

**Inter-Agency Partners Meeting**

<b>TIME</b>	<b>TOPIC</b>	<b>DISCUSSION LEADER</b>	<b>PREPARATION</b>	<b>OBJECTIVE</b>
<b>Thursday, July 17, 2012</b>		<b>[**Upcoming Meetings: Aug. 30<sup>th</sup> (?), Sept. 27<sup>th</sup> (?)]</b>		
12:00 – 12:20	Check-in / Review Ground Rules	B. Whisenant/ S. Anderson-Hudgins		Introductions of new attendees/ Personal check-in / Review Ground Rules
12:20-12:35	NTCRA/Arsenic Removal	L. Reeser		Review status of follow-on effort and arsenic boring MFR, and EPA review of arsenic toxicity level
12:35-12:45	Additional AOI Sampling	L. Reeser/ T. Bachovchin		Review status of effort
12:45-1:00	Groundwater	T. Beckwith		Discuss ongoing and upcoming groundwater efforts - Purging and re-sampling MP-2 - Installation of deep well on the AU campus - Proposed semi-annual sampling locations
1:00-1:10	Document Tracking Matrix for MMRP/HTW	L. Reeser/ Parsons	Partners Review	Review pending documents
1:10 – 1:20	<b>BREAK</b>			
1:20-2:30	4825 Glenbrook Road	B. Barber/Parsons		Discuss Draft-Final Remedial Design and Remedial Action Work Plan - Engineering Controls
2:30-2:45	Open Issues and New Data	B. Whisenant/ S. Anderson-Hudgins		Community Meeting
2:45-2:55	Partners' Parking Lot	B. Whisenant/ S. Anderson-Hudgins	Partners Review	
2:55-3:05	Agenda Building	B. Whisenant/ S. Anderson-Hudgins		** Discuss having upcoming meetings every 2 months
3:05	Adjourn	B. Whisenant/ S. Anderson-Hudgins		

**Spring Valley Partnering Meeting  
July 17, 2012  
Spring Valley Trailer Conference Room**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization/Address</b>	<b>X</b>
Sherri Anderson-Hudgins	CEHNC	<b>X</b>
Thomas Bachovchin	ERT	
Brenda Barber	CENAB	<b>X</b>
Todd Beckwith	CENAB	<b>X</b>
Frank Bochnowicz	CENAB	
Bethany Bridgham	American University	<b>X</b>
Jessica Bruland	ERT	<b>X</b>
Sean Buckley	Parsons	
Jack Choynowski	Shaw	
Paul Chrostowski	CPF Associates, AU Consultant	<b>X</b>
Tom Colozza	CENAB	
Jennifer Conklin	DDOE	
Kathy Davies	US EPA Region 3	
Dr. Peter deFur	Environmental Stewardship Concepts/RAB TAPP Consultant	<b>X</b>
Diane Douglas	DDOE	
Bill Eaton	URS	
Brandon Fleming	USGS	
Clem Gaines	CENAB, Public Affairs	
Alma Gates	RAB Member - Horace Mann Rep.	<b>X</b>
Steve Hirsh	US EPA Region 3	<b>X</b>
Betsey Hutton	ERT- Community Outreach Team	<b>X</b>
Leigh Isaac	Environmental Stewardship Concepts	
David King	CENAB	

Carrie Johnston	RCAI - Community Outreach Team	<b>X</b>
Neil Jones	ERT	
Brian Junck	Weston	
Dan Noble	CENAB	<b>X</b>
John Owens	CENAB	
Randall Patrick	Parsons	<b>X</b>
Lan Reeser	CENAB	<b>X</b>
Mike Rehmert	CENAB	
Paul Rich	Parsons	
Allen Shapiro	USGS	
Jim Sweeney	DDOE	<b>X</b>
Andrea Takash	CENAB, Public Affairs	<b>X</b>
Fan Wang-Cahill	Parsons	<b>X</b>
Ethan Weikel	CENAB	
Nan Wells	ANC3D Commissioner	
Cheryl Webster	CENAB	
Maya Werner	ERT - Community Outreach Team	
Laura Williams	Environmental Stewardship Concepts	
Bruce Whisenant	CEHNC	<b>X</b>
Doug Yeskis	USGS	

### Summary of July 17 Spring Valley Partnering Meeting

#### Consensus Decisions

- No consensus decisions were made.

#### July 17, 2012 Action Items

- EPA will check whether their risk assessor is available to discuss their agency's review of the arsenic toxicity level (including potential impacts on Spring Valley arsenic remediation) at the September 2012 RAB meeting, as requested by the RAB and the Partners.
- DDOE will speak with their hydrogeologist about whether a new permit application is necessary for installing MP-1 near Kreeger Hall on the AU campus.

