

**MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT #347
FOR FEBRUARY 2026**

EPA REGION I ADMINISTRATIVE ORDERS SDWA 1-97-1019 and 1-2000-0014

**JOINT BASE CAPE COD (JBCC)
TRAINING RANGE AND IMPACT AREA**

The following summary of progress is for the period from 01 to 28 February 2026.

1. SUMMARY OF REMEDIATION ACTIONS

Remediation Actions (RA) Underway at Camp Edwards as of 27 February 2026:

Demolition Area 1 Comprehensive Groundwater RA

The Demolition Area 1 Comprehensive Groundwater RA consists of the removal and treatment of contaminated groundwater to control further migration of explosives compounds and perchlorate. Extraction, treatment, and recharge (ETR) systems at Frank Perkins Road and Base Boundary include extraction wells, an ex-situ treatment process to remove explosives compounds and perchlorate from the groundwater, and an infiltration gallery and injection wells to return treated water to the aquifer.

The Frank Perkins Road Treatment Facility has been optimized as part of the Environmental and System Performance Monitoring (ESPM) program at Demolition Area 1. On 31 March 2025, the flow rate at the Frank Perkins Treatment Facility was reduced from 175 gallons per minute (gpm) to 100 gpm as a result of shutting down extraction well D1-EW-501, leaving only D1-EW-4 pumping as part of the Frank Perkins Road system. Due to a vault flood on 23 May 2025, which damaged electrical and pump equipment EW-501 had been operating at 100 gpm in place of EW-4 until the system was turned off on 30 September 2025 due to a government shutdown. Future actions are being evaluated and the system will remain off until further notice. As of 27 February 2026, over 3.185 billion gallons of water were treated and re-injected.

The Base Boundary Mobile Treatment Unit (MTU) operates at a flow rate of 65 gpm. As of 27 February 2026, over 459.7 million gallons of water were treated and re-injected. The following Base Boundary system shutdowns occurred in the reporting period:

- From 23 February 2026 through the end of the reporting period due to a winter storm. KGS is investigating the shutdown's timing and assessing any potential system damage

The Leading-Edge System was turned off with regulatory approval on 19 August 2025 (formerly operated at a flow rate of 125 gpm). Over 481.6 million gallons of water were treated and re-injected since RA.

The Pew Road MTU was turned off with regulatory approval on 08 March 2021 (formerly operated at a flow rate of 65 gpm). Over 672.9 million gallons of water were treated and re-injected during the RA.

J-2 Range Groundwater RA

Northern

The J-2 Range Northern Treatment facility consists of removal and treatment of contaminated groundwater to control further migration of explosives compounds and perchlorate. The Extraction, Treatment, and Re-infiltration system includes three extraction wells, an ex-situ

treatment process to remove explosives compounds and perchlorate from the groundwater, and infiltration galleries to return treated water to the aquifer.

The Northern MTUs E and F operate at a combined flow rate of 250 gpm. As of 27 February 2026, over 2.425 billion gallons of water have been treated and re-injected. The following MTU E and F system shutdowns occurred in the reporting period:

- From 23 February 2026 through the end of the reporting period due to a winter storm. KGS is investigating the shutdown's timing and assessing any potential system damage

The Northern Treatment Building G operates at a flow rate of 225 gpm. As of 27 February 2026, over 1.868 billion gallons of water have been treated and re-injected. The following MTU G system shutdowns occurred in the reporting period:

- From between 31 January and 01 February 2026 through the end of the reporting period due to a phase loss caused by a blown fuse on a utility pole. The system will remain off until repairs are made

Eastern

The J-2 Range Eastern Treatment system consists of removal and treatment of groundwater to minimize downgradient migration of explosives compounds and perchlorate. The ETI system includes the following components: two extraction wells, an ex-situ treatment process consisting of an ion exchange (IX) resin and granular activated carbon (GAC) media to treat perchlorate and explosives compounds, and two infiltration galleries. The flow rate at MTU J was reduced from 120 gpm to 90 gpm and MTU K was turned off with regulatory approval on 28 October 2025. The J-2 Range Eastern system has been running at a combined total flow rate of 340 gpm.

The MTUs H and I operate at a combined flow rate of 250 gpm. As of 27 February 2026, over 2.047 billion gallons of water have been treated and re-injected. MTUs H and I were turned off at 0650 on 19 December 2025 to prevent damage to the system due to a broken insulator and a blown fuse caused by high winds. MTUs H and I will remain off until repairs are made.

MTU J operates at a flow rate of 90 gpm. As of 27 February 2026, over 959.5 million gallons of water have been treated and re-injected. MTU J was turned off at 0650 on 19 December 2025 to prevent damage to the system due to a broken insulator and a blown fuse caused by high winds. MTU J will remain off until repairs are made.

MTU K was turned off with regulatory approval on 28 October 2025. (formerly operated at a flow rate of 125 gpm). Over 1.086 billion gallons of water were treated and re-injected during the RA.

J-3 Range Groundwater RA

The J-3 Range Groundwater RA consists of removal and treatment of contaminated groundwater to control further migration of explosives compounds and perchlorate. The ETR system includes four extraction wells, an ex-situ treatment process to remove explosives compounds and perchlorate from the groundwater and utilizes the existing Fuel Spill-12 (FS-12) injection wells to return treated water to the aquifer.

The J-3 system operates at a flow rate of 255 gpm. As of 27 February 2026, over 2.049 billion gallons of water have been treated and re-injected. The following J-3 system shutdowns occurred in the reporting period:

- 2220 on 08 February 2026 due to a power interruption and was restarted at 0950 on 09 February 2026
- From 23 February 2026 through the end of the reporting period due to a winter storm. KGS is investigating the shutdown's timing and assessing any potential system damage

J-1 Range Groundwater RA

Southern

The J-1 Range Southern Groundwater RA consists of removal and treatment of contaminated groundwater to control further migration of explosives compounds. The ETR system includes one extraction well, an ex-situ treatment process to remove explosives compounds from the groundwater, and an infiltration gallery to return treated water to the aquifer.

The Southern MTU has been optimized as part of the ESPM program at J-1 Range Southern. The on-base extraction well J1SEW0001 was turned off with regulatory approval on 28 February 2017 (formerly operated at a flow of 35 gpm), and flow was increased from 90 gpm to 125 gpm at the Leading-Edge extraction well J1SEW0002. The Leading-Edge extraction well has been operating at a flow rate of 125 gpm. As of 27 February 2026, over 899.5 million gallons of water have been treated and re-injected. J-1 Southern MTU was turned off at 0650 on 19 December 2025 to prevent damage to the system due to a broken insulator and a blown fuse caused by high winds. J-1 Southern MTU will remain off until repairs are made.

Northern

The J-1 Range Northern Groundwater RA consists of removal and treatment of contaminated groundwater to control further migration of explosives compounds and perchlorate. The ETR system includes two extraction wells, an ex-situ treatment process to remove explosives compounds and perchlorate from the groundwater, and an infiltration gallery to return treated water to the aquifer.

The Northern MTU operates at a flow rate of 250 gpm. The flow rates for the two extraction wells at J-1 Northern were modified on 28 October 2024 based on regulatory agency concurrence with the J-1 Range Northern Data Presentation for January 2023 to December 2023. The flow rate at J1NEW0001 was reduced from 125 gpm to 85 gpm and the flow rate at J1NEW0002 was increased from 125 gpm to 165 gpm.

As of 27 February 2026, over 1.584 billion gallons of water have been treated and re-injected. The following J-1 Range Northern MTU shutdowns occurred in the reporting period:

- From 23 February 2026 through the end of the reporting period due to a winter storm. KGS is investigating the shutdown's timing and assessing any potential system damage

Central Impact Area RA

The Central Impact Area (CIA) Groundwater treatment system consists of removal and treatment of groundwater to minimize downgradient migration of explosives compounds and perchlorate. The ETR system includes the following components: three extraction wells, an ex-situ treatment process consisting of an ion exchange resin and granular activated carbon media to treat explosives compounds, and three infiltration galleries to return treated water to the aquifer. CIA systems 1, 2 and 3 continue to run at a total flow rate of 750 gpm. As of 27 February 2026, over 4.258 billion gallons of water have been treated and re-injected. The following CIA shutdowns occurred in the reporting period:

- 1138 on 03 February 2026 CIA-3 was turned off due to a leaking fitting. A new camlock fitting and hose were installed, and the system was restarted at 0920 on 05 February 2026
- 0523 on 13 February 2026 CIA-2 tripped due to an alarm caused by a broken hose. A new hose was installed, and the system was restarted at 0811 on 13 February 2026
- From 23 February 2026 through the end of the reporting period due to a winter storm. KGS is investigating the shutdown's timing and assessing any potential system damage.

2. SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN

Operable Unit (OU) Activity as of 27 February 2026:

CIA

- Source Area Investigation
 - CSS cover and perimeter inspections were not conducted due to snow cover.
- Annual sampling within the CIA SPM Program

Demolition Area 1

- No activity

Demolition Area 2

- No activity

J-1 Range

- No activity

J-2 Range

- No activity

J-3 Range

- No activity

L Range

- PFAS sampling at MW-291M1

Small Arms Ranges

- No activity

Northwest Corner

- No activity

Training Areas

- No activity

Impact Area Roads

- No activity

Sierra Range

- No activity

Other

- Collected process water samples from Central Impact Area, Demolition Area 1, J-1 Range Northern, J-1 Range Southern, J-2 Range Eastern, J-2 Range Northern, and J-3 Range treatment systems.

JBCC Impact Area Groundwater Study Program (IAGWSP) Tech Update Meeting Minutes for 08 January 2026**Project and Fieldwork Update**

Darrin Smith (USACE) provided the project and fieldwork. The J-3 semi-annual groundwater sampling event was completed. The Central Impact Area (CIA) annual groundwater sampling event is ongoing and will likely run through the end of March. After that is completed, the Demolition Area 1 annual groundwater sampling event will begin. The February operations and maintenance (O&M) sampling was completed on 2/5/26, and results are pending. The January O&M sampling results indicated that CIA-2 midfluent concentrations were above the respective action levels of 0.25 micrograms per liter ($\mu\text{g/L}$) for RDX and 0.35 $\mu\text{g/L}$ for perchlorate. RDX was reported at 0.26 $\mu\text{g/L}$, and perchlorate was reported at 0.49 $\mu\text{g/L}$ in the midfluent. Contract options for the associated media changeout options will be awarded and performed once current year funding becomes available.

The J-1 South system and J-2 East system (H, I, and J) are offline. These systems tripped on 12/19/25 due to damage to the overhead power lines caused by high winds associated with a storm. They will remain offline until current year funding is available to execute a contract option for repair. J-2 North treatment system G has been offline since 2/1/26 due to a blown fuse on the overhead power lines, during a storm. There was also some minor electrical damage inside the plant. Those repairs will be made once the overhead power line is repaired. The system will remain offline until current year funding is available to execute a contract option for repair.

Document and Project Tracking

Jeff Dvorak (USACE) reviewed the tracking list for documents and upcoming presentations.

J-2 Range Eastern 2025 Annual Environmental Monitoring Report (EMR) Presentation

Ryan Hupfer (USACE) began a presentation on the J-2 Range East (J-2 E) for the reporting period November 1, 2024 through October 31, 2025. He displayed a figure showing the J-2 E operable unit, site features, and the current depictions of the extent of the current RDX and perchlorate plumes at the site. He pointed out the three extraction wells that are part of the extraction treatment and reinfiltration (ETR) system (EW0004 (EW-4), EW0005 (EW-5), and EW0006 (EW-6)).

Mr. Hupfer (USACE) reported that uptimes for the modular treatment units (MTU) were: 95% (MTU J), 96% (MTU H&I), and 99% (MTU K). He noted that in October 2025, before the end of the reporting period, optimization of the system flow rates was implemented. EW-4 was reduced from 120 gallons per minute (gpm) to 90 gpm, EW-5 remained the same at 250 gpm, and EW-6, which had been operating at 125 gpm, was shutdown.

Mr. Hupfer (USACE) reviewed the influent concentrations and mass removal for the three systems. He displayed concentration trend plots. During the reporting period at MTU J, perchlorate influent concentrations ranged from 0.46 µg/L to 0.43 µg/L. RDX and HMX ranged from non-detect (ND) to below the laboratory reporting limit (RL) of 0.2 µg/L (J values). He showed mass removal amounts during the reporting period for perchlorate (0.24 lbs), RDX (0.01), and HMX (0.01 lbs) at MTU J. Since system startup, MTU J has removed over 6 lbs of perchlorate, over 2 lbs of HMX, and over 1 lb of RDX. He noted there is a small plume just upgradient of the system but no RDX plume in Zone 1. There was no breakthrough during the reporting period and therefore, no media changeout needed.

During the reporting period at MTUs H and I, perchlorate influent concentrations ranged from 0.79 µg/L to 1.1 µg/L. RDX ranged below the laboratory reporting limit to 0.27 µg/L. HMX was seen at trace levels ranging from ND to the RL. Since system startup, MTUs H and I have removed 25 lbs of perchlorate, 0.23 lbs of RDX and 1–2 lbs of HMX. There was breakthrough of perchlorate in May, June, and July and, therefore, there was a changeout of the ion exchange resin in July 2025.

During the reporting period at MTU K, perchlorate and RDX influent concentrations ranged from ND to below the RL. HMX was ND throughout the reporting period. Since system startup, MTU K has removed nearly 4 lbs of RDX, just over 2 lbs of perchlorate, and trace amounts of HMX. There was no breakthrough during the reporting period and therefore, no media changeout needed.

The groundwater monitoring results for the reporting period were discussed. Twenty-three well screens were sampled for perchlorate. Results ranged from below the RL to 19 µg/L (MW-368M1). There were four well screens above 2 µg/L and one well screen above the 15 µg/L Health Advisory (HA). Perchlorate trend plots were shown. Mr. Hupfer (USACE) noted that MW-668M1 was the last well remaining with an exceedance in Zone 1 and during the reporting period it was less than 2 µg/L. He added that since 2021 there has been a sharp and consistent decrease in concentrations, which indicates that the plume is moving downgradient towards EW-4. It is anticipated that cleanup at Zone 1 will soon be complete.

A cross-section of MW-02M1 was shown. The well is located next to EW-5 and has a deeper screen. The packering of the well in May 2024 caused an expected increase in concentrations at EW-5, which indicates the desired movement towards the extraction well for increased plume

capture. Mr. Hupfer (USACE) stated that the plumes are well within the vertical capture zones of the extraction wells.

Sixteen well screens were sampled for RDX. Results ranged from ND to 4.0 µg/L (MW-368M1). There were two well screens above the 0.97 µg/L Regional Screening Level (RSL), and two screens above the 2 µg/L HA. RDX trend plots were displayed.

Longitudinal cross-sections were displayed for the J-2 E RDX plumes capture zones. Mr. Hupfer (USACE) stated that there are no RDX plumes in Zone 1 or Zone 3. RDX contamination still exists in Zone 2, within the capture zone of EW-5.

Mr. Hupfer (USACE) also provided a summary of the aquifer hydraulic analysis. For the synoptic water level round in August 2025, water levels ranged from 68.21' mean sea level (msl) at MW-128M1 to 63.00 ft msl at J2MW-01M2. The horizontal gradient was approximately 0.00045 ft/ft. Groundwater flow is similar to years past. The plumes are well within the capture zones.

Figures showing the observed and the model-predicted mass removal and concentrations for perchlorate and RDX were displayed. The measured and predicted perchlorate and RDX plumes were summarized. The Decision Document (DD) cleanup timelines were discussed. The DD predicted perchlorate would be below 2.0 µg/L by 2027 and RDX below 0.6 µg/L by 2022. The 2025 model-predicted cleanup times are below 2.0 µg/L by 2030 for perchlorate and below 0.97 µg/L by 2029 for RDX. Mr. Hupfer (USACE) noted that the perchlorate and RDX cleanup times predicted by the 2025 models are a year sooner than the cleanup times predicted by the 2024 models due to the packering.

