have to look at the source.  
23 And that's where we're going to need the most  
24 effective change, In looking at the source and  
25 taking action on what we can do to protect people's

1 health and the environment.

2                   And with government's - I totally  
3 support that we need to notify veterans who lived in  
4 different bases and are also affected by these  
5 chemicals.

6                   Along with that, I urge the DEP to  
7 identify the scope of the widespread pollution  
8 problems and eliminate all PFAS chemicals from the  
9 environment. To set safe drinking water standards  
10 and health guidelines that - for the protection of  
11 women and children, to the cost of the cleanup,  
12 improve the communication about health risks to the  
13 public and provide thorough testing and support for  
14 directly impacted residents.

15                   And if this issue was - there's places  
16 that you can get testing at. And the fact that  
17 we're dragging our feet on this, in this area, we're  
18 dragging our feet on other areas. And no one  
19 deserves that.

20                   So with so many people and so many  
21 products in these plans, as such - they - they  
22 should have been talked about decades ago. It - and  
23 you know, we need to - this should have been handled  
24 yesterday. And so that's why it's important to take  
25 action as soon as possible and not wait two years

1 and drag our feet.

2 As - as a young woman who, you know,  
3 plans to have a long healthy life and the  
4 environment, we need to take action.

5 MS. EVANS: Good evening. Thank you  
6 for this opportunity to testify. My name is Cakky  
7 Evans. I'm an appointed member of the Abington  
8 Township Environmental Advisory Council.

9 We echo concerns following several  
10 meetings. And as was stated earlier regarding Aqua  
11 PA.

12 In earlier meetings that I attended,  
13 Aqua PA has stated publicly that they would comply  
14 with Pennsylvania in - in their words, given the  
15 proper guidance. So that means that - it also means  
16 that they're going to shield themselves with the  
17 current 70 parts per trillion, the EPA level.

18 As you heard earlier that other states  
19 have taken action. And I don't understand why there  
20 just can't be an - but I do feel that at this point  
21 it's really unconscionable that Pennsylvania has  
22 not.

23 I'm going to ask you to do something  
24 and perhaps you can give me an answer. Everybody  
25 signed in tonight, I - I believe with their e-mail



1 address. So what would be helpful is if you would  
2 not only take action but summarize what happened  
3 tonight and e-mail everyone who took the time to  
4 attend whether or not they testified and tell them  
5 what you plan to do.

6 I think that's something you could do.  
7 Will you do that, please, so we don't have to read  
8 out of the papers? Is that a reasonable request?

9 PUBLIC MEMBER: Will you answer her?

10 MR. MCDONNELL: No - I'm - I'm sorry.  
11 We have not everybody's e-mail address. We'll be  
12 clear about that. We have people not - I think we  
13 can certainly e-mail the transcript.

14 I know we had discussions about how we  
15 handle the comments and - and hopefully it's been -  
16 and I'll continue, with the arrival of the forums,  
17 as an Action Team, showing you the things we are  
18 doing and spending time on that.

19 So - so just - in the conversation and  
20 some of it we didn't explore and see if there's some  
21 other general way.

22 MS. EVANS: It would really be great.  
23 I mean, I'm wondering why there can't be any  
24 assistance on the PFAS Governor's Task Force. I  
25 think that way you will be making plans with people

1 and not for people.

2                   And I know you don't want to be in  
3 that position. So I'm going to reiterate that would  
4 you please, whatever you do decide, not only the  
5 transcript to the citizens, for the community, but  
6 also what the decisions are going to be, so we don't  
7 have to go searching.

8                   And I think - you know, I'm online, so  
9 I get the DEP e-mails - the e-mails. And that's  
10 very helpful to know what you've done.

11                   But I think that for people,  
12 especially people that live in Jenkintown, Upper  
13 Dublin, you know, we - we really need  
14 accountability.

15                   My husband died of cancer almost two  
16 years ago. It was his third cancer. I don't know  
17 what to imply, but there was no history of cancer in  
18 his family.

19                   I've been a cancer patient. I'll  
20 always be in treatment for the rest of my life. I  
21 pray to God that none of you ever have to endure  
22 anything like this.

23                   But what I've read about small  
24 children so close to the Air Force Base, something  
25 is wrong. There is definitely a link to cancer.

1                   So please, time is of the essence and  
2 make plans for this. Thank you so much.

3                   MR. MCDONNELL: Thank you. Anyone  
4 else, just -.

5                   MS. ACOSTA: Hi. My name is Kathy  
6 Acosta. I'm a Glenside resident. I was hoping that  
7 I would hear tonight what a citizen can do to help  
8 themselves. I don't know what the answer is.

