Spring Valley Partnering Conference Call
April 30, 2013
Remote Participation

Name	**Organization/Address**	**X**
Sherri Anderson-Hudgins	CEHNC	**X**
Thomas Bachovchin	ERT	**X**
Brenda Barber	CENAB	**X**
Todd Beckwith	CENAB	
Bethany Bridgham	American University	**X**
Jessica Bruland	ERT	**X**
Sean Buckley	Parsons	**X**
Paul Chrostowski	CPF Associates, AU Consultant	**X**
Tom Colozza	CENAB	
Jennifer Conklin	DDOE	
Kathy Davies	US EPA Region 3	
Dr. Peter deFur	Environmental Stewardship Concepts/RAB TAPP Consultant	**X**
Diane Douglas	DDOE	
Bill Eaton	URS	
Brandon Fleming	USGS	
Alma Gates	RAB Member - Horace Mann Rep.	
Steve Hirsh	US EPA Region 3	**X**
Leigh Isaac	Environmental Stewardship Concepts	
David King	CENAB	
Carrie Johnston	RCAI - Community Outreach Team	
Dan Noble	CENAB	**X**
John Owens	CENAB	
Randall Patrick	Parsons	

Lan Reeser	CENAB	**X**
Mike Rehmert	CENAB	
Paul Rich	Parsons	
Allen Shapiro	USGS	
Don Silbacher	Parsons	
Jim Sweeney	DDOE	**X**
Andrea Takash	CENAB, Public Affairs	**X**
Fan Wang-Cahill	Parsons	
Ethan Weikel	CENAB	
Nan Wells	ANC3D Commissioner	
Cheryl Webster	CENAB	
Laura Williams	Environmental Stewardship Concepts	
Bruce Whisenant	CEHNC	**X**
Rebecca Yahiel	ERT - Community Outreach Team	
Doug Yeskis	USGS	

Summary of April 30 Spring Valley Partnering Conference Call

Consensus Decisions

- Partner concurrence was provided for the proposed work plan page changes containing details of collecting area and waste characterization samples.
- AU provided concurrence for the 4825 Glenbrook Road proposed backfill source (2000 Block of 49th Street property).

April 30, 2013 Action Items

- Parsons will finalize the proposed 4825 Glenbrook Road sampling and analysis work plan page changes and will redistribute the final work plan to the Partners, as requested.
- USACE will provide a look-ahead to AU, containing the anticipated dates of site preparation activities including crane placement and ECS construction, so that the campus community can be briefed accordingly, as requested.
- USACE Public Affairs will add EPA to the Corps'pondent mailing list if their office contact information is not already included, as requested.
- Existing arsenic soil at the 3700 block of Fordham Road property will be discussed with the neighboring homeowners, in the event that right-of-entry is not granted and further sampling along the property boundaries is preferred, as recommended by EPA.

- A follow-up conference call and/or follow-on meeting will be scheduled to resolve any questions or concerns with respect to the draft final pre-2005 HHRA review document, depending on Partner availability.

Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Check-in

The Partners conducted an abbreviated check-in procedure consisting of roll call.

The conference call primarily focused on the remedial activities at the 4825 Glenbrook Road site. A formal agenda was not established, and subsequent discussion topics are summarized under Open Issues and New Data.

A. 4825 Glenbrook Road Remedial Action Update

The goal of this segment of the meeting was to discuss the decision-making process and the ongoing remedial action for the 4825 Glenbrook Road site.

USACE-Baltimore and Parsons provided an update on the remedial activities completed to date at the 4825 Glenbrook Road site.

Completed Efforts to Date

Previously Completed Activities: House demolition was completed in late November 2012, followed by removal of associated debris from the site. Remaining structural elements include the basement walls and the basement slab, which will be removed during high-probability excavations. Low-probability site preparations began in December 2012 and were completed in January 2013. (Details of previously-completed efforts were presented at the December 2012 and January 2013 Partnering meetings.)