Mr. Hupfer (USACE) stated that the IAGWSP is recommending keeping treatment systems O&M, and monitoring programs the same.

Jessica Crispin (MassDEP) asked if there is a deeper well screen associated with MW-665M2. Mr. Kulbersh (USACE) confirmed there was a deeper screen (MW-665M1) and Mr. Hupfer (USACE) noted that sampling of that screen was discontinued due to several rounds of ND, likely due to the depth. Mr. Kulbersh (USACE) stated MW-665M1 has never had any detections of RDX. Ms. Crispin (MassDEP) asked if there was a similar trend of increased RDX concentrations near EW-5. Mr. Kulbersh (USACE) stated that MW-01 M1 has also been ND for RDX.

Bob Lim (EPA) asked if any other optimization scenarios were evaluated, or if that will be coming in the next few years. Mr. Hupfer (USACE) replied he would expect additional optimization efforts in the next two years since the most recent optimization was done in October 2025. Mr. Lim (EPA) concurred with that approach.

L Range and J-3 Range EMR Response to Comments Letters

Mr. Dvorak (USACE) stated that as the annual EMRs have become more streamlined, IAGWSP thought it would be helpful to try to reach a better understanding and consensus on some recurring questions and comments. Mr. Dvorak (USACE) noted that there are several lines of evidence used for conclusions and recommendations in the reports: modeling, plume shell development every five years, sampling data, system performance data, and United States Geological Survey (USGS) well monitoring. He hopes the discussion will help to clarify report

structure and some commonly used verbiage and reduce further comments on some of the accepted practices.

Mr. Dvorak (USACE) suggested that the group start with a discussion of recent comments regarding the J-3 Range EMR. He noted that the site has had 17 EMRs over the years. Len Pinaud (MassDEP) stated that there are tables and information referenced in the report, but there is some additional information missing. He does not think responses to the MassDEP requests for that information, or questions, would be very difficult to address. Mr. Dvorak (USACE) agreed that the comments about table omissions can be resolved. Mr. Dvorak (USACE) stated that the purpose of today's discussion is to explain general, higher-level comments like how the modeling works.

Mr. Pinaud (MassDEP) referenced the L Range responses to comments and stated that using a reference to the MassDEP concurrence letter on the RDX standard as a response to one of their comments was incorrect and he added, "That's not what that letter means. We are not concurring on anything you do in the L Range until you do a completion of work report." He stated that the MassDEP letter sent to Bryan Olson (EPA) was in reference to the RDX standard being changed and it repeated information in the L Range EMR. He further commented, "You need to explain, other than referencing our letter, why you don't want to do another round of sampling." Mr. Pinaud (MassDEP) had to leave the meeting immediately following his comments.

Mr. Dvorak (USACE) recommended focusing on the J-3 Range responses to comments. Mr. Lim (EPA) suggested the team review EPA comments for the remainder of the meeting.

Jodi Lyn Cutler (IAGWSP) said that given the state of remediation for J-3 Range, and at all of the sites, and the history of how the models have been developed, and mass removals calculated, repeat comments about model reliability and mass calculation should not be recurring. She notes that on each report in the past, there has been agency 'buy-in,' and comments have been resolved satisfactorily. Ms. Cutler (IAGWSP) stated that responding to these types of comments on every report should not be necessary. She asked the agencies, for the sake of efficiency, to consider not repeating comments that have already been addressed in multiple reports. Ms. Cutler (IAGWSP) said that the IAGWSP is happy to address comments before they're issued in a letter to resolve questions more quickly. Mr. Lim (EPA) suggested that the upcoming modeling meeting will hopefully address some of the questions on the models and help to limit those recurring comments.

Mr. Dvorak (USACE) said that he planned on starting with specific comments on the J-3 EMR and that for some he would read the entire comment, others he would summarize. He encouraged others to jump in if they wanted to provide additional information or dive deeper into the rationale behind the responses. A review of specific comments commenced:

Comment 1 referenced that RDX breakthrough was observed on July 1, 2024; however, the text in Section 3.0 does not discuss this event or identify the date of corrective action(s) was/were implemented. It does recognize that the table addresses what was done.

Mr. Dvorak (USACE) noted that this was an intentional part of the agreed-upon streamlining effort to reduce text in the report and he stated that the data is called out in the tables, as the comment confirms. IAGWSP would like to keep this practice and will also discuss the data during the EMR presentations.

Tim Barbeau (EPA) agreed with this approach and stated that EPA will avoid making comments like this in the future.

Comment 2 requested revised language, and Mr. Dvorak (USACE) agreed it would be changed.

Comment 3 noted that Table 3.3 does not exist. Mr. Dvorak (USACE) stated Table 3.3 was accidentally omitted and will be included in the final report.

Comment 4 requested revised language, and Mr. Dvorak (USACE) agreed it would be changed.

Comment 5 noted that the report text states that a single synoptic groundwater level event was conducted in July of 2024, but does not identify what hydraulic conditions this date represents. Additionally, text should also indicate whether synoptic measurements are collected within one week of rainfall event.

Mr. Dvorak (USACE) commented that this appears to be a request to include text describing hydraulic conditions when the gauging event occurred and noted that that there is a USGS trend graph included, and other conditions are referenced in attachments. He explained that this information is no longer included in the body of the reports as part of the EMR streamlining process. He explained that IAGWSP would like to leave all the information in the trend graphs and attachments rather than adding it back into the body of the report.

Mike Kulbersh (USACE) added that the treatment systems are designed to account for weather-related effects, and those details are well-documented in the graphs that are included in the reports. He added that the effects of different precipitation conditions in the week or the month leading up to a synoptic event are typically negligible. Chris Kilbridge (USACE) noted that a similar comment has been made over the past couple of years for J-1 North and J-1 South and those details were included in the older versions of the EMRs.

Mac McRae (TechLaw) accepted this response. Mr. Dvorak (USACE) said IAGWSP would continue to keep the streamlined version and refer to previous report responses if the issue is raised again.

Mr. Dvorak (USACE) continued with comment 6 stating, "Include text in this section about GAC breakthrough that occurred in July of 24 and any action taken upon the breakthrough." Mr. Dvorak (USACE) responded that a similar streamlining approach was taken, and tables are included for additional information EPA concurred with this approach.

Comment 7 requested revised language, and Mr. Dvorak (USACE) agreed it would be changed.

Mr. Dvorak (USACE) read Comment 8, "Text compares decision document cleanup predictions with current model estimates, but does not identify the factors that affect the extended timeframe. Text should clarify whether the differences in predicted cleanup times are due to model input or attenuation back diffusion, more expensive contamination than known at the time of Record of Decision, or other factors."

Mr. Dvorak (USACE) replied that there was higher data density at this point in time and further details of the model will be provided during the modeling presentation later this month. He suggested that a line could be added to the response to further address the concern.

Mr. McRae (TechLaw) concurred with this approach.

Mr. Dvorak (USACE) noted that Comment 9 referred to another issue similar to Table 3-3, that PFAS language that was left in the table and both agencies commented on it. He stated that this was an error. IAGWSP will continue to reference the comprehensive PFAS report, and any follow-up will be in that report and will not be discussed in the annual EMRs. The EMRs will focus on the contaminants of concern that are recognized in the DDs. The PFAS reference will be removed from the next version of the document.

Comment 10 references the recommendation for shutting down the extraction well. Mr. Dvorak (USACE) noted that while IAGWSP believes there is an argument for shutting it down based on current concentrations in J-3 and attenuation. However, for this report, IAGWSP will remove the recommendation for shutdown and that optimization will not be included in the 2024 EMR. IAGWSP will reevaluate for the 2025 EMR. This will impact several of the comments on this report and lead to a discussion after the next J-3 Range presentation.

Mr. Barbeau (EPA) agreed with that approach.

Comment 11 references reconciling the differences in downtime. Mr. Dvorak (USACE) replied that IAGWSP will reconcile the differences, and any corrections will be made in the revised version of the EMR.

