Draft

Explanation of Significant Differences to the FTMM-53 Record of Decision

Fort Monmouth, New Jersey

United States Department of Army

June 2026

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronym	Meaning
AFFF	Aqueous Film-Forming Foam
AOPI	Area of Potential Interest
Army	U.S. Army
AS/SVE	Air Sparge/Soil Vapor Extraction
BRAC	Base Realignment and Closure
CEA	Classification Exception Area
CECOM	U.S. Army Communications Electronics Command
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CWA	Charles Wood Area
DoD	U.S. Department of Defense
EA	Evans Area
ECOM	Electronics Command
ESD	Explanation of Significant Differences
ESOH	Environmental Safety and Occupational Health
FMERA	Fort Monmouth Economic Revitalization Authority
FTMM	Fort Monmouth
HFPO-DA	Hexafluoropropylene Oxide Dimer Acid
LUC	Land Use Control
MCL	Maximum Contaminant Levels
MCLG	Maximum Contaminant Level Goals
MDL	Method Detection Limit
MNA	Monitored Natural Attenuation
MP	Main Post
NCP	National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan
NFA	No Further Action
NJDEP	New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection
NPDWR	National Primary Drinking Water Regulation
ODASA-ESOH	Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Environment, Safety and Occupational Health
PA	Preliminary Assessment
PCE	Tetrachloroethene
PFAS	Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances
PFBA	Perfluorobutanoic Acid
PFBS	Perfluorobutanesulfonic Acid
PFDA	Perfluorodecanoic Acid
PFHxA	Perfluorohexanoic Acid
PFHxS	Perfluorohexanesulfonic Acid
PFNA	Perfluorononanoic Acid
PFOA	Perfluorooctanoic Acid

PFPrA	Perfluoropropanoic Acid
ppb	Parts per Billion
ppt	Parts per Trillion
R&D	Research and Development
RI	Remedial Investigation
ROD	Record of Decision
RSL	Regional Screening Level
SL	Screening Level
U.S.C.	United States Code
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
UST	Underground Storage Tank
WWI	World War I
WWII	World War II

Draft
Explanation of Significant Differences
For The
Fort Monmouth Record of Decision
Monmouth, New Jersey

June 2026

1 Introduction To the Site and Statement of Purpose

Site Name and Location:	FTMM-53 (Parcel 52/Building 699 site) Fort Monmouth, Monmouth, New Jersey
Lead Agency:	United States Army, Base Realignment and Closure Directorate (BRAC), Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army, Environment (ODASA), Environment, Safety and Occupational Health (ESOH)
Support Agency:	New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP)

Statement of Purpose:

Section 117(c) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), 42 U.S.C. §9617(c), and Section 300.435(c)(2)(i) of the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP), 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §300.435(c)(2)(i), requite that, if any remedial action is taken after adoption of a final remedial action plan, and such action differs in any significant respect from the final plan, the lead agency (U.S. Army) shall publish an Explanation of Significant Differences (ESD). The ESD must describe the significant difference(s) between the selected remedial action and the modified remedial action, including an explanation of why such changes were made. This ESD will specifically address the differences between remedy selected in the Record of Decision (ROD) for Fort Monmouth (FTMM) site FTMM-53 (Parcel 52/Bldg 699), October 2020 based on new information related to an additional contaminant.

Description of the FTMM-53 Remedy (Parcel 52/Bldg 699) as described by the 2020 ROD.

1.1 FTMM-53 (Parcel 52/Bldg 699 Site) Background information

While in operation, Fort Monmouth was comprised of the Main Post (MP), Charles Wood Area (CWA), and the Evans Area (EA). The MP is in the Eatontown and Oceanport Boroughs of Monmouth County, New Jersey. FTMM-53 is located on the MP.

Due to BRAC 2005 (10 U.S.C. 2687 (BRAC Law), Public Law 101-526), Fort Monmouth MP ceased operations in 2011. The Army is in the process of transferring all property outside of federal ownership for non-residential mixed use.