Overview of Previously Completed Low-Probability Efforts: Initial low-probability efforts began in early February 2013 and were completed in April 2013. These efforts included soil removal adjacent to Glenbrook Road in Area B, followed by excavation of the remaining backyard test pits. No AUES-related items were found during these efforts. (Details of initial low-probability efforts were provided at the March 2013 Partnering meeting.)

Recently Completed Site Preparations: The sewer utility line was successfully rerouted and was completed on April 30th. The water utility line was re-established but requires modification due to a manufacturing defect on one of the replacement flexible lines. Currently, the rerouted water utility only consists of one 4-inch replacement line. The second planned 4-inch line will be installed pending receipt of a more robust flexible hose from the manufacturer, to provide the full water utility capacity.

Sections of abandoned utilities were removed to provide full access to soldier pile locations. As described at the March 2013 Partnering meeting, these abandoned iron pipes would interfere with the down hole magnetometer readings during soldier pile installations.

Soil grading activities are underway to provide access for the soldier pile installation rig along the property boundaries.

Upcoming Activities: The remaining low-probability efforts include completion of site preparations for high-probability efforts. Installation of soldier piles will begin this week, to maintain slope and stability in areas where space is limited and thus the required slope cannot be obtained. Upon completion of soldier pile installations, the ECBC equipment support area will be prepared by removing backyard soil and establishing the necessary grade.

The soldier pile installations and the grading activities for ECBC equipment will occur concurrently. Next, ECS tent construction, personnel training, tabletop activities, and pre-operational surveys will be conducted by USACE-Huntsville and then inspected and reviewed by the Department of the Army (DA). High-probability excavation will begin once all of these preparations have been completed.

Proposed Page Changes: Proposed page changes for the Sampling and Analysis Plan (within the overall finalized Site-Specific Work Plan for Remedial Design and Remedial Action) were recently distributed to the Partners for review.

- **Waste Characterization Samples:** Currently, the work plan describes a more intensive process for producing a waste manifest to submit to the receiving facility (where waste characterization samples would be collected per roll-off drum per day). Instead, proposed in situ and stockpile waste characterization samples would be collected to develop the waste manifest. The goal of this methodology is to allow the waste manifest to be developed ahead of time, and to allow the excavated low-probability soil to be loaded directly into the dump trucks and transported directly to the approved landfill, instead of storing this soil in roll-offs on-site for lengthy time frames.
    - In situ subsamples will be collected at the bottom and at the midpoint of the expected excavation depths, and then composited.
    - Stockpile subsamples will be collected from random locations, and then composited.
    - The same sampling parameters and compositing method would be used to match previous waste characterization sampling efforts.
- **Area Characterization Samples:** An additional category of soil samples is proposed for the purpose of characterizing the area where the ECBC equipment pad will be installed. This area has been extensively disturbed during previous site efforts, with excavations extending to saprolite in some cases including recent test pits and benching and utility line rerouting, and no AUES-related debris was found. Floor and wall samples will be collected upon completion of soil grading activities.
    - A grab floor sample will be collected at the center point of each grid overlying the flat area established for the equipment pad.
    - Wall grab samples will be collected from the east wall (parallel to the 4825 Glenbrook Road and AU campus boundary) of the flat equipment pad area. Samples will be collected at three depths matching those typically collected for confirmation samples. These include 0 to 0.5 feet below the existing ground surface or clean backfill (where applicable); 0.5 feet above the maximum excavation depth; and the wall mid-point.
    - The same sampling parameters and collection methods would be used to match previous confirmation sampling efforts.

Backfill Characterization Sampling: Soil samples were collected in mid-February 2013 at 2000 Block of 49th Street NW property to characterize the proposed backfill source for the 4825 Glenbrook Road remedial action.

Metals were detected in all samples (floor, wall and disposal soil). Aluminum was the only metal that exceeded the RSL. All samples exceeded the RSL for aluminum.

Several SVOCs were detected above their respective RSLs in a total of four samples. These included benzo(a)anthracene, benzo(a)pyrene, benzo(b)fluoranthene, and fluoranthene.

