

Kirtland Air Force Base (KAFB) Bulk Fuels Facility (BFF) Jet Fuel Leak

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

(Based on questions from the public with responses from Air Force, NM Environment Department, and other project partners. Will be periodically updated. References and Links provided at the end of this document.)

NMED - September 2016

FUEL LEAK AND REMEDIATION HISTORY

1) When was the fuel leak discovered and what interventions have taken place since?

In November 1999, stained soil was discovered at the ground surface, above the underground transfer pipes near the fuel offloading rack at the BFF.

Soil Excavation Interim Measures

- In total, 4,822 tons of fuel contaminated soil was removed from the source area at the BFF site:
 - 1999/2000 - removal of approximately 120 tons of contaminated surface soil at the former fuel offloading rack (FFOR) area
 - 2010 - removal of approximately 1,018 tons of contaminated soil with underground transfer piping infrastructure below FFOR area and between the FFOR area and pump house
 - 2014 - removal of approximately 3,684 tons of contaminated soil along former pipelines that were below and above ground

Soil Vapor Extraction (SVE) Interim Measures

- Removed more than 550,000 gallons of fuel from the vadose zone, which extends 60 feet below ground surface (bgs) to 450 feet bgs and is just above the water table (approximately 480 feet bgs) using SVE technology at various SVE well locations in the on-Base BFF area:
 - 2003 to 2012 - first SVE system using a combustion engine (ICE) to destroy vapor hydrocarbons was connected to nine SVE wells in FFOR area
 - 2012 - three additional ICE SVE systems were connected to different SVE well locations
 - 2013 to 2015 - expansion of vacuum and destruction capabilities using a Catalytic Oxidizer (CATOX) SVE system along with optimization at different SVE well locations
- The SVE system also helped naturally occurring bacteria to breakdown the fuel contaminants, resulting in at least 200,000 gallons of fuel being biodegraded in the vadose zone over that 12 year period

LNAPL Interim Measures

- 2007 to 2008 - implementation of the skimmer system to vacuum the floating fuel on the groundwater table

- 2008/2009 to 2011 - SVE implementation as a bioslurping technology by adding three additional ICE units to remove floating LNAPL at existing groundwater monitoring wells (KAFB-1065, KAFB-1066, and KAFB-1068)

Groundwater Interim Measures

- June to December 2015 - implementation of temporary groundwater treatment systems (GWTS) to extract and treat dissolved EDB groundwater in the distal end, or northern end of the EDB plume
- December 2015 to present - operational full scale GWTS and expansion of number of extraction wells along with treatment capacity to extract and treat the EDB plume

SOIL REMEDIATION AT LEAK SOURCE

2) About what percentage of the 4,822 tons of contaminated soil was removed in 1999 & 2000 when the ground surface was soaking in fuel?

Approximately 120 tons of contaminated soil was removed in 2000 which is roughly 2.5 % of the total volume of soil excavated. In total 4,822 tons of fuel contaminated soil was removed from the source area at the BFF site.

3) Approximately how much jet fuel was recovered from the contaminated soil in 1999 & 2000?

Recovering jet fuel from soil is not technically possible. The amount of jet fuel in the soil was not quantified. Approximately 120 tons of contaminated soil was removed to protect worker exposure at the BFF site in 1999/2000. After this point, a soil investigation took place to examine all possible remaining sources areas and evaluate nature and extent of the soil contamination on-base at the BFF site.

4) How much fuel was recovered from the soil remediation in 2014?

In 2010, approximately 1,018 tons of contaminated soil was removed during the construction of the new state of the art Bulk Fuels Facility, which began operation in April 2011. This removal was to protect workers from exposure to contaminated soil during construction. After construction, the Air Force performed an investigation to define the contaminated soil area still requiring excavation. This was done by collecting soil samples on 5-foot grid centers to a total depth of 20 feet below ground surface (bgs) all along the former above and below ground pipelines and around the former fuel tanks at the BFF site. As data was received, analyzed, and contaminant concentrations exceeding residential SSLs identified, additional sampling locations were required. This soil investigation led to a total of 3,684 tons of fuel contaminated soil being removed to a depth of 20 feet bgs by the end of 2014. In total 4,822 tons of fuel contaminated soil was removed from the source area at the BFF site.