Prior to closure, Building 699 was a full-service gas station and convenience store. Fuel (gasoline) was released from multiple sources into the soil, resulting in soil and groundwater contamination. Investigations, Underground Storage Tank (UST) removals, groundwater treatment and soil removals took place during the 1990s through 2019. Those efforts reduced the contamination, but did not eliminate it. The remaining residual contamination in soil and groundwater are at levels acceptable for the planned future land use of the property, with some restrictions. In accordance with CERLCA and NJDEP regulations to ensure there is no exposure of the residual contamination, a remedy was selected to restrict the land and groundwater use, and continue to monitor the groundwater. The groundwater contamination is expected to naturally degrade over time through monitored natural attenuation (MNA). This remedy was selected and approved by NJDEP, as documented by the 2020 FTMM-53 ROD. The site is subject to the monitoring requirements of the Land Use Control Implementation Plan (LUCIP)[1] and via a Classification Exception Area (CEA).

After the 2020 ROD was signed, emerging contaminants of Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) were identified by the EPA. Congressional and Department of War requirements, as well as Army policies, required Fort Monmouth to undergo a PFAS Preliminary Assessment (PA) to identify potential areas of use, storage or disposal of PFAS containing materials. The PA identified FTMM-53, Building 699 as an area of potential interest (AOPI). Based on a personnel interviews, fuel (gasoline) was released by a tanker truck refilling an Underground Storage Tank (UST) located at the Building 699 Gasoline Service Station. The fuel flowed from the UST pad area and into the parking lot east of Building 699. The fire department reportedly used Aqueous Film-Forming Foam (AFFF) to contain the fuel spill (Leidos 2024). During the sampling events, PFAS constituents were found to be present in groundwater and soil above the Department Of War (DOW) designated RSLs. The maximum detected in soil was subsurface soil at 2.75 µg/kg for PFOS and the maximum detected in groundwater was 337 ng/L. See Table 1 below for results.

Table 1 – FTMM-53 Phase I RI Groundwater Sample Results

Location ID	Sample ID	Depth (feet)	Sample Date	HFPO-DA	PFBS	PFBA	PFDA	PFHxS	PFHxA	PFNA	PFOS	PFOA
Groundwater			Units	ng/L	ng/L	ng/L	ng/L	ng/L	ng/L	ng/L	ng/L	ng/L
			Screening Levels	1.5	600	1800	0.52	10	990	5.9	4.0	4.0
699MW01	699MW01-202507	9	7/14/2025	0.727 UJ	**0.937 J**	**11.2 J**	**1.26 J**	**24.8 J**	**12.5 J**	**1.47 J**	**64.0 J**	**40.5 J**
699MW05	699MW05-202507	10	7/13/2025	0.716 U	**1.26 J**	5.37 U	1.34 U	**18.6**	**5.14**	**0.794 J**	**20.2**	**14.6**
	699MW05-202507FD	10	7/13/2025	0.723 U	**1.25 J**	5.42 U	1.36 U	**18.2**	**4.90**	**0.802 J**	**19.7**	**14.4**
699MW06	699MW06-202507	10	7/14/2025	**3.14 J**	**10.1 J**	**21.2 J**	**1.83 J**	**241 J**	**31.9 J**	**5.39 J**	**337 J**	**93.9 J**
FTMM-53-MW-01	FTMM-53-MW-01-202507	10	7/14/2025	0.738 UJ	**2.48 J**	**4.06 J**	1.38 UJ	**36.2 J**	**5.18 J**	**2.99 J**	**38.4 J**	**85.2 J**

Notes:

PFAS SLs used in DoD investigations are listed in the 2025 ASD memorandum titled Investigating Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances within the Department of Defense Cleanup Program (DoD 2025a).

These and subsequent SL updates for DoD investigations of PFAS are documented on the PFAS Task Force website, https://www.acq.osd.mil/eie/eer/ecc/pfas/pfas101/rsl.html (DoD 2025b).

[1] The LUCIP will be updated and finalized in July 2026.

DoD PFAS SLs are based on USEPA's RSL tables dated November 2024 except where the USEPA RSLs were below the MDLs of USEPA-approved analytical methods.
Bolded values denote detected concentrations.
Highlighted values indicate a value equal to or exceeding the screening level.
Qualifiers:
J = The analyte was positively identified; the associated numerical value is the approximate concentration of the analyte in the sample (+/- indicates biased high or low).