Mr. Dvorak (USACE) read Comment 12, "The perchlorate plume in Zone 1 appears quite different from the perchlorate plume shown in 2023 EMR. In the 2023 EMR, perchlorate is shown as one large plume, while in the 2024 EMR, the plume is shown as two smaller plumelets. However, results from chemical monitoring appear the same for both 2023 and 2024. Please reconcile."

Mr. Dvorak (USACE) responded that the plume shaping is based on several inputs, including exceedances and trends of neighboring wells, not just concentrations for the specific wells that have the exceedances or that are within the plume that's shown between 2023 and 2024. Based on the concentrations that are there, there are not large differences. It is the inputs of the wells in and around Zone 1 that impact the shape of the plume.

Mr. Kilbridge (USACE) noted he could add some additional information to the response. He explained that what could be viewed as a "large plume" is actually smaller extents of remaining perchlorate in this area, near the former J-3 source area. In the 2023 EMR, the perchlorate mass was a relatively small plume. In the current report, it's shown as two smaller masses. The difference in size is due to the act of transport and dispersion. The perchlorate mass shrank between the time frames of the two reports due to monitored natural attenuation (MNA) and the mechanism of dispersion in one year. That reinforces how little perchlorate mass is left just above 2 µg/L. He added that this is the lowest contour interval for perchlorate (between 2 µg/L and 15 µg/L). The data was closer to 2 µg/L in 2024, with one exceedance above 2 µg/L. Modeling during that one-year interval indicated that the larger mass dispersed through MNA. Mr. Kilbridge (USACE) said he can add a sentence in the EMR to make that clearer.

Mr. Barbeau (EPA) stated that hearing the explanation, and Mr. Kilbridge (USACE) adding a statement in the EMR, satisfies this comment.

Comment 14: Referenced the recommendation for the EW-3 shutdown. Mr. Dvorak (USACE) reiterated that IAGWSP will remove the recommendation for shutdown in the 2024 EMR and will reevaluate for the 2025 EMR.

Mr. Dvorak (USACE) continued with Comment 15, which references clarity in the figure. “Color and label the wells and sampling frequency. Also, since there's a perchlorate plume being captured. EPA recommends wells downgradient be part of the chemical monitoring network to monitor the plume.”

Mr. Dvorak (USACE) noted that the EMRs typically have Table 8.2 with all of the information about future recommendations and the status of the wells within the chemical monitoring network. Moving towards trying to use the figures and tables more. IAGWSP asks the agencies to refer to Table 8.2. The colors in the figures indicate wells that are remaining in the network, how frequently they're sampled, and the rationale if there are changes recommended.

Mr. Kilbridge (USACE) explained that Table 8.2 is meant to be used together with Figure 8.2. Mr. Dvorak (USACE) continued with Comment 15 saying EPA also noted that since there is a perchlorate plume not being captured by J3EW0032, they recommend wells downgradient to be part of the chemical monitoring network to monitoring the plume. Mr. Kilbridge (USACE) stated that some downgradient wells will be added to the chemical monitoring network and reflected in Table 8.2 to address this comment.

Mr. Barbeau (EPA) concurred with this approach.

Note: Comment 16 was skipped and not discussed.

Mr. Dvorak (USACE) read Comment 17, “Table 3.1, pages 17 and 18, references the statement, ‘Cumulative mass removal is the sum of the products of influent concentration, average system flow rate, duration, monitoring periods, and specified intervals. Mass removal assumes 100%. However, this assumption overestimates actual mass removed because effluent detections of perchlorate and RDX are consistently reported in Table 3.1.’”

Mr. Dvorak (USACE) noted that this is a repeat comment from other EMRs. Mr. Hupfer (USACE) said he addressed it in previous EMR responses to comments. Mr. Dvorak (USACE) noted that typically the same response has been provided and it can be referenced. He explained that there is a process for breakthrough requirements with detection limits when it was first generated. Mr. Kulbersh (USACE) said that for Demolition Area 1, upwards of 50% of perchlorate had been removed from the intervening years between the rapid response action and the response action. In that timeframe, while removing tens of pounds, the effluent was non-detect but could have been less than 0.2 µg/L. Mr. Kilbridge (USACE) said most of the time the effluent is non-detect and said, “If you look at the trends of monitoring wells anywhere near where the groundwater is recharged, you will see mostly non-detects or a J value. He noted that over the past couple of years, the contractors are paying attention to ‘old media’ that has achieved breakthrough and everyone is keeping an eye on it to see if media needs to be changed out.” Mr. Kilbridge (USACE) offered to provide additional detail for the mass removal calculation and reference previous RCLs.

Mr. Barbeau (EPA) said that it sounded good and noted he did not recall this coming up when he was working on Demolition Area 1. Mr. McRae (TechLaw) concurred with the suggested approach.

Mr. Dvorak (USACE) said Comment 18 referenced a typographical error in Table 3.2 and noted that it will be corrected.

Comment 19 requests a footnote be added and Mr. Dvorak (USACE) agreed.

Mr. Dvorak (USACE) read Comment 20, "Table indicates that the sampling frequency for explosives at 90MW0054 was increased from annual to semiannual. But perchlorate remains on the annual monitoring schedule because 90MW0054 is located in the vicinity of the perchlorate plume, not the RDX plume. It is unclear why the sampling frequency for explosives is being increased while perchlorate monitoring is not. It should also be monitored on some annual basis for detection of concentration changes or potential flow migration. Please revise Table 8.2 to recommend semiannual perchlorate monitoring at 90MW0054."

Mr. Kilbridge (USACE) responded that, in plan view, it looks like 90MW0054 has a small mass of perchlorate. But cross-sections, show perchlorate is at a much different depth, at approximately 50 feet below the screen. He added that a couple of years ago, there were detections of RDX at concentrations from 3–4 ug/L at 90MW0054 so that was justification to increase the sampling frequency for explosives to twice a year. Those concentrations have gone down and were only at trace levels in the recent sampling event. Whereas perchlorate sits 50 feet deeper, so 90MW0054 is not well-suited due to screen depth to monitor for perchlorate. However, monitoring is still done annually. Mr. Kulbersh (USACE) added that there has not been exceedance of the reporting level for perchlorate since before 2020.

EPA was satisfied with the clarification.

Ms. Crispin (MassDEP) stated that many of the explanations provided today were helpful and noted that she does try to go back to the previous EMRs to see what the comments were and how they were responded to. She said she's willing to look back at other documents if some of her comments are related to topics already addressed in previous reports, and she's happy with a response like, "We've already discussed this, refer to this report." She added that she might need help determining where to find some of that information. Ms. Cutler (IAGWSP) reiterated the offer to review comments before they are issued as letters so that questions can be answered ahead of time. She said that she recognizes it has been discussed before but would love to see it implemented as a process if the agencies are amenable.

Mr. Dvorak (USACE) reviewed some of the more general recurring report comments:

General Comment 1: "Model-predicted cumulative mass removal differs substantially from measured values based on Table 6.3. However, the text in Section 6 does not discuss model sensitivity, limitations, or assumptions that explain the differences. Discrepancies may indicate key model parameters exert strong control on auto behavior and overall predictive accuracy. Please revise Section 6 to describe whether matrix diffusion or rate-limited mass transfer processes were incorporated in the model, and discuss primary model sensitivities and limitations that could explain the discrepancy between modeled and measured mass removal." Mr. Dvorak (USACE) stated the upcoming plume shell presentation will explain how the model is generated with multiple lines of evidence.

Mr. McRae (TechLaw) said it sounded like a lot of these issues had been discussed in the past and agreed with Ms. Crispin (MassDEP)'s suggestion for IAGWSP to provide information about prior EMR comment resolutions on the same topics.

Mr. Kulbersh (USACE) explained that for 20 years, the models have been developed with flow and transport, in conjunction with USGS efforts. He noted the effort is not dual domain, and it is not mass transfer limited. Most of the contamination exists in a fairly coarse aquifer. The modeling effort is MT3D, MODFLOW-SURFACT™ with infection dispersion with sorption.

Mr. McRae (TechLaw) said that made a lot of sense and puts into perspective that the model is being used as a tool.