As mentioned above, recovering jet fuel from soil is not technically possible. The metric for excavating contaminated soil was confirmed by soil samples showing that no contamination remains in the soil from 0 to 20 feet bgs in concentrations greater than the NMED residential SSLs. To put this in perspective, NMED typically requires removal to a depth of 10 feet bgs.

5) What does the phrase “above screening levels” mean?

Soil Screening Guidance is a tool that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) developed to help standardize and accelerate the evaluation and cleanup of contaminated soils at sites on the National Priorities List (NPL) under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) with future residential land use (USEPA, 1996). This guidance provides a methodology for environmental science/engineering professionals to calculate risk-based, site-specific, soil screening levels (SSLs) for contaminants in soil that may be used to identify areas needing further investigation at NPL or Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) sites. The term SSLs can be also used for RCRA corrective action sites as “action levels,” since the RCRA corrective action program currently views the role of action levels as generally fulfilling the same purpose as SSLs. The New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) has set SSLs that facilities like Kirtland Air Force Base (AFB) must use to evaluate and cleanup contaminated soils at a given site. These values were utilized to guide removal of contaminated soil at the Kirtland AFB Bulk Fuels Facility (BFF) site and any soil that above the residential SSLs was removed from the BFF site. The [NMED SSLs are available on our website](#).

TREATMENT SYSTEM FOR CONTAMINATED WATER

6) How does extraction work? Does it result in contaminated water? What happens to water?

Extraction wells are installed into the groundwater at specific locations and to a depth based on the known dissolved phase of the ethylene dibromide (EDB) plume footprint, concentration trends, and soil/geology that makes up the aquifer environment. Additionally, groundwater modeling was used to identify the best locations to capture the EDB-contaminated water. Pumps installed within the extraction wells move EDB-contaminated water through leak protected, double-walled conveyance pipes to the Groundwater Treatment Facility located on-Base.

At this facility, the water goes through filters to remove particles that could clog the facility treatment process. Then the EDB-contaminated water is pumped through two tanks with 20,000 pounds of Granulated Activated Carbon (GAC) each to remove contaminants. All extracted water passes through this filter media so no contamination remains in the water. The treated water is tested to ensure it meets regulatory standards and is then discharged to either the Base golf course or injected back into the regional aquifer through a gravity-fed injection well on-Base.

All methods being considered for clean-up of the site are determined by proven technologies, success at other sites, and site data. The project is still in the “interim measures” phase, so all methods currently in place and being proposed are tested for effectiveness at this site.

For more details, please see [2016 Strategic Plan](#) page 17, the [Remediation Strategies NMED webpage](#) and [posters 1-4 from the April 2016 public meeting](#).

7) Are materials such as soil and rocks in the aquifer treated or only water?

Materials in both the dry vadose zone (i.e., soil and air) and the aquifer (i.e., soil and water) where the leak happened are being treated based on the various phases of the fuel and its interactions with soil, air, and water material. Fuel released into the environment is found in four phases:

- 1) LNAPL residual fuel (free product (i.e., oil));
- 2) Soil vapor (lighter fuel constituents as vapor in soil air);

3) Adsorbed contaminants (fuel constituents attached to soil particles); and

4) Dissolved contaminants (fuel constituents in groundwater).

Depending on the phase being targeted, treatment may focus on one phase or multiple phases. As for the materials in the aquifer (i.e., adsorbed and dissolved contaminants), the dissolved EDB-contaminated groundwater along with adsorbed EDB to soil is being pulled into the pump and treat system which is an interim measure for the BFF site. The LNAPL residual fuel has been removed at the BFF site through multiple processes: 1) Skimmer technology that vacuum the floating fuel; 2) Bioslurping technology that vacuums and destroys the fuel constituents by combustion engine, e.g., soil vapor extraction system, and/or catalytic oxidizer; and 3) Bioremediation by native bacteria to breakdown the fuel constituents.

The second pilot test will evaluate air-lift bioremediation technology to treat the aquifer soil material smeared with LNAPL (i.e., adsorbed contaminants) and the vadose just above the aquifer in the source area. For more details please see the [2016 Strategic Plan](#)– Introduction pp 5-6, Strategies pp 11-19.

8) How much water is being used in the treatment process?