Concurrence was obtained from EPA and DDOE for accepting this backfill source. AU requested that the backfill be aerated prior to transporting it to the 4825 Glenbrook Road site. USACE proposed that during the process of excavating, transporting, and stockpiling backfill, the SVOC concentrations will be reduced

through aeration to levels where they no longer remain a concern. USACE feels that this will sufficiently aerate the soil, and will achieve the same goal as spreading and tilling the soil.

Tentative Remedial Action Schedule: Three phases of remedial action are planned: demolition (completed), the remaining low-probability test pits in the back yard including the utility trench (in progress), and all planned high-probability and low-probability soil removal areas.

Initial low-probability efforts were completed in April 2013. Site preparations for high-probability efforts, including construction of the engineering control structure (ECS), are underway and are anticipated in May through mid-summer 2013. High-probability soil removal will tentatively begin in late summer 2013, with completion anticipated in April 2014. The remaining low-probability soil removal actions (the remainder of excavation area A, along with excavation area B) will be conducted in April through May 2014, followed by site restoration in May 2014. The remediated property will be returned to AU, the property owner, as early as May 2014.

Discussion – Proposed Work Plan Page Changes

USACE requested Partner concurrence to move forward with the proposed work plan page changes, assuming that the Partners have had sufficient opportunity to review the revisions.

Partner concurrence was provided for the proposed work plan page changes. EPA noted that these changes are fine as long as they do not apply to high-probability excavation under the ECS. USACE-Huntsville added that these changes are very proactive because they reduce storage of material in roll-offs, on-site handling of materials, and associated disturbance to neighbors. Parsons will finalize the page changes and redistribute the final work plan to the Partners, as requested. [This concurrence was obtained after discussion of proposed work plan page changes, and was moved here for clarification purposes.]

Discussion – Area Characterization Samples (Proposed Work Plan Page Changes)

In response to EPA's inquiry, USACE replied that the area characterization samples are not formally called confirmation samples because they are technically situated outside of the remedy (the low and high-probability excavation areas). The purpose of these samples is to confirm that the site is clean, and if these samples are clean, then no further soil excavation will be conducted in the backyard beyond Area A.

In response to P. deFur's inquiry, USACE replied that if the area characterization samples contain exceedances, then the affected area would become part of the remedy. Area A consists of a strip of soil behind the backyard retaining wall, extending 10 feet into the backyard. The exception to this 10-foot limit is if AUES-related debris or contaminated soil are encountered.

EPA mentioned that the analytical parameters for these samples should probably include arsenic. This parameter should not be excluded based on the rationale that arsenic sampling was previously completed at the site, as has been done during some recent sampling efforts. Parsons confirmed that the analyses will match the Spring Valley parameter list used for the floor and wall confirmation samples. USACE confirmed that arsenic is included as a parameter.

P. deFur asked whether the proposed sample locations are depicted on a map. Parsons confirmed this and briefly reviewed the proposed distribution of area characterization samples.

Discussion – Waste Characterization Samples (Proposed Work Plan Page Changes)

In response to EPA's inquiry, Parsons confirmed that the proposed waste characterization changes are acceptable to the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) facility that will receive the waste.

EPA asked how agent and agent breakdown product analyses will be incorporated into the proposed changes. Parsons replied that the same methodology, including headspacing and low-level analysis, will be performed at the time at which the samples are collected.

In response to EPA's inquiry, Parsons explained that if the excavation alarms go off, or if AUES-related debris or evidence of contamination is encountered, the item or soil of concern will be containerized and loaded into the dump truck.

EPA asked how this alarm scenario will be addressed in front of the house foundation, where agent was previously encountered. USACE clarified that the proposed waste characterization changes apply only to the low-probability soil removal areas and the areas that lay outside of Areas A through F (specifically, the backyard, which is not characterized as low or high probability).

In response to EPA's inquiry, USACE confirmed that all high-probability protocols will be followed for excavation areas underneath the ECS.

P. deFur inquired about the timeframe for collecting waste characterization samples. Parsons replied that these samples are being collected now, with the goal of obtaining approval for proposed page changes so that the waste manifest sample analyses can be expedited and turned around as soon as possible.