- Parsons will convert the ECS diagram dimensions from millimeters to feet in the Remedial Design and Remedial Action work plan for 4825 Glenbrook Road, as requested by the Partners.
- AU will seek input from the university administration on whether they would like soldier piles to be left in place during 4825 Glenbrook Road site restoration, as requested by USACE.
- AU will provide the EPA ALOHA model input parameters to USACE-Huntsville who will forward them to Michael Myirski of the US Army Chemical Materiel Agency (USACMA), as requested. [These parameters were requested by M. Myirski for the purpose of preparing a formal response to draft work plan comment responses for 4825 Glenbrook Road.]
- USACE-Huntsville will request input from Kevin Coats (formerly of EPA and familiar with the MEC HA design) during review of the Site-Wide MEC HA by the EM CX directorate, as requested by EPA.

**Tuesday, July 17, 2012**

### **Check-in**

The Partners conducted their normal check-in procedure.

### **A. Arsenic Sampling and Soil Removal**

USACE briefly reviewed the status of follow-on arsenic soil removal efforts and the arsenic soil boring memorandum for record (MFR).

**Arsenic Exceedances Associated with Soil Borings:** All arsenic sampling results from the Spring Valley arsenic sampling and removal program were recently reviewed to assess whether any arsenic exceedances at depth (associated with soil borings) were inadvertently not addressed. A total of two soil samples with levels slightly above the Spring Valley clean up level of 20 parts per million (ppm) at depth were identified as not previously addressed. Both samples were below the EPA's national action level of 43 ppm. Details were provided at the January and April 2012 Partnering meetings.

- AU concurrence for No Further Action (NFA) was obtained for the AU campus, where 20.6 ppm arsenic was detected at 3 feet below ground surface (bgs) within Lot 44, near the Mary Graydon Center. AU (the property owner) selected NFA for this soil boring to minimize damage to dense vegetation and landscaping without presenting a hazard to human health as the level was at depth and below 43 ppm.
- Soil removal was requested by the property owner at a 5100 block of Tilden Street property, where 22.8 ppm arsenic was detected at 5 feet bgs in the front yard. Soil delineation was completed in mid-July 2012. Delineation samples were situated 2 feet horizontally from the original exceedance, and were collected at two depths: 6 inches (representing surface soil) and 5 feet 6 inches (representing 6 inches below the original 22.8 ppm sample). A clean floor sample at a depth of 6 feet bgs was previously obtained as part of the original soil boring. Delineation samples were cleared for headspace and low-level chemical agent, and commercial laboratory analyses for arsenic are pending. Excavation is planned for a small area measuring 4 feet square and 6 feet deep. (If one or more delineation samples exceed the 20 ppm cleanup level, then further soil delineation will be completed.) USACE expects to complete this soil removal effort in Summer/Fall 2012 using USACE personnel since the previous soil removal contractor, Severson, is unavailable to remobilize to conduct the soil removal.

- The arsenic findings above 20 ppm and associated Partner feedback are documented in the revised MFR. This MFR also documents the process used to review all soil sampling results and identify remaining arsenic samples above 20 ppm associated with soil boring locations.

### **Discussion – EPA Review of Arsenic Toxicity Level**

USACE mentioned that during the June 2012 RAB meeting, the EPA's review of the arsenic toxicity level was recently proposed as a future RAB agenda item. AU seconded this request. EPA will check whether their risk assessor is available to discuss this topic at the September 2012 RAB meeting.

In response to an inquiry from Dr. Peter deFur, RAB TAPP Consultant, EPA explained that this issue focuses on their agency's ongoing review of the current arsenic toxicity level. To date, no new arsenic values (such as toxicity criteria) have been established.

Alma Gates, RAB Member, asked whether changes to the arsenic toxicity level would affect previously-completed work in Spring Valley and require additional remediation. EPA replied that 5-year toxicity reviews are completed at sites that may be affected by frequently-revised toxicity criteria, to determine whether the remediation efforts previously completed at the site remain acceptable. EPA added that they do not anticipate the current Spring Valley arsenic cleanup criteria to become unacceptable in the future.

A. Gates mentioned USACE's response to this question at the June 2012 RAB meeting, which emphasized that USACE will never completely walk away from a FUDS project. EPA replied that they will ask for input from their risk assessor on this topic.

### **Discussion – EPA Review of Arsenic Toxicity Level**

P. deFur mentioned his familiarity with the USEPA's 5-year review policy. He asked whether the related policy of completing additional remediation at a cleanup site as appropriate (in the event that site contamination left in place is identified as a toxic problem during a 5-year review) is articulated in a USEPA guidance document or letter. He added that this topic has been discussed at other project sites, and regulatory agency managers typically confirm that additional cleanup will be conducted if the 5-year review process reveals that unacceptable contamination has been left in place.