All extracted groundwater is treated and all water coming out of the treatment system is clean of contaminants of concern before it is discharged for land application such as irrigating the Base golf course or gravity-fed into the regional aquifer. Treated water applied to the Base golf course is used to water golf course greens that would otherwise be watered with drinking water from the KAFB drinking water supply system. When treated water is gravity-fed into the aquifer, the full volume of extracted and treated water is recharged to the aquifer and available for use. As of August 19, 2016, the pump and treat system has extracted 102,671,100 gallons of EDB-contaminated water from the aquifer. All reported numbers for operations and maintenance including gallons of extracted water, where and how much the treated water was discharged, flow rate, EDB removed, and sampling of the treatment facility for both the temporary treatment system which operated from June 2015 to December 2015 and the full scale treatment system operating from December 31, 2015 to present are in Quarterly Reports and are posted (as they are submitted) on the [NMED website](#) and/or [Kirtland website](#).

9) What is the future of remediated water going to KAFB golf course?

The Air Force and New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) have had multiple technical and logistical discussions about what to do with the treated water that have included the City of Albuquerque and Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority (Water Utility Authority).

As soon as the pump and treat interim measure was identified, the project team examined numerous options for the treated water given infrastructure needs, permitting requirements, ability to handle the quantities of treated water, the best use of taxpayer money, worker and infrastructure safety, timing, and overall sustainability. Given these parameters, the Base golf course was identified as the most appropriate option as it had the infrastructure in place for moving the water, quick timing/immediate availability, provided the best cost to taxpayers, and was considered sustainable by using treated water instead of drinking water for irrigation purposes.

In addition, the project team understood the golf course could not use the treated water during winter months due to damaging infrastructure (i.e., pipes freezing) and no irrigation activities occurring. Given the lack of winter irrigation at the golf course, the project team identified the need for additional options for the treated water. Based on a review of existing Base infrastructure and the well construction details of an existing production well previously used to irrigate the Base golf course, the project team determined that gravity-fed injection at that existing production well was the best option for winter months. A pilot test demonstration began on February 22, 2016; the goal of the pilot test is to determine if adding treated water to the regional aquifer would work. Data collected to date indicates that adding

treated water via a gravity-fed approach into the regional aquifer can be done without adverse impact to the aquifer and provides another productive, probably more sustainable approach. As more extraction wells come online, the project team will continue to revisit this use of treated water, as appropriate.

10) Is the plume contained & to what degree has this been tested/monitored?

At the July public meeting, the project team presented the first line of evidence that the extraction well locations are drawing down the northern end area of the ethylene dibromide (EDB) plume. This is based on the depression in water-levels across the EDB plume area using the most current field water-level measurements (collected at the end of March 2016) from the Bulk Fuels Facility groundwater monitoring network. The initial line of evidence, which shows the “cone of depression”, demonstrates that the three current extraction wells are in the right locations. The next line of evidence will be further depression of water-levels and reduction of EDB mass. The third line of evidence will be the reduction of the EDB plume footprint. At this early stage, a significant reduction in EDB concentration has not been observed yet, but is expected in the future. It is important to note that it will take a few years before there will be substantive changes in the EDB mass numbers and footprint.

Currently, 134 groundwater monitoring wells are sampled in the affected area on a semi-annually basis (i.e, Second and Fourth Quarters). Beginning in 2000, reports have and continue to be issued on the groundwater monitoring program. All monitoring reports, such as the Quarterly Reports, are available on [NMED’s website](#) and [Kirtland AFB project website](#). The Second Quarter 2016 report is currently in Air Force review.

11) What is the schedule for future remediation wells?

A fourth extraction well site has been chosen and is expected to be installed in winter 2016. This well was located and designed based on the operational data from the three extraction wells, the aquifer pump test done at the first extraction well, and the revised modeling data based on the first extraction well aquifer test results. All this information was used to pick the best, or optimal, location for the fourth extraction well and determine its pumping rate to capture the EDB contamination. Once we get the fourth extraction well installed, the technical team will evaluate the performance of all extraction wells before determining when and where additional extraction wells should be installed. Should it be determined that an additional extraction well(s) is needed, there is a contract already in place to perform this work. (map of extraction wells available on the NMED project website in [Remediation Strategies](#) section and in most recent Public Meeting presentations on the [Public Outreach](#) page)

12) What is the anticipated length of time for the extraction process and fuel plume reduction?