1.2 Summary of this Explanation of Significant Differences

In May 2016, USEPA issued lifetime health advisories (LHAs) for PFOA and PFOS under the Safe Drinking Water Act. To provide Americans, including the most sensitive populations, with a margin of protection from a lifetime of exposure to PFOS and PFOA in drinking water, USEPA established an LHA level for PFOS and PFOA (individually or combined) of 70 ng/L (USEPA 2016).

In October 2019, the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) issued *Investigating Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances within the Department of Defense Cleanup Program* which included guidance on investigating PFOS, PFOA, and PFBS at DoD restoration sites (DoD 2019). The OSD memorandum provided risk screening levels (SLs) for PFOS, PFOA, and PFBS in groundwater, tap water, and soil, based on the USEPA regional screening level (RSL) calculator for residential and industrial reuse. Multiple updates were subsequently issued modifying the numbers and screening levels for additional PFAS constituents.

The Army's strategy was to continue to assess and investigate potential releases and implement necessary response actions in accordance with CERCLA to ensure that no human health-based exposures are above the CERCLA risk-based values or the LHA in drinking water. Therefore, sites where human exposure to contaminated drinking water exists will be addressed first and as quickly as possible to eliminate the exposure and then will be subsequently prioritized and sequenced to conduct the investigations and response actions necessary to characterize and, if necessary, remediate the source of PFAS contamination (Army Guidance on Addressing Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances U.S. Army 2018).

In April 2024, USEPA issued the PFAS National Primary Drinking Water Regulation (NPDWR) which established enforceable Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) for six PFAS in drinking water. Individual MCLs include PFOA, PFOS, PFHxS, PFNA, and HFPO-DA. A Hazard Index MCL is presented for a PFAS mixture containing at least two or more of PFHxS, PFNA, HFPO-DA, and PFBS, to account for the combined and co-occurring levels of these PFAS in drinking water. The USEPA also finalized health-based, non-enforceable Maximum Contaminant Level Goals for these six PFAS (USEPA 2024). These levels are summarized in Table 2 below. These MCLs and MCLGs went into effect on 8 July 2024, however a May 2026 proposed rule by the EPA intends to rescind the regulations for PFHxS, PFNA, HFPO-DA and PFBS.

Table 2 – MCLs and MCLGs for Six PFAS Compounds in Drinking Water

Compound	Final MCLG	Final MCL (enforceable levels)[1]
PFOA	Zero	4.0 parts per trillion (ppt) (also expressed as ng/L)
PFOS	Zero	4.0 ppt
PFHxS	10 ppt	10 ppt
PFNA	10 ppt	10 ppt
HFPO-DA (commonly known as GenX Chemicals)	10 ppt	10 ppt
Mixtures containing two or more of PFHxS, PFNA, HFPO-DA, and PFBS	1 (unitless) Hazard Index	1 (unitless) Hazard Index

Through the CERCLA PA process, Fort Monmouth was identified as having several Areas of Potential Interests (AOPIs) for the use, storage, or disposal of PFAS-containing materials and a sitewide Remedial Investigation was initiated in October 2024. The Sitewide PFAS Remedial Investigation was finalized in April 2026. Field investigation activities and procedures used for the Phase I RI were consistent with DoD guidance *(Investigating Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances Within the Department of Defense Cleanup Program,* August 2023). Due to the already completed remedial actions, the selected alternative remedy at Site FTMM-53 (Parcel 52/Bldg 699) is being addressed expeditiously. The potential risk posed by PFAS in drinking water is already mitigated by limited use of groundwater, as documented by the FTMM-53 ROD. This action is also being completed separately in order to support the anticipated transfer of Parcel 52 to the Fort Monmouth Economic Redevelopment Authority (FMERA). Parcel 52 is a "carve out" area that did not transfer with the surrounding property in order to address the historical groundwater contamination identified and enable a remedy to be implemented prior to the transfer in accordance with Section 120(h) of CERCLA. This ESD describes the significant changes being made to the existing remedy needed to include PFAS contamination as an additional reason to restrict the use of the groundwater at Parcel 52. This ESD is supported by a Focused Feasibility Study for Parcel 52, finalized in June 2026 (Army, 2026).