Mr. Dvorak (USACE) said the plume process presentation would help clarify things and noted that plume shells are redone every five years and one is being worked on now and there will be a presentation to the agencies on that as well. Mr. Kilbridge (USACE) noted that the plume shell process for J-3 is explained in great detail in an appendix in a Technical Memorandum to the previous annual report. He will provide that reference to the agencies.

General Comment 2: "EMR presents inconsistent descriptions of model reliability. Section 6 states perchlorate and RDX Fate and Transport models are considered to reliably predict perchlorate and RDX plumes, but not the magnitude of concentrations in the interiors of the plumes. Section 6.1 states the groundwater Fate and Transport Models for perchlorate and RDX presented in the Feasibility Study are demonstrated to be useful tools for predicting plume capture and approximating cleanup times, and to a lesser extent, for predicting perchlorate and RDX concentrations and mass transport throughout the interior plume and at extraction wells. Because capture and cleanup predictions depend on accurate simulation of concentration gradients and mass transport, these statements appear to be inconsistent. Please revise EMR to reconcile differing descriptions of model predictive accuracy."

Mr. Kilbridge (USACE) said he planned on providing a sentence to add some clarity and again notes the model is just one tool to define the extent of the plume. It is less reliable to predict interior concentrations because there is only so much documentation on source releases. It's been very effective at selecting extraction well locations, screen depths, pumping rates. He said, "One line of evidence is the model, then there is empirical evidence from the chemical sampling network and the O&M sampling, and the actual concentration values and trends of those concentrations. It is used all together before recommendations are made on optimizing a system."

Mr. McRae (TechLaw) said he appreciates the clarification and understands the use of the model as one tool.

Mr. Dvorak (USACE) noted that both General Comments 3 and 4 reference the recommendation to shut down the extraction wells. As previously stated, IAGWSP will remove this from this EMR and will reevaluate for the 2025 report.

EPA reiterated concurrence with that approach.

General Comment 5 states, "As included in Section 1.3 of the J-3 Range 2023 EMR, please add text regarding wells that were abandoned or have ROE issues. Especially for any wells that could be added to the monitoring or chemical monitoring network in the future. For example,

wells downgradient (near Snake Pond) might need to be included in the future to monitor the leading perchlorate plume that is going through MNA.”

Mr. Dvorak (USACE) commented that MW-361 has been added to the chemical monitoring network to address the leading edge of the plume. This is downgradient and adjacent to Snake Pond. Data were collected from surface water at Snake Pond for many years. Sampling was just recently discontinued with regulatory approval due to lack of detections.

Mr. Kilbridge (USACE) will add language from previous reports about ND sampling results and a statement about the addition of MW-316 to the chemical monitoring network. EPA concurred with that approach.

Mr. Dvorak (USACE) encouraged continued dialogue for any questions and clarifications before comment letters are issued. Mr. Barbeau (EPA) said it was good to talk through the comments to get the IAGWSP perspective and it was a productive meeting. Ms. Cutler (IAGWSP) thanked the group for their participation for the lengthy duration of the meeting.

Next Tech Meeting: March 19, 2026

JBCC Cleanup Team Meeting

The next JBCC Cleanup Team (JBCCCT) meeting is scheduled for 25 March 2026 (previous meeting was 27 August 2025). Meeting details and presentation materials from previous meetings can be found on the IAGWSP web site at <http://jbcciagwsp.org/community/impact/presentations/>. The Cleanup Team meeting discusses late breaking news and responses to action items, as well as updates from the IAGWSP and the Installation Restoration Program (IRP). The JBCCCT meetings provide a forum for community input regarding issues related to both the IRP and the IAGWSP.

3. SUMMARY OF DATA RECEIVED

Table 1 summarizes sampling for all media from 01 to 28 February 2026. Table 2 summarizes the validated detections of explosives compounds and perchlorate for all groundwater results received from 01 to 28 February 2026. These results are compared to the Maximum Contaminant Levels/Health Advisory (MCL/HA) values for respective analytes. Explosives and perchlorate are the primary contaminants of concern (COC) at Camp Edwards. Table 3 summarizes the validated detections of per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) for influent and groundwater results analyzed by EPA draft Method 1633 and received from 01 to 28 February 2026. Table 3 PFAS results are compared to the Regional Screening Levels (RSLs) published by EPA in November 2023.

The operable units (OUs) under investigation and cleanup at Camp Edwards are the Central Impact Area, Demolition Area 1, Demolition Area 2, J-1 Range, J-2 Range, J-3 Range, L Range, and Small Arms Ranges. Environmental monitoring reports for each OU are generated each year to evaluate the current year groundwater results. These reports are available on the site Environmental Data Management System (EDMS) and at the project document repository (IAGWSP office).

4. SUBMITTED DELIVERABLES

Deliverables submitted during the reporting period include the following:

- Small Arms Range Post-Decision Document 03 February 2026
Completion of Work Project Note
- Draft J-1 Range South EMR for January 2024 through 20 February 2026
December 2024

5. SCHEDULED ACTIONS

The following actions and/or documents are being prepared in March 2026.

- Response to Comments on the Draft J-3 Range EMR for September 2023 through August 2024
- Response to Comments on the Draft L Range EMR for March 2024 through February 2025
- Draft J-1 Range Northern EMR for January 2024 through December 2024
- Draft J-2 Range Eastern EMR for November 2024 through October 2025
- Draft J-2 Range Northern EMR for November 2024 through October 2025
- Response to Comments on the IAGWSP Comprehensive PFAS Report
- Draft Site-Wide QAPP Update
- Northwest Corner Demonstration of Compliance Response to Comments
- Draft Annual Land Use Controls Report
- Response to Comments to Draft CIA EMR July 2024 through June 2025

TABLE 1
Sampling Progress: 01 to 28 February 2026

Area Of Concern	Location	Field Sample ID	Sample Type	Date Sampled	Matrix	Top of Screen (ft bgs)	Bottom of Screen (ft bgs)
Central Impact Area	MW-485M1	MW-485M1_S26	N	02/19/2026	Ground Water	125.32	135.32
Central Impact Area	MW-485M1	MW-485M1_S26D	FD	02/19/2026	Ground Water	125.32	135.32
Central Impact Area	MW-115M1	MW-115M1_S26	N	02/19/2026	Ground Water	138.00	148.00
Central Impact Area	MW-85S	MW-85S_S26	N	02/19/2026	Ground Water	116.00	126.00
Central Impact Area	MW-40M1	MW-40M1_S26	N	02/18/2026	Ground Water	132.50	142.00
Central Impact Area	MW-729M1	MW-729M1_S26	N	02/18/2026	Ground Water	231.50	241.50
Central Impact Area	MW-106M2	MW-106M2_S26	N	02/18/2026	Ground Water	140.50	150.50
Central Impact Area	MW-44M1	MW-44M1_S26	N	02/18/2026	Ground Water	182.00	192.00
Central Impact Area	MW-01S	MW-01S_S26	N	02/17/2026	Ground Water	114.00	124.00
Central Impact Area	MW-01M2	MW-01M2_S26	N	02/17/2026	Ground Water	160.00	165.00
Central Impact Area	MW-90S	MW-90S_S26	N	02/17/2026	Ground Water	118.00	128.00
Central Impact Area	MW-90M1	MW-90M1_S26	N	02/17/2026	Ground Water	145.00	155.00
Central Impact Area	MW-727M1	MW-727M1_S26	N	02/12/2026	Ground Water	145.40	155.40
Central Impact Area	MW-02M2	MW-02M2_S26	N	02/12/2026	Ground Water	170.00	175.00
Central Impact Area	MW-02M1	MW-02M1_S26	N	02/12/2026	Ground Water	212.00	217.00
Central Impact Area	OW-1	OW-1_S26	N	02/11/2026	Ground Water	126.00	136.00
Central Impact Area	OW-1	OW-1_S26D	FD	02/11/2026	Ground Water	126.00	136.00
Central Impact Area	OW-2	OW-2_S26	N	02/11/2026	Ground Water	175.00	185.00
Central Impact Area	MW-91S	MW-91S_S26	N	02/11/2026	Ground Water	124.00	134.00
Central Impact Area	MW-91S	MW-91S_S26D	FD	02/11/2026	Ground Water	124.00	134.00
Central Impact Area	MW-91M1	MW-91M1_S26	N	02/11/2026	Ground Water	170.00	180.00
Central Impact Area	MW-105M1	MW-105M1_S26	N	02/11/2026	Ground Water	205.00	215.00
Central Impact Area	MW-93M2	MW-93M2_S26	N	02/10/2026	Ground Water	145.00	155.00
Central Impact Area	MW-93M1	MW-93M1_S26	N	02/10/2026	Ground Water	185.00	195.00
Central Impact Area	MW-101M1	MW-101M1_S26	N	02/10/2026	Ground Water	158.00	168.00
Central Impact Area	MW-101M1	MW-101M1_S26D	FD	02/10/2026	Ground Water	158.00	168.00
Central Impact Area	MW-100M2	MW-100M2_S26	N	02/10/2026	Ground Water	164.00	174.00
Central Impact Area	MW-100M1	MW-100M1_S26	N	02/10/2026	Ground Water	179.00	189.00