At the July public meeting, the project team presented the first line of evidence that the extraction well locations are drawing down the distal, or northern, end area of the EDB plume. For the dissolved EDB plume, it is estimated that a pump and treat system would need to run for approximately 10 years to capture the EDB plume, reduce EDB mass, and reduce the EDB footprint. This 10-year estimation is based on modeling using environmental characteristics and site data. There is a video animation of the modeling used to capture the EDB plume, reduce EDB mass, and reduce the EDB footprint that can be found on project websites and on YouTube (<http://youtu.be/Ys8iuWrdJsA>). After the system has operated for a period of time, the model will be revisited to determine if the project is on target.

FUNDING / ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES

13) Who is providing funding for the remediation project?

Funding for the cleanup is provided to Congress by the taxpayers. Congress then appropriates funding to the Air Force under the Environmental Restoration Account and cannot be moved for other uses. The Air Force is committed to funding this site to satisfy the RCRA Hazardous Waste Permit and in accordance with state and federal environmental and health regulations.

14) Who is in charge of the project and who are the team leaders?

The core team is NMED, Air Force (Secretary of the Air Force and Air Force Civil Engineer Center [AFCEC]), USACE, Water Utility Authority, City of Albuquerque, and EPA Region 6.

The NMED is the primary regulatory authority for this site's corrective action under the RCRA Hazardous Waste Treatment Facility Operating Permit EPA ID No. NM9570024423 (Permit). KAFB is the responsible party for performing the site's corrective action. The AFCEC is actively doing the remediation work and are using the USACE as the Air Force service provider along with using a wide variety of expert contractors.

Air Force Team Leads:

- Kate Lynnes, Senior Advisor for project; works at KAFB, reports to the Pentagon
- Adria Bodour, PhD, Technical Lead, works at AFCEC, San Antonio, TX

New Mexico Environment Department Leads:

- Dennis McQuillan, PG, NMED Chief Scientist, Santa Fe office
- Diane Agnew, PG, Technical Lead, Albuquerque office

There are many entities involved in the project including the City of Albuquerque, Water Utility Authority, EPA Region 6, USGS and multiple project contractors. The USACE is responsible for oversight of the Air Force Contractors and providing technical expertise.

The table below shows project partners and their roles. It is also available online at the [NMED project website in the About Project](#) section:

<i>Regulatory Entities</i>	<i>Responsible Party</i>	<i>Key Stakeholder Entities</i>
<p><u>New Mexico Environment Department</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RCRA Hazardous Waste Permits • Ground Water Permits <p><u>City of Albuquerque</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental, infrastructure, & safety permits <p><u>New Mexico Office of the State Engineer</u></p> <p><u>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)</u> acting in an advisory capacity</p>	<p><u>Air Force</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KAFB holds the RCRA Hazardous Waste Permit and all other permits as issued 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Utility Authority • Neighborhood Associations & Residents above and adjacent to the plume
<i>Project Contractors to NMED</i>	<i>Project Contractors To AFCEC</i>	<i>Project Contractors To WUA</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thomson and Associates (on contract from 6/1/2015 thru 6/30/2016). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AECOM • AGEISS • CB&I Federal Services • Cherokee • Colorado State University • EA Engineering • Neptune and Company • NewFields Government Services • Noblis • Portage • Sundance Consulting • USACE (oversees contracts for AFCEC) • USGS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intera (Nov 2010 to July 2016)
	<p><i>Other Project Partners</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Mexico Tech • 	

HEALTH AND SAFETY

15) Are there overall health effects or trends related to the fuel plume?

As there is no mechanism for exposure in the residential areas, there is no effect on human health related to this fuel leak. For more details see the [Exposure and Risk Dashboard and the Garden Information Sheets](#).

In addition, the RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI) Report will include a risk assessment for human health and the environment and is anticipated to be submitted to NMED in late 2016. This document will also identify all possible contaminant pathways to people and the environment. A risk assessment evaluates site data against possible pathways using the [NMED Risk Assessment Guidance](#). This document provides a conservative road map for the Air Force to evaluate potential risk.

16) How clean and safe is our drinking water and how safe is it to live/work above the plume?

Residents in the City of Albuquerque, including residents living directly above the fuel plume, receive their water from the Water Utility Authority. The process followed by the Water Utility Authority for treating, testing, and monitoring drinking water is [outlined on the WUA website](#). The Water Utility Authority is required by law to meet drinking water standards under the Safe Drinking Water Act (SWDA), and as part of these requirements, they sample their water distribution system and supply wells once every 3 years. There are six drinking water supply wells around the plume – three KAFB, one VA, and two Water Utility Authority. These drinking supply wells are tested monthly and have had no detections of contaminants. An annual report on water quality is prepared and sent to all Water Utility Authority customers and provided in a special insert to the Albuquerque Journal. Further, there is a Water Utility Authority resolution in place that outlines what is to happen if EDB is detected in a water production well in the vicinity of the BFF contamination plume – the well would be shut off and alternate water sources used. Drinking water provided by the Water Utility Authority continues to be free of any detectable fuel contamination and is safe for all uses.

