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Timeline

• January 2017 - citizens group contacted MDEQ - concerned residential wells NE of House Street threatened.

• April 2017 – Wolverine sampled eight residences. None exceeded USEPA Health Advisory Level (HAL).

• May 2017 - US DoD sampled Belmont Armory wells SW of disposal area- PFOA / PFOS > HAL.

• July – September 2017 – Wolverine residential well sampling expands (70 in “Study Area”, 230 in “Buffer Zone”)

• October 2017 - DEQ provided information from various sources regarding other alleged Wolverine disposal areas.
Timeline

• October 23, 2017 – DEQ RRD Grand Rapids requests assistance from DEQ Incident Management Team (IMT).
• October 30, 2017 – IMT Mobilization & Agency Administrator Briefing.
• November 1, 2017 – IMT develops project Objectives and Organizational Structure (Project Plan).
• November 2, 2017 – Initiate Rhythm of Briefings, Team Coordination, and Project Coordination Meetings.
Team Briefing
Source Investigations - Imperial Pine Leather Scraps
Imperial Pine Soil Removal
North Kent Sampling Areas

- PFAS Investigation Areas
  - House Street
  - North Childsdale/10 Mile
  - Rogue River
  - 12 Mile - White Pine Trail Area
  - Wolven - Jewell Sampling Area
  - Wolven Northeast
  - North Kent Landfill Area
PFAS

PFOS / PFOA
Alternate Water and Filter Status

All >70 on AW
Project Objectives

• Ensure the safety of public and field personnel for the duration of the project.
• Develop a coordinated response structure by 11/3/17.
• Establish an effective document management system by 11/10/17.
• Prioritize and investigate all alleged PFAS source areas as reports are received from the public.
• Identify and mitigate PFAS ingestion risks as soon as possible.
• Develop and maintain an effective communication strategy.
• Develop and maintain an effective data management strategy.
Data Management

• Wolverine and DEQ samples.
• Multiple matrices and laboratories.
• EDDs uploaded into AECOM EQuIS database.
• Shape Files / GIS data in AECOM GIS database.
• Provided Figures / Data Summaries as requested by Work Crews.

• Data Cycle
  • Thursday – Data push from Wolverine, previous week data tables to DEQ, USEPA, DHHS, KCHD.
  • Friday / Saturday – Majority of EDDs.
  • Monday AM – GIS / Data Call to address issues.
  • Monday PM – Figures / Metrics to DEQ for Tuesday brief and web site updates.
Progress

• Developed coordinated response structure.

• Established effective document management system.

• Developed effective data management and communication strategies

• Prioritized and investigated PFAS source areas as identified (106 of 108 investigated).

• Identified and mitigated PFAS ingestion risks as identified (RI – vulnerable drinking water well sampling ongoing).
Lessons Learned

• Critical to establish an effective response structure immediately
• Establish Data and Document Management ASAP
• GIS extremely valuable to manage and effectively use large amounts of data during a response
• Communication – Unity of Command
• Additional Resources - Expand structure
  • Public Health Unit
  • Environmental Unit
  • Situation Unit