N = Normal Sample
FD = Field Duplicate

TABLE 1
Sampling Progress: 01 to 28 February 2026

Area Of Concern	Location	Field Sample ID	Sample Type	Date Sampled	Matrix	Top of Screen (ft bgs)	Bottom of Screen (ft bgs)
Central Impact Area	MW-203M2	MW-203M2_S26	N	02/05/2026	Ground Water	176.00	186.00
J3 Range	J3-EFF	J3-EFF-233A	N	02/05/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
J3 Range	J3-MID-2	J3-MID-2-233A	N	02/05/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
J3 Range	J3-MID-1	J3-MID-1-233A	N	02/05/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
J3 Range	J3-INF	J3-INF-233A	N	02/05/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
Central Impact Area	MW-687M2	MW-687M2_S26	N	02/05/2026	Ground Water	188.00	198.00
Demolition Area 1	D1-EFF	D1-EFF-187A	N	02/05/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
Demolition Area 1	D1-MID-2	D1-MID-2-187A	N	02/05/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
Demolition Area 1	D1-MID-1	D1-MID-1-187A	N	02/05/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
Demolition Area 1	D1-INF	D1-INF-187A	N	02/05/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
Central Impact Area	MW-686M2	MW-686M2_S26	N	02/05/2026	Ground Water	194.30	204.30
Central Impact Area	MW-614M2	MW-614M2_S26	MS	02/04/2026	Ground Water	215.00	225.00
Central Impact Area	MW-614M2	MW-614M2_S26	N	02/04/2026	Ground Water	215.00	225.00
Central Impact Area	MW-614M2	MW-614M2_S26	SD	02/04/2026	Ground Water	215.00	225.00
Central Impact Area	MW-614M1	MW-614M1_S26	N	02/04/2026	Ground Water	275.00	285.00
Central Impact Area	MW-615M2	MW-615M2_S26	N	02/04/2026	Ground Water	200.00	210.00
Central Impact Area	MW-615M1	MW-615M1_S26	N	02/04/2026	Ground Water	260.00	270.00
Central Impact Area	MW-124M1	MW-124M1_S26	MS	02/03/2026	Ground Water	234.00	244.00
Central Impact Area	MW-124M1	MW-124M1_S26	N	02/03/2026	Ground Water	234.00	244.00
Central Impact Area	MW-124M1	MW-124M1_S26	SD	02/03/2026	Ground Water	234.00	244.00
Central Impact Area	CIA2-EFF	CIA2-EFF-145A	N	02/03/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
Central Impact Area	CIA2-MID2	CIA2-MID2-145A	N	02/03/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
Central Impact Area	CIA2-MID1	CIA2-MID1-145A	N	02/03/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
Central Impact Area	CIA2-INF	CIA2-INF-145A	N	02/03/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
Central Impact Area	CIA1-EFF	CIA1-EFF-145A	N	02/03/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
Central Impact Area	MW-23M1	MW-23M1_S26	MS	02/03/2026	Ground Water	225.00	235.00
Central Impact Area	MW-23M1	MW-23M1_S26	N	02/03/2026	Ground Water	225.00	235.00
Central Impact Area	MW-23M1	MW-23M1_S26	SD	02/03/2026	Ground Water	225.00	235.00

N = Normal Sample
FD = Field Duplicate

TABLE 1
Sampling Progress: 01 to 28 February 2026

Area Of Concern	Location	Field Sample ID	Sample Type	Date Sampled	Matrix	Top of Screen (ft bgs)	Bottom of Screen (ft bgs)
Central Impact Area	CIA1-MID2	CIA1-MID2-145A	N	02/03/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
Central Impact Area	CIA1-MID1	CIA1-MID1-145A	N	02/03/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
Central Impact Area	CIA1-INF	CIA1-INF-145A	N	02/03/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
Central Impact Area	CIA3-EFF	CIA3-EFF-116A	N	02/03/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
Central Impact Area	CIA3-MID2	CIA3-MID2-116A	N	02/03/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
Central Impact Area	CIA3-MID1	CIA3-MID1-116A	N	02/03/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
Central Impact Area	MW-23D	MW-23D_S26	N	02/03/2026	Ground Water	272.00	282.00
Central Impact Area	CIA3-INF	CIA3-INF-116A	N	02/03/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
J2 Range Northern	J2N-MID-2F	J2N-MID-2F-233A	N	02/02/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
J2 Range Northern	J2N-MID-1F	J2N-MID-1F-233A	N	02/02/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
J2 Range Northern	J2N-EFF-EF	J2N-EFF-EF-233A	N	02/02/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
J2 Range Northern	J2N-MID-2E	J2N-MID-2E-233A	N	02/02/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
J2 Range Northern	J2N-MID-1E	J2N-MID-1E-233A	N	02/02/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
J2 Range Northern	J2N-INF-EF	J2N-INF-EF-233A	N	02/02/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
Central Impact Area	MW-123M2	MW-123M2_S26	N	02/02/2026	Ground Water	236.00	246.00
J1 Range Northern	J1N-EFF	J1N-EFF-148A	N	02/02/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
J1 Range Northern	J1N-MID2	J1N-MID2-148A	N	02/02/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
J1 Range Northern	J1N-MID1	J1N-MID1-148A	N	02/02/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
J1 Range Northern	J1N-INF2	J1N-INF2-148A	N	02/02/2026	Process Water	0.00	0.00
Central Impact Area	MW-123M1	MW-123M1_S26	N	02/02/2026	Ground Water	291.00	301.00
Central Impact Area	MW-102M2	MW-102M2_S26	N	02/02/2026	Ground Water	237.00	247.00
Central Impact Area	MW-102M1	MW-102M1_S26	N	02/02/2026	Ground Water	267.00	277.00