Drinking water provided by the Veteran's Administration hospital and at KAFB is subject to the SWDA. These wells are also sampled monthly and continue to not have any detections of fuel constituents.

Fuel from the Air Force did not leak at the ground surface in residential areas or parks neighboring the base so there is no concern regarding vapor exposure at the surface in the residential areas. The portion of the fuel contamination that exists off KAFB is in the dissolved phase, meaning it exists in the groundwater. The ability for fuel constituents to cause a vapor concern near the surface depends on a number of factors: the concentration of the fuel compound, the depth to the plume, and the types of soil (e.g. cobblestones, sand, silt and/or clays). It is the combination of these factors that we assess to determine if the EDB plume affects the residential areas above the plume. Based on what we know to date, there is no threat of vapor reaching the ground surface from the dissolved fuel in the aquifer because:

- EDB-measured concentrations within residential areas of groundwater are consistently low. These low concentrations limit the amount of EDB vapor that can form in soil air spaces above the groundwater.
- The EDB plume in residential areas is 455 to 480 feet below the ground surface.
- Residential soil types are made up of cobblestones, sand, silt, and/or clays which work together to prevent any EDB vapors from reaching the ground surface.

See the KAFB Fuel Leak [Exposure and Risk Dashboard and the Garden Information Sheets](#).

PROJECT INFORMATION AND OTHER ISSUES

17) Where are the independent studies?

Reports and project documents (including studies, work plans, final reports, etc.) are posted in various location on the web (as they are submitted): on the NMED website in the Hazardous Waste Bureau, [KAFB permit section](#) and on the [Kirtland project website](#).

18) What about having 3rd party oversight for the fuel plume clean-up project?

The Air Force cannot pay for a third-party selected by the community because of the procurement process (Federal Acquisitions Regulation [FAR]; www.acquisition.gov). Furthermore, once work has been contracted and money allocated, neither the NMED nor Air Force can procure another contract to complete the same scope of work without demonstrating a *bona fide* need for duplicative work. This process ensures fair and appropriate use of tax-payer dollars.

The Air Force can use other federal agencies, such as the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), to issue procurement actions (e.g., contracts) to hire pre-screened companies who are selected through a scrutinized and rigorous process to perform environmental work. All federal agencies have to follow federal procurement regulations, which is a system of checks and balances to ensure work is performed in an independent and technically sound way. The selection and procurement of services must follow a strict, legal procedure (i.e., FAR). Given this procurement process, which has independent review processes for each agency, it would not be a proper use of taxpayer dollars and does not comply with the FAR to have the Air Force pay for an additional layer of “independent” oversight to perform work. This is because a federal agency cannot issue a duplicate contract for work that is already being done in an independent fashion through current contracts. There are very similar procurement requirements in place for New Mexico state agencies including NMED. For more information , see [General Services Department purchasing webpage](#) at: <http://www.generalservices.state.nm.us/statepurchasing/>

If the community/neighborhood associations are willing to obtain funding through another source, they can select and hire a third party sampler and/or laboratory to take and analyze environmental samples for this site. However, this third party must meet federal requirements to access, collect, and process samples to ensure integrity and reliability of the sample results. At a minimum, the following criteria and processes would need to be met to perform work at the BFF site:

- Government oversight to obtain access to wellheads,
- Personnel certified to collect environmental samples,
- Laboratories certified by the government to ensure that the data is accurate and that standard protocols are used for sample analyses (i.e., quality assurance/quality control procedures and standard methods),
- Samples have a clear chain of custody,
- The laboratory certifies analytical results, and
- A final report is prepared for the government and community.

In order for samples collected outside of the project structure to be meaningful, the processes and results need to meet the same requirements that the project is required to follow under federal law. To ensure sample integrity and be comparable to project-generated results, the sampler who is certified to collect a hazardous waste sample (HAZWOPER-certified) will collect the samples with the government present and have NMED approval for the work conducted. This person would then be responsible for ensuring these samples follow and meet the same processes as described above.

19) What about public access to technical project meetings?