9                   I'm still left drinking tap water. Is  
10 the answer filters? Is it something you put on the  
11 kitchen sink? Should I just go to bottled water?

12                   And yet it's - it's - is this water  
13 still safe to bathe in, cook with? I - I don't  
14 know.

15                   I would like to get some answers as to  
16 what a person can do to help themselves right now  
17 while we're waiting for everybody else to do their  
18 studies and things like that. Thank you.

19                   MR. MCDONNELL: Thank you.

20                   MR. GAUSS: Thank you guys for having  
21 us here tonight. My name's George Gauss. I'm from  
22 Glenside. We moved on to bottled water. You know,  
23 we've done some studying and cooking, that the  
24 chemicals are condensed in the water, they're  
25 removed from the cooking.

1 I think as long as we're trying, Aqua  
2 do what they do. I can't wait. So you do what you  
3 have to do, I will do what I have to do.

4 So I get my repairs for my house, I  
5 get a tax rebate. I get a tax rebate for new  
6 windows or something else like that.

7 To have all-house filters for my house  
8 to stop them coming into the house, I should be able  
9 to get a tax rebate for that. Okay?

10 Just - just so when you come in  
11 contact with stuff, when you guys moved here. You  
12 know, that's why I started.

13 MS. GUSHUE: Rebecca Gushue, I'm  
14 Commissioner for Upper Dublin, Ward 5. The reason I  
15 came up is because I've been listening to everyone  
16 speak.

17 In 1989 we adopted the Montreal  
18 agreement. That was in order to save the ozone. We  
19 had less scientific proof that fluorocarbons were,  
20 in fact, in our ozone, but yet we took a stand not  
21 only as a nation but locally.

22 What's upsetting is that here in  
23 Pennsylvania, especially here in Southeastern  
24 Pennsylvania, we are at the mercy now of the State  
25 DEP which is not taking action, a country that which

1 is unwilling to admit the scientific discovery.

2           And here we are now arguing as citizens,  
3 mind you people who do not have degrees in science,  
4 but who accept the scientific method and accept the  
5 information that's being presented by our scientists  
6 that this is a poison, that is causing harm to our  
7 residents. This is causing harm to our children.

8           I'm a person who was nursing when I  
9 found out about this. I was filtering that, the -  
10 the water and that was intensifying the effects of  
11 PFAS and PFOA to my baby. And I did that with my  
12 other two children as well.

13           I was trying remediation to do the  
14 best that I possibly could for my children. That's  
15 my personal story regarding PFAS and PFOA.

16           It's upsetting that we have a state  
17 that will not admit to the science. Science that  
18 are - received everything that went into the  
19 Montreal Protocol. We can combat this, but we are  
20 taking a step backwards and we're ignoring science  
21 where you can't have all the answers.

22           I wish they had found the answers. My  
23 question to the State is, why can't you just use  
24 some of the information that has been established by  
25 other institutions?

1                   The information is all out there.  
2 Thank you.

3                   DIANE: Good evening. My name is  
4 Diane. I'm here from Bethlehem ,Pennsylvania. I'm  
5 a member of the Sierra Club.

6                   This is the first meeting of this type  
7 I've ever been to. I was really impressed with all  
8 the - the questions, the really great questions.

9                   I have a question. I don't know if  
10 you can answer this, any particular ones, but what  
11 happens with all the - the wonderful questions about  
12 PFAS that were provided by these citizens?

13                   Is that recorded? Is it responded it?  
14 What happens with all this information that we  
15 shared this evening?

16                   MR. MCDONNELL: So I - I - and I can  
17 answer that. And I was going to address that as  
18 part of the wrap-up.

19                   But basically it's - it's monitored,  
20 as I said in a transcript. And while we're doing  
21 this, we have different groups within the PFAS  
22 Action Team working on specific issues.

23                   So depending on the question, that  
24 will go to the specific groups as we addressed in -  
25 in somewhat of a transcript tonight. Some of it was

1 around the standard setting. Some of it was around  
2 the health impacts.

3           Some of it was around getting things  
4 out, comments and issues like that. And what we  
5 have the various groups looking at.

6           So it will come - come to us. And we  
7 will use that to inform, so, you know, continue to  
8 inform the next steps that we're taking.

9           DIANE: So do the - do these folks  
10 that spoke provided in writing the testimonies they  
11 addressed? Is that how that gets responded to?

12           MR. MCDONNELL: That's what the  
13 transcript is - is for, is to get - we're - we're  
14 having it transcribed, -

15           DIANE: Okay.

16           MR. MCDONNELL: - so - to have a  
17 record -

18           DIANE: Okay.

19           MR. MCDONNELL: - of it.

20           DIANE: Okay. Thank you.

21           MR. MCDONNELL: Certainly.

22           Any other comments, questions?

23           MR. STAMM: Earl Stamm, I spoke once  
24 before. And I'd like to answer that woman's  
25 question about what you can do.