N = Normal Sample
FD = Field Duplicate

**TABLE 2
VALIDATED EXPLOSIVE AND PERCHLORATE RESULTS
Data Received 01 to 28 February 2026**

Area of Concern	Location ID	Field Sample ID	Top Depth (ft bgs)	Bottom Depth (ft bgs)	Date Sampled	Test Method	Analyte	Result Value	Qualifier	Units	MCL/HA	> MCL/HA	MDL	RL
Central Impact Area	MW-686M2	MW-686M2_S26	194.30	204.30	02/05/2026	SW8330B	Hexahydro-1,3,5-trinitro-1,3,5-triazine (RDX)	0.99		µg/L	0.60	X	0.10	0.21
Central Impact Area	MW-614M1	MW-614M1_S26	275.00	285.00	02/04/2026	SW6850	Perchlorate	0.29		µg/L	2.0		0.10	0.20
Central Impact Area	MW-614M1	MW-614M1_S26	275.00	285.00	02/04/2026	SW8330B	Hexahydro-1,3,5-trinitro-1,3,5-triazine (RDX)	1.1		µg/L	0.60	X	0.10	0.21
Central Impact Area	MW-615M1	MW-615M1_S26	260.00	270.00	02/04/2026	SW6850	Perchlorate	1.1		µg/L	2.0		0.10	0.20
Central Impact Area	MW-615M1	MW-615M1_S26	260.00	270.00	02/04/2026	SW8330B	Hexahydro-1,3,5-trinitro-1,3,5-triazine (RDX)	1.8		µg/L	0.60	X	0.11	0.22
Central Impact Area	MW-615M1	MW-615M1_S26	260.00	270.00	02/04/2026	SW8330B	Octahydro-1,3,5,7-tetranitro-1,3,5,7-tetrazocine (HMX)	0.28		µg/L	400		0.099	0.22
Central Impact Area	MW-23M1	MW-23M1_S26	225.00	235.00	02/03/2026	SW6850	Perchlorate	2.2		µg/L	2.0	X	0.10	0.20
Central Impact Area	MW-123M1	MW-123M1_S26	291.00	301.00	02/02/2026	SW8330B	Hexahydro-1,3,5-trinitro-1,3,5-triazine (RDX)	0.19	J	µg/L	0.60		0.10	0.21
Central Impact Area	MW-102M2	MW-102M2_S26	237.00	247.00	02/02/2026	SW8330B	Hexahydro-1,3,5-trinitro-1,3,5-triazine (RDX)	0.75		µg/L	0.60	X	0.10	0.21
Central Impact Area	MW-726S	MW-726S_S26	135.50	145.50	01/22/2026	SW8330B	2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene	0.14	J	µg/L	2.0		0.045	0.22
Central Impact Area	MW-726S	MW-726S_S26	135.50	145.50	01/22/2026	SW8330B	2-Amino-4,6-dinitrotoluene	0.32	J	µg/L	7.3		0.055	1.1
Central Impact Area	MW-726S	MW-726S_S26	135.50	145.50	01/22/2026	SW8330B	4-Amino-2,6-dinitrotoluene	0.33	J	µg/L	7.3		0.066	0.22
Central Impact Area	MW-98S	MW-98S_S26	137.00	147.00	01/22/2026	SW8330B	2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene	0.17	J	µg/L	2.0		0.043	0.22
Central Impact Area	MW-98S	MW-98S_S26	137.00	147.00	01/22/2026	SW8330B	2-Amino-4,6-dinitrotoluene	0.20	J	µg/L	7.3		0.053	1.1
Central Impact Area	MW-98S	MW-98S_S26	137.00	147.00	01/22/2026	SW8330B	4-Amino-2,6-dinitrotoluene	0.39	J	µg/L	7.3		0.064	0.22
Central Impact Area	MW-98M1	MW-98M1_S26	164.00	174.00	01/22/2026	SW8330B	Hexahydro-1,3,5-trinitro-1,3,5-triazine (RDX)	3.9		µg/L	0.60	X	0.11	0.22
Central Impact Area	MW-98M1	MW-98M1_S26	164.00	174.00	01/22/2026	SW8330B	Octahydro-1,3,5,7-tetranitro-1,3,5,7-tetrazocine (HMX)	0.22		µg/L	400		0.10	0.22
Central Impact Area	MW-112M1	MW-112M1_S26	195.00	205.00	01/21/2026	SW8330B	Hexahydro-1,3,5-trinitro-1,3,5-triazine (RDX)	0.99		µg/L	0.60	X	0.10	0.21
Central Impact Area	MW-609M1	MW-609M1_S26	210.40	220.40	01/20/2026	SW8330B	Hexahydro-1,3,5-trinitro-1,3,5-triazine (RDX)	0.24		µg/L	0.60		0.11	0.22
Central Impact Area	MW-618M1	MW-618M1_S26	238.50	248.50	01/15/2026	SW8330B	Octahydro-1,3,5,7-tetranitro-1,3,5,7-tetrazocine (HMX)	0.12	J	µg/L	400		0.098	0.21
Central Impact Area	MW-629M1	MW-629M1_S26	216.90	226.90	01/15/2026	SW8330B	Hexahydro-1,3,5-trinitro-1,3,5-triazine (RDX)	0.21		µg/L	0.60		0.11	0.21
Central Impact Area	MW-638M2	MW-638M2_S26	204.20	214.20	01/15/2026	SW8330B	Hexahydro-1,3,5-trinitro-1,3,5-triazine (RDX)	0.38		µg/L	0.60		0.11	0.22
Central Impact Area	MW-638M2	MW-638M2_S26	204.20	214.20	01/15/2026	SW8330B	Octahydro-1,3,5,7-tetranitro-1,3,5,7-tetrazocine (HMX)	0.24		µg/L	400		0.10	0.22
Central Impact Area	MW-204M1	MW-204M1_S26	141.00	151.00	01/14/2026	SW8330B	Hexahydro-1,3,5-trinitro-1,3,5-triazine (RDX)	0.11	J	µg/L	0.60		0.10	0.21
Central Impact Area	MW-204M1	MW-204M1_S26D	141.00	151.00	01/14/2026	SW8330B	Hexahydro-1,3,5-trinitro-1,3,5-triazine (RDX)	0.12	J	µg/L	0.60		0.10	0.21
Central Impact Area	MW-209M2	MW-209M2_S26	220.00	230.00	01/13/2026	SW6850	Perchlorate	0.12	J	µg/L	2.0		0.10	0.20
Central Impact Area	MW-209M1	MW-209M1_S26	240.00	250.00	01/13/2026	SW6850	Perchlorate	2.4		µg/L	2.0	X	0.10	0.20
Central Impact Area	MW-209M1	MW-209M1_S26	240.00	250.00	01/13/2026	SW8330B	Hexahydro-1,3,5-trinitro-1,3,5-triazine (RDX)	2.0		µg/L	0.60	X	0.11	0.22

J = Estimated Result
MDL = Method Detection Limit
RL = Reporting Limit
ND = Non-Detect

MCL/HA= Either the MCL or Lowest Health Advisory Limit

**TABLE 2
VALIDATED EXPLOSIVE AND PERCHLORATE RESULTS
Data Received 01 to 28 February 2026**

Area of Concern	Location ID	Field Sample ID	Top Depth (ft bgs)	Bottom Depth (ft bgs)	Date Sampled	Test Method	Analyte	Result Value	Qualifier	Units	MCL/HA	> MCL/HA	MDL	RL
Central Impact Area	MW-209M1	MW-209M1_S26	240.00	250.00	01/13/2026	SW8330B	Octahydro-1,3,5,7-tetranitro-1,3,5,7-tetrazocine (HMX)	0.27		µg/L	400		0.10	0.22
Central Impact Area	MW-209M1	MW-209M1_S26D	240.00	250.00	01/13/2026	SW6850	Perchlorate	2.5		µg/L	2.0	X	0.10	0.20
Central Impact Area	MW-209M1	MW-209M1_S26D	240.00	250.00	01/13/2026	SW8330B	Hexahydro-1,3,5-trinitro-1,3,5-triazine (RDX)	1.9		µg/L	0.60	X	0.10	0.21
Central Impact Area	MW-209M1	MW-209M1_S26D	240.00	250.00	01/13/2026	SW8330B	Octahydro-1,3,5,7-tetranitro-1,3,5,7-tetrazocine (HMX)	0.28		µg/L	400		0.097	0.21
J3 Range	90MW0054	90MW0054_S26	107.00	112.00	01/13/2026	SW8330B	Hexahydro-1,3,5-trinitro-1,3,5-triazine (RDX)	2.5		µg/L	0.60	X	0.11	0.23
J3 Range	90MW0054	90MW0054_S26	107.00	112.00	01/13/2026	SW8330B	Octahydro-1,3,5,7-tetranitro-1,3,5,7-tetrazocine (HMX)	0.37		µg/L	400		0.10	0.23
J3 Range	MW-637M2	MW-637M2_S26	214.10	224.10	01/12/2026	SW6850	Perchlorate	1.6		µg/L	2.0		0.10	0.20
J3 Range	MW-637M2	MW-637M2_S26	214.10	224.10	01/12/2026	SW8330B	Hexahydro-1,3,5-trinitro-1,3,5-triazine (RDX)	0.44		µg/L	0.60		0.10	0.21
J3 Range	MW-653M1	MW-653M1_S26	147.50	157.50	01/12/2026	SW6850	Perchlorate	0.12	J	µg/L	2.0		0.10	0.20