The project team recognizes the importance of keeping the public well informed and engaged in the process. That said, the technical working group meetings are not an appropriate or effective venue for public participation. NMED and Air Force will be holding the first Public Technical Workshop this November 12, 2016 at the Christ United Methodist Church from 9 am to 1 pm. These meetings, which will involve a technical discussion of data being evaluated for the project, will continue as long as community members are interested and indicate that they are useful for providing a format for open dialog between the project team and the public. The project team has heard the continued request from the public to have an opportunity to participate in technical discussions and we believe the Workshop will help answer that call.

The technical working groups are a forum by which technical staff representing NMED and the Air Force exchange information and ideas through phone calls, emails, and in-person meetings. The purpose is to increase the quality of required documents (such as work plans, reports, and draft permits) being submitted by the Air Force to NMED. These are not meetings of a decision making body and no final agency actions are being taken, thus, the meetings are not subject to the New Mexico Open Meetings Act, or the public participation requirements of Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) or the New Mexico Hazardous Waste Act. The discussions at technical working group meetings frequently involve preliminary and confidential information that is necessary for making informed decisions. Working group participants come to the table with decades of experience on cleanup across the nation. Their ability to openly share information without concern of information being taken out of context or made public maintains the integrity of the goals of the technical working groups.

Documents formally submitted to NMED are made available to the public on the NMED website and through the Inspection of Public Records Act (IPRA) process if requested. No permit decisions are being made without applicable public notice and participation, as required by law. The technical work plans submitted and approved by NMED are for interim measures taken as part of the RCRA corrective action process and are not final remedies. As part of the RCRA Corrective Measures Evaluation, all interim measure processes will be available for public review and comment before the final remedies are selected.

Useful References and Additional Links

AIR FORCE

- **Air Force** project website: <http://www.kirtlandjetfuelremediation.com/>
 - Includes: project updates, history, and documents

NMED

- NMED project website: <https://www.env.nm.gov/kafbfuelplume/>
 - Includes: project history & timeline, project schedule & activities, remediation strategies, site characterization, documents, public outreach information, and photos/videos.
 - Map of extraction wells and full pump & treat system
 - <https://www.env.nm.gov/kafbfuelplume/kafb-fuel-plume-remediation-strategies/>
 - <https://www.env.nm.gov/kafbfuelplume/kafb-fuel-plume-public-outreach/> (various project presentation slides)
- NMED 2016 Strategic Plan – Kirtland Air Force Base Fuel Leak: https://www.env.nm.gov/NMED/Issues/KirtlandFuelPlume/documents/KAFB2016StrategicPlan_Version2.0_Final.pdf
- NMED Hazardous Waste Bureau – links to all project documents submitted to NMED by KAFB: <https://www.env.nm.gov/HWB/kafbperm.htm#KAFBBulkFuelsFacSpill>
- NMED Risk Assessment Guidance: (https://www.env.nm.gov/HWB/documents/SSLs_RA_Guidance_for_SI_and_Remediation_July_2015.pdf).
- NMED Soil Screening Levels are available on our website at: https://www.env.nm.gov/HWB/documents/Table_A-1_NMED_Soil_Screening_Levels_July_2015.xlsx
- Exposure & Risk Dashboard / Garden Info Sheet (multiple languages available) <https://www.env.nm.gov/kafbfuelplume/kafb-fuel-plume-documents/>

Past presentations available on the NMED project website:

<https://www.env.nm.gov/kafbfuelplume/kafb-fuel-plume-public-outreach/>

- July 14, 2016 KAFB/NMED Joint Public Meeting – [update presentation slides](#)
- August 13, 2016 Community Conversation – [technical reference slides](#)
- April 19, 2016 Public Meeting - [Posters](#)

OTHER

- ATSDR, 2014. Health Consultation, Evaluation of Potential Exposures: Bulk Fuels Facility Groundwater Plume, Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
[http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/HAC/pha/KirtlandAirForceBase/Kirtland%20AFB%20\(Bulk%20Fuels%20Facility\)_HC_08-14-2014_508.pdf](http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/HAC/pha/KirtlandAirForceBase/Kirtland%20AFB%20(Bulk%20Fuels%20Facility)_HC_08-14-2014_508.pdf)
- Water Utility Authority process for drinking water supply treatment & monitoring:
http://www.abcwua.org/SWTP_Source_and_Finished_Water_Monitoring.aspx