1                   First of all, bottled water is not  
2 regulated. So your bottled water could be coming  
3 out of the tap from Horsham. You can't depend on  
4 that.

5                   And water filters, they've very  
6 expensive. People can't afford them. I don't want  
7 to grow up and live in a country where I am told if  
8 you can afford if, you can protect yourself, but the  
9 government is going to do nothing for you.

10                   MR. MCDONNELL: Anyone else?

11                   DIANE: All right. I - I just have  
12 another - another quick question. It - it came up  
13 that - that these chemicals that are in our - our  
14 drinking water here are also used in - in fracking,  
15 hydraulic fracturing.

16                   Is it possible that the - that the  
17 delay for any type of action at all -? As, like you  
18 said, the states all over are active about this. We  
19 have it. Is that because we're economically-  
20 dependent on injecting these chemicals into our  
21 groundwater?

22                   As long as our budget is dependent on  
23 fracking you - your hands are sort of tied? Is - is  
24 that what's holding you - you up on your end?

25                   MR. MCDONNELL: No.



1                    DIANE: Okay. Thank you.

2                    I'm sorry. I just wanted to ask -  
3 that - that Aqua, the company that gives us our  
4 drinking water also supplies the water to the  
5 Marcellus Shale fracturing operation.

6                    And it seems like a terrible conflict  
7 of interest. Thank you.

8                    MR. MCDONNELL: Okay. I want to just,  
9 you know, take one last moment to thank everyone for  
10 - for participating tonight. We are coming up on  
11 the end time here.

12                    Did - I'm sorry, did you want -?

13                    MR. SPEARING: Yeah, I have a comment.

14                    MR. MCDONNELL: Go ahead.

15                    MR. SPEARING: I had a previous  
16 meeting. I couldn't make it here earlier, so thanks  
17 for still being here.

18                    I just have a couple questions. I've  
19 been monitoring these meetings all along, right from  
20 the start. The first meeting I attended in Horsham,  
21 there was a discussion about how you monitored the  
22 plume.

23                    And what are some of the tools that  
24 you're using in terms of how far it's gone? And has  
25 there been any wells drilled on the site of the - of

1 either place that had yielded a - a - a clean water  
2 at a significant depth?

3 And - and how about the soil itself,  
4 specifically on the site of the Horsham base that's  
5 considering redevelopment?

6 MR. MCDONNELL: Again, the - the  
7 primary purpose tonight is the - the comments.  
8 That's something - I - I don't have that data  
9 sitting in front of me, but we can get data on how  
10 the State characterization laws look.

11 MR. SPEARING: Okay. Thank you.

12 MR. MCDONNELL: Sure. I'm sorry. And  
13 did you - had you stated your name?

14 MR. SPEARING: My name's Kevin  
15 Spearing. I'm - I'm here as a Township Commissioner  
16 of Upper Moreland Township.

17 MR. MCDONNELL: So just - just again  
18 while I - I - I want to thank everybody for  
19 participating here tonight. Appreciate it.

20 As I said at the onset, in knowing  
21 that the - frankly this is the center of where we're  
22 really seeing the - the impacts from the PFOS  
23 chemicals. It was important for us to be here for -  
24 for us to be able to get each and every one of your  
25 personal experiences.

1                   To answer one, I'd say a question kind  
2 of posted in a lot of the comments, yes, we - we -  
3 you were heard. You - you are enabling us to do  
4 what we take very seriously, the health impacts of  
5 this, and need to proceed as quickly as we can.

6                   There are and - and you know it's not  
7 the answer some of you - but there are processes  
8 that we have to follow to make sure we have for  
9 regulation that stand up to legal requirements.

10                   We are working with all of those other  
11 states that - that are - as our partner for PFAS.  
12 Caucus with - with a number of the other states that  
13 - that were mentioned that are working on this, so  
14 we are taking absolute advantage of the work done on  
15 - in other places.

16                   Appreciate everybody's time here  
17 tonight. And you - you can expect you'll - you'll  
18 be hearing more from us. So thank you all again for  
19 coming in. Thanks.

20                   \* \* \* \* \*

21                   MEETING CONCLUDED AT 8:47 P.M.

22                   \* \* \* \* \*

23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATE

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

I hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings was reported by me on 04-15-19 and that I, Jennifer Corb, read this transcript, and that I attest that this transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceeding.

Dated the 6th day of May, 2019

Jennifer Corb  
Jennifer Corb,  
Court Reporter