J = Estimated Result
MDL = Method Detection Limit
RL = Reporting Limit
ND = Non-Detect

MCL/HA= Either the MCL or Lowest Health Advisory Limit

**TABLE 3
VALIDATED PER- AND POLYFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES (PFAS) RESULTS
Data Received 01 to 28 February 2026**

Area of Concern	Location ID	Field Sample ID	Top Depth (ft bgs)	Bottom Depth (ft bgs)	Date Sampled	Test Method	Analyte	Result Value	Qualifier	Units	MCL/HA	> MCL/HA	MDL	RL
Demolition Area 1	MW-19S	MW-19S_JAN26	52.70	62.70	01/07/2026	E1633	Perfluorobutanoic acid (PFBA)	2.1	J	ng/L	1800		0.94	3.8
Demolition Area 1	MW-19S	MW-19S_JAN26	52.70	62.70	01/07/2026	E1633	Perfluoroheptanoic acid (PFHpA)	1.2	J	ng/L	20.0		0.47	1.9
Demolition Area 1	MW-19S	MW-19S_JAN26	52.70	62.70	01/07/2026	E1633	Perfluorohexanoic acid (PFHxA)	1.6	J	ng/L	990		0.47	1.9
Demolition Area 1	MW-19S	MW-19S_JAN26	52.70	62.70	01/07/2026	E1633	Perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (PFOS)	0.53	J	ng/L	4.0		0.47	1.9
Demolition Area 1	MW-19S	MW-19S_JAN26	52.70	62.70	01/07/2026	E1633	Perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA)	4.0		ng/L	6.0		0.47	1.9
Demolition Area 1	MW-19S	MW-19S_JAN26	52.70	62.70	01/07/2026	E1633	Perfluoropentanoic acid (PFPeA)	0.59	J	ng/L			0.47	1.9
Lima Range	MW-291M1	MW-291M1_JAN26	185.41	195.41	01/07/2026	E1633	Perfluorodecanoic acid (PFDA)	9.7		ng/L	20.0		0.45	1.8
Lima Range	MW-291M1	MW-291M1_JAN26	185.41	195.41	01/07/2026	E1633	Perfluorododecanoic acid (PFDoA)	2.3		ng/L	100		0.50	1.8
Lima Range	MW-291M1	MW-291M1_JAN26	185.41	195.41	01/07/2026	E1633	Perfluorononanoic acid (PFNA)	4.4		ng/L	5.9		0.45	1.8
Lima Range	MW-291M1	MW-291M1_JAN26	185.41	195.41	01/07/2026	E1633	Perfluorotridecanoic acid (PFTrDA)	0.97	J	ng/L			0.52	1.8
Lima Range	MW-291M1	MW-291M1_JAN26	185.41	195.41	01/07/2026	E1633	Perfluoroundecanoic acid (PFUnA)	33.0		ng/L	600		0.45	1.8
J2 Range Northern	J2N-EFF-F	J2N-EFF-F_JAN26	0.00	0.00	01/06/2026	E1633	6:2 Fluorotelomer sulfonic acid (6:2 FTS)	12.0		ng/L			0.89	3.6
J2 Range Northern	J2N-EFF-F	J2N-EFF-F_JAN26	0.00	0.00	01/06/2026	E1633	Perfluoroheptanoic acid (PFHpA)	0.56	J	ng/L	20.0		0.45	1.8
J2 Range Northern	J2N-EFF-F	J2N-EFF-F_JAN26	0.00	0.00	01/06/2026	E1633	Perfluorohexanoic acid (PFHxA)	0.81	J	ng/L	990		0.45	1.8
J2 Range Northern	J2N-EFF-F	J2N-EFF-F_JAN26	0.00	0.00	01/06/2026	E1633	Perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (PFOS)	2.7		ng/L	4.0		0.45	1.8
J2 Range Northern	J2N-EFF-F	J2N-EFF-F_JAN26	0.00	0.00	01/06/2026	E1633	Perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA)	2.6		ng/L	6.0		0.45	1.8
J2 Range Northern	J2N-EFF-F	J2N-EFF-F_JAN26	0.00	0.00	01/06/2026	E1633	Perfluoropentanoic acid (PFPeA)	0.74	J	ng/L			0.45	1.8
J2 Range Northern	J2N-INF-F	J2N-INF-F_JAN26	0.00	0.00	01/06/2026	E1633	6:2 Fluorotelomer sulfonic acid (6:2 FTS)	9.2		ng/L			0.91	3.6
J2 Range Northern	J2N-INF-F	J2N-INF-F_JAN26	0.00	0.00	01/06/2026	E1633	Perfluoroheptanesulfonic acid (PFHpS)	0.59	J	ng/L			0.45	1.8
J2 Range Northern	J2N-INF-F	J2N-INF-F_JAN26	0.00	0.00	01/06/2026	E1633	Perfluorohexanesulfonic acid (PFHxS)	4.2		ng/L	20.0		0.45	1.8
J2 Range Northern	J2N-INF-F	J2N-INF-F_JAN26	0.00	0.00	01/06/2026	E1633	Perfluorohexanoic acid (PFHxA)	0.70	J	ng/L	990		0.45	1.8
J2 Range Northern	J2N-INF-F	J2N-INF-F_JAN26	0.00	0.00	01/06/2026	E1633	Perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (PFOS)	8.9		ng/L	4.0	X	0.45	1.8
J2 Range Northern	J2N-INF-F	J2N-INF-F_JAN26	0.00	0.00	01/06/2026	E1633	Perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA)	2.3		ng/L	6.0		0.45	1.8
J2 Range Northern	J2N-INF-F	J2N-INF-F_JAN26	0.00	0.00	01/06/2026	E1633	Perfluoropentanoic acid (PFPeA)	0.78	J	ng/L			0.45	1.8
J2 Range Northern	J2N-INF-F	J2N-INF-F_JAN26D	0.00	0.00	01/06/2026	E1633	6:2 Fluorotelomer sulfonic acid (6:2 FTS)	8.2		ng/L			0.90	3.6
J2 Range Northern	J2N-INF-F	J2N-INF-F_JAN26D	0.00	0.00	01/06/2026	E1633	Perfluoroheptanesulfonic acid (PFHpS)	0.71	J	ng/L			0.45	1.8
J2 Range Northern	J2N-INF-F	J2N-INF-F_JAN26D	0.00	0.00	01/06/2026	E1633	Perfluorohexanesulfonic acid (PFHxS)	4.0		ng/L	20.0		0.45	1.8
J2 Range Northern	J2N-INF-F	J2N-INF-F_JAN26D	0.00	0.00	01/06/2026	E1633	Perfluorohexanoic acid (PFHxA)	0.72	J	ng/L	990		0.45	1.8

J = Estimated Result
MDL = Method Detection Limit
RL = Reporting Limit
ND = Non-Detect

MCL/HA= Either the MCL or Lowest Health Advisory Limit

**TABLE 3
VALIDATED PER- AND POLYFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES (PFAS) RESULTS
Data Received 01 to 28 February 2026**

Area of Concern	Location ID	Field Sample ID	Top Depth (ft bgs)	Bottom Depth (ft bgs)	Date Sampled	Test Method	Analyte	Result Value	Qualifier	Units	MCL/HA	> MCL/HA	MDL	RL
J2 Range Northern	J2N-INF-F	J2N-INF-F_JAN26D	0.00	0.00	01/06/2026	E1633	Perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (PFOS)	9.4		ng/L	4.0	X	0.45	1.8
J2 Range Northern	J2N-INF-F	J2N-INF-F_JAN26D	0.00	0.00	01/06/2026	E1633	Perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA)	2.7		ng/L	6.0		0.45	1.8
J2 Range Northern	J2N-INF-F	J2N-INF-F_JAN26D	0.00	0.00	01/06/2026	E1633	Perfluoropentanoic acid (PFPeA)	0.75	J	ng/L			0.45	1.8

J = Estimated Result
MDL = Method Detection Limit
RL = Reporting Limit
ND = Non-Detect

MCL/HA= Either the MCL or Lowest Health Advisory Limit