EPA explained that their agency is occasionally asked to identify previously completed sites where low-level surface soil contamination remains in place. Problems typically arise at sites where cleanups have been completed without a follow-up 5-year review process. The purpose of the 5-year review guidance is to ensure that protective remedies are reassessed based on updated screening and cleanup criteria. For example, vapor intrusion TCE contamination at a cleanup site in Virginia (Richmond) is currently being reassessed because the previously acceptable sampling results now exceed the new screening criteria.

### **Next Steps**

EPA will check whether their risk assessor is available to discuss their agency's review of the arsenic toxicity level (including potential impacts on Spring Valley arsenic remediation) at the September 2012 RAB meeting, as requested by the RAB and the Partners.

### **B. Site-Wide Evaluation Document (Supplemental Soil Sampling)**

USACE provided an update on the Site-Wide Evaluation Document and follow-on soil sampling.

**Site-Wide Evaluation Document:** The site-wide evaluation document, *Evaluation of Remaining Sampling Requirements*, was finalized in July 2012. Key issues in this document include **work plan details** for proposed follow-on sampling in areas known to require supplemental sampling, as described at previous Partnering meetings.

**Supplemental Soil Sampling:** Supplemental soil sampling is proposed for a total of 5 discrete AOIs. The objective of supplemental sampling is to ensure enough data exists to make human health and

ecological risk determinations about these AOIs. Details of this sampling effort were provided at the April 2012 Partnering meeting.

Supplemental sampling is planned at total of 17 residential properties and at the AU campus. Following the supplemental sampling, the analytical results for each area will undergo risk screening. A discrete HHRA may be completed for any AOI that presents potential health risks based on the risk screening.

The Community Outreach Team is currently coordinating with residential property owners to obtain rights-of-entry for the supplemental soil sampling. Most property owners have responded positively and are likely to grant access. Alternate residential properties were also selected in case the planned rights-of-entry are not granted.

**Tentative Schedule:** Supplemental soil sampling is planned for August 2012.

### **Discussion – Rights-of-Entry for Supplemental Soil Sampling**

DDOE mentioned that he received an inquiry from the residential property on the corner of Sedgwick Street and Fordham Road. The homeowner noted the temporary disturbances associated with previously-completed soil sampling at their property and asked whether there is an issue with their soil. DDOE's response clarified that this sampling effort is designed to fill data gaps across the Spring Valley FUDS, and a single soil sample will be collected at the property with an approximate completion timeframe of one hour. Community Outreach added that based on their conversation with the property owner, an alternate residential property was selected for supplemental soil sampling in lieu of this property.

## **C. Groundwater Study Efforts**

**The goal of this segment of the meeting was to provide an update on ongoing and upcoming groundwater study efforts.**

USACE-Baltimore provided an update on the status of ongoing and upcoming groundwater study efforts. (Details of these groundwater study efforts were provided at the May 31, 2012 Groundwater-Partnering meeting.)

**MP-2:** This deep well is located on the 4800 block of Glenbrook Road. Follow-up purging and resampling of all intervals at MP-2 are underway. The purpose of this effort is to measure the effects on water pressure of other sampling intervals and to gain insight on whether the intervals are interconnected. Sampling results will be used to evaluate whether the similarity of arsenic concentrations across all MP-2 sampling intervals is truly representative of the groundwater chemistry at MP-2, or whether the results were influenced by FLUTE sampling interval placement. Connectivity of sampling intervals could be caused by well construction or the degree of natural groundwater mixing in highly-fractured bedrock.

This field effort is expected to be complete within approximately eight days. Based on very low flow rates of groundwater (approximately 40 gallons per sampling port per day), a single sampling interval is purged and resampled each day. This daily groundwater flow rate is much lower than the field team's original estimate of 200 gallons per sampling port per day.

Based on initial purging observations, the sampling intervals appear to be discrete with minimal connectivity, but conclusions are pending review of all purging and resampling results. Analytical groundwater chemistry results are anticipated in approximately one month (August 2012).

**Additional Deep Well:** Installation of an additional multi-port deep well (MP-1) near Kreeger Hall on the AU campus is tentatively scheduled to begin on August 1, 2012. This well will be drilled close to MW-44 to assess bedrock and groundwater flow conditions between 100 feet and 200 feet bgs. (This depth range lies between the maximum depth of MW-44 and the maximum depth of the existing deep wells, respectively). The well construction (a small number of conventional screened well intervals or a ported

FLUTE sampling liner) will be determined by the Partners based on downhole geophysical test results using a blank FLUTE liner.