In response to P. deFur's inquiry, Parsons confirmed that the sample storage and analysis procedures match those used previously. Waste characterization samples will be stored in a refrigerator until they are cleared for headspace and low-level agent/ABP. Once they are cleared, which is anticipated, the samples will be shipped to the laboratory for analysis. Parsons agreed that the anticipated time frame for collecting waste characterization samples and receiving analytical results is approximately two weeks.

Parsons clarified that these samples are strictly collected for waste characterization purposes, and are not necessarily referred to as pre-confirmation or confirmation samples. Floor and wall confirmation samples associated with excavation areas will still be collected.

P. deFur inquired about the rationale for collecting waste characterization samples in Area B separately from those in Area A. He noted that this is certainly logistically easier, but asked whether there is any advantage to collecting both composite samples during the same time frame. Parsons explained that sampling in Area B would require disturbing the existing access road, which is used to access the excavation and sampling areas. P. deFur replied that he understands this rationale.

Discussion – Backfill Source

AU provided clarification on their concerns associated with the backfill source. Odorants were detected in the total ion chromatogram (TIC) analyses, and oxygenated solvents were detected in the volatile organic compound (VOC) analyses. These aromatic compounds could create an objective smell at the site. AU is sensitive to disturbing neighboring homeowners, particularly AU President Kerwin, and AU suggested that the odorants be eliminated from the backfill source.

AU added that they feel the proposed strategy is fine for eliminating the odorants before the backfill is transported to the 4825 Glenbrook Road site. AU provided concurrence for the 4825 Glenbrook Road proposed backfill source (2000 Block of 49th Street property).

USACE restated that Parsons now has an approved backfill source.

Discussion – Tentative Schedule

AU asked for confirmation that, to date, no AUES-related debris or contamination was found during the initial low-probability efforts and the completed site preparations. USACE replied that this is correct.

As a follow-up to AU's inquiry, EPA asked for confirmation that any remaining contamination at the 4825 Glenbrook Road site is now bounded on three sides. USACE replied that this is essentially correct.

Parsons and USACE provided additional schedule details for clarification purposes. ECS construction is tentatively scheduled to begin in late May 2013. The proposed start date for the high-probability excavation is August 5, 2013. Activities preceding the start date include tabletop exercises, the USACE-Huntsville pre-operational survey, the DA pre-operational survey, and obtaining the DA approval letter to begin high-probability work.

In response to AU's inquiry, Parsons confirmed that the high-probability effort will tentatively begin in August 2013 and the entire remedial effort will be completed by April 2014, assuming that no AUES-related debris or contamination of concern is encountered. USACE emphasized that the current remedial action schedule is tentative and intended for planning purposes. Any findings of concern will require schedule adjustments, and depending on findings, the duration of the high-probability effort could be longer or shorter than currently anticipated.

USACE mentioned that due to minimal advantages of working partial weekends, the field team is no longer scheduled to consistently work on Saturdays.

EPA asked whether some of the time lost to field work delays were recouped. This schedule loss was experienced early during the field effort. USACE replied that although not all the lost time has been recouped, no schedule additional delays have occurred and no additional time has been lost. USACE hopes that no further loss of field work time will occur.

P. deFur noted that this is considered progress at many sites. EPA added that this is positive news, as many logistically difficult activities are completed and no further delays are anticipated. USACE acknowledged that the utility relocation hurdle is completed, to be followed by soldier pile installations and then high-probability site preparations. The next potential hurdle would be the nature and extent of any AUES-related findings during high-probability excavation.

USACE mentioned that from the workers' perspective, the schedule loss is advantageous because the high-probability effort will be completed during relatively comfortable weather instead of the brutally hot summer months. This should alleviate heat stress and improve productivity during high-probability activities. P. deFur and EPA agreed that September is a more comfortable month for performing excavation work.

AU asked whether the crane will be moved through the AU campus or along residential streets during the initial ECS construction and CAFS setup activities. Parsons replied that the crane for establishing the CAFS units will be situated at the top of the backyard hill and will need to be transported through Fletcher Gate on AU's campus. This effort will be coordinated with AU, matching coordination completed for similar efforts, including the current soldier pile installation rig location. USACE added that the crane will be located along Glenbrook Road to support the first ECS location, but subsequent crane locations will vary depending on which portion of the high-probability areas are being excavated.