1.3 Finalizing the Parcel 52/Building 699 Remedy

The Army evaluated two alternatives to address unacceptable risks associated with the exposure of the PFAS groundwater contamination under a drinking water exposure pathway and is selecting one of these alternatives.

1) No Action Alternative. The NCP (40 CFR §300.430(e)(6)) requires all feasibility studies to evaluate the no-action alternative. The No-Action Alternative is protective in the short term because the current CEA restricts the use, and therefore any exposure to contaminated groundwater. However, it is not protective in the long term because the current restriction is not predicated on the presence of PFAS contamination, only residual levels of benzene, ethylbenzene, toluene, xylenes and PCE. As MNA progresses, the levels of the original contaminates will continue to reduce and without knowing there are

additional PFAS contaminants at the site, the CEA could be lifted, thus potentially completing an exposure pathway to PFAS contaminated groundwater.

2) Land Use Controls – Groundwater Restrictions. Adding PFAS constituents to the existing contaminants on the restriction on the use of groundwater creates a PFAS-specific reason to eliminate the drinking water exposure pathway to contaminated groundwater. This remedy will remain in place, even when MNA reduces the non-PFAS contamination at the site, thus remaining protective in both the short- and long-term.

Through this ESD, the Army is documenting that the Army selected Alternative 2 after seeking NJDEP concurrence and a public comment period on the two alternatives. These two alternatives are evaluated in the FFS which is included in the Administrative Record for Fort Monmouth.

1.4 Public Comment Period

A formal public comment period on the Draft ESD for FTMM-53 (Parcel 52/Bldg 699) was held from 16-June-26 through 01-July26 (two weeks). During the comment period, the Army accepted written and e-mailed comments on the Draft ESD. The Army considered and responded to all formal comments received during the comment period before issuing this final ESD. The public comments and the Army's responses to them are a part of the Administrative Record for Fort Monmouth. Attachment B includes the Army's Response to Comments received on the Draft ESD.

1.5 Availability of Records and Public Notice

The documents supporting this ESD, including any public comments and the Army's responses, have been compiled into an Administrative Record for the Fort Monmouth Site, as required by the NCP (40 CFR §300.825(a)(2)). The Administrative Record for this ESD has been developed in accordance with Section 113(k) of CERCLA and a copy of the files associated with the AR are available for public review at the following information repository located at the following website:

2 Site History, Contamination, and Selected Remedy

Fort Monmouth occupied approximately 1,376 acres in Monmouth County, New Jersey, approximately 45 miles south of New York City, New York, and 70 miles northeast of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Fort Monmouth was composed of three operational areas: the MP (637 acres), located to the east of State Highway 35 and within the boroughs of Eatontown and Oceanport; the CWA (489 acres), located on the western side of State Highway 35 approximately 1 mile to the west of the MP and within the boroughs of Eatontown and Tinton Falls; and the EA (250 acres), located approximately 10 miles south of the MP in Wall Township (Leidos, 2026).

Fort Monmouth (originally known as Camp Little Silver) was established in 1917 as a training camp for Signal Corps troops prior to U.S. involvement in WWI (Weston 1995). The land was purchased in 1919, and on August 6, 1925, the base was designated a permanent installation and officially named Fort Monmouth (). During WWII, Fort Monmouth expanded as the pace of training increased. The Army purchased the CWA in 1941, and it was primarily used for Research and Development (R&D), testing, and housing. The Army purchased the EA in

November 1941 for use as a radar development site (Earth Tech 1996). Primary activities conducted in the EA included research and development, maintenance, and administrative activities. In 1962, Fort Monmouth became the headquarters for the U.S. Army Electronics Command (ECOM) with a mission to develop electronic equipment for use in battlefields of the future. In 1978, ECOM was replaced with two new commands: the U.S. Army Communications-Electronics Materiel Readiness Command and the U.S. Army Communications Research and Development Command. In 1981, these commands were combined to form the U.S. Army Communications Electronics Command (CECOM) (Leidos, 2026).