Parsons noted that during construction of the first ECS location, they anticipate situating the all-terrain crane in the open basement area of the 4825 Glenbrook Road site. Therefore, they do not anticipate impacts to Glenbrook Road traffic.

AU mentioned that they must make a recommendation for when the campus community should be informed of the upcoming remedial effort. The campus community prefers to be informed of activities before they occur, including those that are visible from campus, such as the crane placement and the ECS construction. USACE replied that preliminary information is provided in the ongoing weekly e-mail updates, and asked when AU anticipates needing more formal notice of the upcoming schedule. AU replied that it is better to provide information sooner, even if only rough dates are available at this time. Follow-up information approximately one week before these activities occur would also be helpful, to increase the notices and reminders provided to the campus community. USACE agreed to provide a look-ahead to AU, containing the anticipated dates of site preparation activities including crane placement and ECS construction, so that the campus community can be briefed accordingly, as requested.

Next Steps

Partner concurrence was provided for the proposed work plan page changes containing details of collecting area and waste characterization samples.

Parsons will finalize the proposed work plan page changes and will redistribute the final work plan to the Partners, as requested.

AU provided concurrence for the 4825 Glenbrook Road proposed backfill source (2000 Block of 49th Street property).

USACE will provide a look-ahead to AU, containing the anticipated dates of site preparation activities including crane placement and ECS construction, so that the campus community can be briefed accordingly, as requested.

B. Open Issues and New Data

The goal of this segment of the meeting was to share issues not on the agenda for possible placement on a future agenda and to share new data that became available since the last Partnering meeting.

Several open issues were brought forward for discussion.

Discussion – Future RAB Meeting Schedule

USACE mentioned that several brief project updates, including recent changes to the RAB meeting schedule, ongoing groundwater study efforts, and plus-up project funding, will be shared at the upcoming May 2013 RAB meeting.

The RAB will meet six times per year, on the second Tuesday evening of every odd-numbered month, as agreed upon by the RAB members at the April 2013 RAB meeting. (This reduces the meeting frequency from ten to six times per year.) Upcoming meetings include May 14 and July 9.

Discussion – Corps'pondent Newsletter Distribution List

USACE noted that a hard copy of the Corps'pondent newsletter was sent to all mailing list recipients.

EPA will be added to the Corps'pondent mailing list if their office contact information is not already included, as requested.

Discussion – Groundwater Study Efforts

USACE provided a brief update on the status of upcoming groundwater study efforts.

Selected existing groundwater monitoring wells and surface water monitoring locations will be sampled twice annually for the next few years. These locations include a total of 20 shallow and deep wells and 10 surface water locations. The first semi-annual sampling event began in late April 2013 (yesterday), as part of the extended 2013 groundwater monitoring program. USACE field sampling crews are present in the neighborhood, and completion of all sampling is anticipated within two weeks. Submission of samples to the laboratory is anticipated in mid-May 2013. Results will be shared with the Partners (and with the RAB) pending receipt of laboratory analytical data, tentatively in late summer 2013.

Two additional deep wells are planned to provide additional vertical delineation of groundwater. Proposed locations include the area between MP-3 and MP-4 (in the vicinity of Indian Lane or further down Rockwood Parkway) and close to Sibley Hospital.

Approval was obtained for using existing task order funding and for using the previous well installation contractor (URS). Planning will be partially completed in FY2013, followed by the contracting process and the deep well installations, tentatively in late FY2013 or in FY2014.

Discussion – Plus-up Funding

USACE mentioned the recent announcement that FY2013 plus-up funding will be awarded to the Spring Valley project despite recent federal budget issues. The anticipated award is approximately 2.9 million dollars. This additional funding will be allocated to the Parsons contract, which focuses on the 4825 Glenbrook Road remedial action, to minimize funding-related work delays during the high-probability effort. This is good news because it results in one fewer potential concern during the remedial effort.