Fort Monmouth and CECOM have a long history of research and development activity, primarily related to communications and electronic equipment. In addition, Fort Monmouth has a significant history of training and housing troops (Parsons 2015). Military training activities at Fort Monmouth have varied depending on the training focus at the operational areas but generally have included the use of the various R&D laboratories, offices, barracks, and training areas. Other military training activities conducted at Fort Monmouth included testing of radio equipment for ground troops and aviation, training and deployment of homing pigeons, development of radar, and meteorology (Leidos, 2026).

Fort Monmouth activities were realigned under four BRAC Commission recommendations in 1988, 1991, 1993, and 1995 prior to the recommendation for closure in 2005. The 1988 BRAC Commission directed the Army to relocate Information Systems Command from Fort Monmouth to Fort Devens, Massachusetts. The 1991 BRAC Commission directed the move of the Electronics Technology and Devices Laboratory from Fort Monmouth to Adelphi, Maryland. The 1993 BRAC Commission directed the relocation of the Chaplain School to Fort Jackson, South Carolina, and the movement of CECOM Headquarters out of leased space and into space at Fort Monmouth vacated by the 513th Military Intelligence Brigade (a non-BRAC movement) and the Chaplain School. It also directed the disposal of excess facilities and real property at Evans and Charles Wood sub-posts. BRAC 1995 involved moving additional tenant personnel from Fort Dix and Bayonne to Fort Monmouth, reassigning procurement and material management personnel to Fort Monmouth, and disposing of excess housing in the Howard Commons area of Fort Monmouth. On September 15, 2011, Fort Monmouth Main Post was officially closed, and all active military activities ceased (Leidos, 2026).

The FTMM environmental cleanup is being conducted under the Installation Restoration Program established by the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) in 1978 to identify, investigate, and clean up petroleum and hazardous contaminants at DoD facilities. FTMM is not on the National Priorities List (NPL) and the Army is the lead agency under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. § 9601 et. seq.), the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (10 U.S.C. § 2701 et. seq.) and Executive Order 12580, as amended. The NJDEP is the supporting agency.

Fuel (gasoline) was released by a tanker truck refilling an UST located at the Building 699 Gasoline Service Station at the MP. The fuel flowed from the UST pad area and into the parking lot east of Building 699. The fire department reportedly used AFFF to contain the fuel spill (Leidos 2024).

Benzene, ethylbenzene, toluene, and xylenes, as well as Tetrachloroethene (PCE), have been detected historically, both in soil and groundwater, exceeding NJDEP standards due to a 1980s release of gasoline from the underground storage tanks (USTs) at Building 699. Remedial

actions, including Air Sparge/Soil Vapor Extraction (AS/SVE) and groundwater pump and treat, have been implemented, and the groundwater currently is being addressed by MNA under a CEA (Leidos, 2026).

3 Explanation of Significant Differences

As discussed above, the Army with concurrence from the NJDEP, originally selected groundwater use controls which are implemented through the CEA. The identification of PFAS as additional groundwater contamination requires the selection of a PFAS-specific remedy, which aim to restrict the drinking water exposure pathway for as long as PFAS contamination remains above Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs).

4 Description of Changes to the Selected Remedy

Regarding the remedy modification to address the PFAS contamination in the groundwater, the Army is selecting Alternative 2 – incorporating the PFAS contamination as a reason to restrict drinking water access to the groundwater. This determination is based on, among other things, the protectiveness, cost-effectiveness, and mitigation of long-term risks of having a PFAS-specific remedy as an additional reason to restrict the use of groundwater at the Fort Monmouth Site.

This ESD is not changing any of the other remedial components of the FTMM-53 Remedy. The Army will continue to perform long term monitoring of PFAS contamination and will continue to conduct LUCs compliance monitoring and reporting, and Five-Year Reviews at the Site.

5 Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements

The term "Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements" (ARARs) are the legal statutes and regulations identified in the FTMM-53 ROD that apply to the CERCLA remedial cleanup. A review of the ARARs identified in the FTMM-53 remedial documents was performed to identify any potential new ARARs or changes to existing ARAR requirements that would pertain to adding PFAS-specific groundwater restrictions at the Site.