Discussion – Site-Wide Evaluation Document (Pre-2005 HHRA Review)

[Details of the finalized site-wide evaluation document, Evaluation of Remaining Sampling Requirements, were described at previous Partnering meetings. Key issues in this document include review of pre-2005 human health risk assessments (HHRAs). Additional details of this topic will be shared at upcoming Partnering meetings, pending Partner discussion of the pre-2005 HHRA review.]

USACE and ERT mentioned that the draft final version of the pre-2005 HHRA review will be distributed to the Partners for review soon. This document is complex and includes numerous data tables with large data volumes.

The Partners briefly discussed conducting an on-board review of the document to accelerate the review process, once the Partners have had the opportunity to read the document. EPA replied that this may be a good idea depending on their initial review. AU expressed support for expediting the review process. P. deFur replied that this is a great idea. He mentioned that at another site, a similar document was distributed for a two-week review and issues were discussed via a conference call, followed by an additional few weeks of review culminating in a formal meeting.

Once the draft final document is distributed to the Partners for review, USACE will send follow-up e-mails to schedule a conference call and a follow-on meeting to resolve any questions or concerns. USACE added that scheduling a Partnering conference call is typically a logistical challenge, due to Partner availability.

In response to P. deFur's inquiry, ERT replied that comment responses are currently in preparation to address USACE-Baltimore feedback. Some comments can potentially be addressed in more than one way, and will be resolved pending further internal discussion with USACE-Baltimore.

P. deFur added once the document is received, that the Partners may require approximately 6 to 8 weeks to complete the anticipated lengthy review process.

ERT mentioned that the document consists of many data tables with some explanatory text. The primary objective is to guide the reviewers through the entire pre-2005 HHRA review process. This elaborate step-by-step assessment process was outlined at the March 2013 Partnering meeting.

Discussion – Planned Efforts at the 3700 block of Fordham Road Property

[Details of the tentative schedule for soil sampling, soil removal, and anomaly removals at the 3700 block of Fordham Road property were provided at the January 2013 Partnering meeting, followed by brief discussion of property issues at the March 2013 Partnering meeting. Details of the signed Anomaly Review Board (ARB) memo for this property were provided at the December 2012 Partnering meeting.]

USACE mentioned that a total of three residential properties are situated adjacent to the 3700 block of Fordham Road property. Elevated arsenic grids overlap with two of the three property boundaries, and USACE hopes to delineate and confirm any arsenic soil extending onto neighboring properties. If right-of-entry cannot be obtained, the neighboring homeowners may need to be contacted for the purpose of collecting arsenic soil samples along property boundaries that are adjacent to the Fordham Road property.

USACE confirmed that contaminated soil was chased across the residential property boundaries during previously-completed arsenic grid removals. Where appropriate, rights-of-entry were obtained for adjacent residential properties, and arsenic grids were delineated and chased across the property boundary until all contaminated soil was removed. Site mobilization logistics provided the greatest challenge during these efforts. Chasing contaminated soil was relatively easy because the necessary equipment was already established at the property of interest.

USACE noted that the Fordham Road property presents a different scenario. Two elevated arsenic grids are situated along the property boundary. Both corresponding adjacent properties were previously screened for arsenic, with concentrations below the arsenic screening level. Statistically, the arsenic grid

portions that lie beyond the property boundary are not expected to exceed the screening level due to clean screening results at the neighboring properties.

USACE requested feedback from EPA and DDOE on whether the neighboring properties should be contacted to request right-of-entry for additional sampling.

EPA recommended that the existing arsenic soil should be discussed with the neighboring homeowners, who may wish to provide right-of-entry for arsenic sampling (and soil removal as needed) on their side of the property boundary. P. deFur and DDOE agreed with this recommendation.

EPA and USACE briefly discussed the possibility that the neighboring homeowners may prefer to accept the presence of nearby contamination without further sampling. USACE mentioned that this decision would not invalidate the clean screening results at their properties, and EPA noted that there are no previous screening results (clean or otherwise) within 10 feet of the known contaminated grids.