Under CERCLA, Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) established under the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) are generally identified as ARARs (42 U.S.C. §9621(d)). However, when the groundwater is not a drinking water source, MCLS are not relevant and appropriate. If the groundwater is not, and cannot reasonably be expected to be, used as a drinking water source, MCLs need not be identified as ARARs. According to EPA guidance, If MCLs are applicable, they are applied at the tap as the point of compliance. If MCLs are relevant and appropriate, as in in situ cleanup standards, where either surface water or groundwater is or may be used for drinking water (*CERCLA Compliance with Other Laws Manual: Interim Final*, EPA/540/G-89/006, August 1988).

The Army will continue to investigate groundwater contamination in a holistic manner across the entirety of the former Fort Monmouth, beginning with a Phase II RI IN FY27. Should active remediation be selected as a future sitewide remedy, PFAS-specific MCLs will be evaluated as ARARs, at that time. Should groundwater ever be used for drinking water purposes, MCLs will

be met prior to usage. At this time, there are no ARARs specific to the action described in this ESD.

6 Supporting Agency Comments

The Army will accept comments on the Draft ESD during a formal public comment period. Attachment A includes the Army's responses to public comments to the Draft ESD. In the Final ESD, the Army will consider comments that the State of New Jersey provided on the Draft ESD. Attachment B includes the Army's responses to NJDEP comments to the Draft ESD. As provided, a copy of the NJDEP letter of support is included as Attachment C.

7 Statutory Determinations

The remedy as modified herein remains protective of human health and the environment, complies with all federal and state requirements that are applicable or relevant and appropriate to the remedy, and is cost-effective.

8 Public Participation Compliance

The Army maintains meaningful public outreach regarding the Fort Monmouth Site. The NCP requires that if a remedial action differs significantly from the remedy selected in the ROD with respect to scope, performance, or cost, the lead agency shall consult with the support agency as appropriate and shall:

Publish an explanation of significant differences when the differences in the remedial or enforcement action, settlement, or consent decree significantly change but do not fundamentally alter the remedy selected in the ROD with respect to scope, performance, or cost. To issue an explanation of significant differences, the lead agency shall:

a. Make the explanation of significant differences and supporting information available to the public in the Administrative Record established under §300.815 and the information repository; and
b. Publish a notice that briefly summarizes the explanation of significant differences, including the reasons for such differences, in a major local newspaper of general circulation;

In addition to publishing the notice summarizing the Draft ESD, the Army held a two-week public comment period to allow the public meaningful input into the Final ESD.

9 Declaration

For the foregoing reasons, by my signature below, I approve the issuance of this Explanation of Significant Differences for the Fort Monmouth Site located in Oceanport, New Jersey and the changes and conclusions stated therein.

Signature Page

Explanation of Significant Differences
FTMM-53 (Building 699/Parcel 52)
Fort Monmouth
Oceanport, New Jersey

United States Department of Army

_____ _____

Richard Ramsdell
BRAC Director
Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army
(Environment, Safety and Occupational Health)

Date

ATTACHMENT A

Placeholder for Public Comments and Army Responses

ATTACHMENT B

Placeholder for NJDEP Comments and Army Responses

ATTACHMENT C

Placeholder for NJDEP Letter of Support

ATTACHMENT D

REFERENCES

Army, 2020. Record of Decision for Fort Monmouth Site FTMM-53 (2020)

Army. 2026. Focused Feasibility Study for Site FTMM-53 at Fort Monmouth, Oceanport, New Jersey. Final. July 2026.

CERCLA Compliance with Other Laws Manual: Interim Final, EPA/540/G-89/006, August 1988).

Leidos. 2024. Preliminary Assessment of Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances at Fort Monmouth, Monmouth County, New Jersey. Final. January.

Leidos. 2026. Phase 1 Remedial Investigation Report for Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances at Fort Monmouth, Monmouth County, New Jersey. Final. April.

Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), 2018. Army Guidance for Addressing Releases of Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances. Final. September,

OSD. 2019. Investigating Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances within the Department of Defense Cleanup Program. Final. October.

OSD. 2021. Memorandum: Investigating Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances within the Department of Defense Cleanup Program. Final. September.