USACE and EPA agreed that clean screening results do not eliminate the possibility of an arsenic hotspot in soil. Instead, these results simply indicate that the property does not exceed background arsenic concentrations based on a statistically acceptable average, and these are considered good results. EPA noted that the difference in this case (at the 3700 block of Fordham Road property) is that unacceptable arsenic soil contamination lies adjacent to the clean screening results at the neighboring properties.

In response to DDOE's inquiry, USACE and EPA confirmed that one of the contaminated grids contains arsenic exceeding 100 ppm (approximately 135 ppm arsenic). The other contaminated grids contain a lower range of arsenic concentrations.

EPA emphasized the importance of these discussions with neighboring homeowners. This communication helps prevent future scenarios where a homeowner may protest that USACE has known about the contamination on their property for years. P. deFur agreed that homeowners will eventually discover any remaining contamination at their properties. USACE emphasized that although the presence of soil contamination is not known or expected at the neighboring properties, there is certainly elevated arsenic immediately across the property boundary on the 3700 block of Fordham Road property.

Based on USACE's experience with arsenic grid excavations along property boundaries, EPA inquired about the relative percentage of arsenic grids site-wide that were extended in order to remove all contaminated soil that was present. This inquiry focused on grids adjacent to property boundaries. USACE replied that specific calculations were not made. Site-wide, most of the lateral grid extensions were limited to 5 feet, which overlapped with the adjacent grid, and this distance corresponded nicely with the adjacent grid's clean center sample. A significant number of these extensions (perhaps around 20 percent) overlapped with adjacent properties.

EPA confirmed that they will accept either decision made by the homeowner. DDOE commented that either decision would have to be accepted, and USACE replied that property access can be further pursued if there is evidence of a threat to human health.

USACE mentioned that progress with obtaining right-of-entry is necessary this summer in order to prepare for field efforts in the fall.

In response to EPA's inquiry, USACE replied that they most recently communicated with the property owner in February 2013. During this conversation, USACE explained to the property owner that a signed right-of-entry is needed in order to collect delineation soil samples and determine the extent of soil removal. The property owner indicated their interest in completing the effort, but has not responded since February. USACE will attempt to contact the property owner with the goal of making progress on this effort.

Next Steps

USACE Public Affairs/Community Outreach Team will add EPA to the Corp'spondent mailing list if their office contact information is not already included, as requested.

Existing arsenic soil at the 3700 block of Fordham Road property may need to be discussed with the neighboring homeowners, in the event that right-of-entry is not granted and further sampling along the property boundaries is preferred, as recommended by EPA.

A follow-up conference call and/or follow-on meeting will be scheduled to resolve any questions or concerns with respect to the draft final pre-2005 HHRA review document, depending on Partner availability.

C. Agenda Building

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for Thursday, May 30, 2013.

Discussion – Upcoming Meetings

P. deFur mentioned that Laura Williams of Environmental Stewardship Concepts will represent him at the May 30, 2013 Partnering meeting.

USACE mentioned that the May 30, 2013 Partnering meeting will be followed by an on-site tour of the 4825 Glenbrook Road site.

Discussion – Relocation Appeal

EPA inquired about any further updates regarding the concerns of Christine Dietrich and her family, who live directly across the street from 4825 Glenbrook Road. [Details of this issue were provided at recent RAB meetings. In summary, C. Dietrich's family expressed strong concerns for their safety during the upcoming remedial effort. USACE Headquarters issued their final administrative decision regarding C. Dietrich's relocation appeal. This relocation request was denied and the final decision was delivered to USACE and the homeowner.]

USACE replied that based on the most recent communication, C. Dietrich's family is planning to relocate to a rental property for the duration of the high-probability effort. EPA replied that this resolution sounds like a good individual choice. [This personal decision was not endorsed or financed by USACE.]

USACE mentioned that the final administrative decision was shared with Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes Norton during the most recent annual Congressional visit. Subsequent discussion topics included the EPA's position on this issue. Congresswoman Norton stated that although she is not happy with this decision, she understands the rationale and she feels that the resident is responsible for initiating any legal action. From Congresswoman Norton's perspective, this issue is closed.

USACE thanked the Partners for participating in the conference call.

D. Adjourn

The conference call was adjourned at 11:00 AM.