The existing permit for drilling MP-1 to a depth of 200 feet bgs is valid through February 2013. A new permit application may be required by DDOE's hydrogeologist

**Semi-annual sampling:** During future groundwater and surface water monitoring, USACE plans to continue to focus on arsenic and perchlorate as the parameters of interest. Semi-annual sampling is proposed at a selected number of existing groundwater monitoring wells and surface water locations, as well as the proposed new deep well (MP-1), based on the results of the quarterly sampling effort. Surface water samples in East Creek are also planned to assess perchlorate concentrations.

The list of proposed semi-annual sampling locations will be finalized pending Partner review and concurrence. The first round of semi-annual sampling is tentatively planned as early as September 2012 (pending Partner concurrence on the selected semi-annual sampling locations).

#### **Discussion – MP-1 Permit Application**

DDOE and USACE discussed the possibility of needing to submit a new well installation permit application. DDOE noted that the existing permit was used for installing MW-44. MP-1 represents a new well in a different location with a slightly different construction

USACE expressed their preference for drilling MP-1 starting in early August using the existing permit. Approval of a new permit may require a lengthy time frame of several months. The well construction details are irrelevant for the permit application because they will be based on Partner decisions made after drilling and down hole geophysical tests are completed. USACE stated that they will address DDOE's concerns if a new permit is required. However, the Spring Valley project is a CERCLA investigation that does not require a permit as long as the substantial requirements (defined by CERCLA) are met.

DDOE confirmed that this response will not be satisfactory to their hydrogeologist. DDOE will speak with their hydrogeologist about whether a new permit application is necessary for installing MP-1 near Kreeger Hall on the AU campus.

#### **Discussion – Semi-annual Sampling**

In response to EPA's inquiry, USACE replied that the list of groundwater monitoring wells and surface water locations proposed for semi-annual sampling was provided at the May 31, 2012 Groundwater-Partnering meeting. Details were provided via a follow-up e-mail to the Partners.

#### **Discussion – Isotopic Perchlorate**

In response to EPA's inquiry, USACE replied that analytical laboratory results for both isotopic perchlorate samples are still pending. Based on a recent update from the University of Chicago laboratory, analytical results are anticipated in approximately 2 to 3 weeks (early August 2012).

#### **Next Steps**

DDOE will speak with their hydrogeologist about whether a new permit application is necessary for installing MP-1 near Kreeger Hall on the AU campus.

#### **D. Document Tracking Matrix for Hazardous Toxic Waste (HTW) and Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP)**

**The goal of this segment of the meeting was to review the comment due dates on HTW and MMRP draft reports and the status of the documents.**

The Partners briefly reviewed the status of several documents.

#### **Discussion – Data Coverage Analysis Memorandum for Dalecarlia Woods Geophysical Survey Area**

USACE mentioned that ERT recently obtained photographs of the inaccessible slopes that could not be surveyed in the Dalecarlia Woods, as requested by the Anomaly Review Board (ARB) at the April 2012 Partnering meeting. This additional documentation supports the conclusion that the steep slopes just outside of AOI 2 (Rick Woods Burial Pit) are too steep to survey safely and are unlikely to harbor AUES-related items. Partner concurrence on No Further Action (NFA) for this data gap is pending, to be followed by Data Gap ARB Memo finalization and signatures.

P. deFur and EPA provided tentative verbal concurrence with NFA. USACE and P. deFur will look for P. deFur's response confirming his formal concurrence. [This brief discussion took place during the Partner's Parking Lot portion of the meeting and was moved here for clarification purposes.]

#### **Discussion – Contract Closure**

USACE-Huntsville emphasized the importance of finalizing specific documents, as the associated contract will expire on December 31, 2012. The contract closure process takes approximately 2 to 3 months and they are receiving pressure from their legal counsel.

USACE-Huntsville also expressed concern regarding remaining residential driveway restorations associated with the same contract. USACE-Baltimore replied that a residential property on Tilden Street would like to accept compensation, while another residential property would like another year before restoration is conducted. USACE-Huntsville replied that this time frame is not feasible based on pressure received from legal counsel.

#### **Discussion – HHRA for AU Public Safety Building**

USACE mentioned that the Draft Final Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) for the Public Safety Building will be issued shortly. The Regulatory Partners may find it useful to review this document concurrently with the Draft Final Public Safety Building Investigation Report, which was previously provided to the Partners for review.

#### **Discussion – ATSDR Health Consultation on the 4825 Glenbrook Road Site**

The Partners briefly discussed the status of the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) health consultation focused on the 4825 Glenbrook Road site. Details were provided at the November 2011 and January 2012 Partnering meetings. Further Partner review and comments are pending receipt of the draft final report.

USACE noted that the completion of the draft final report is currently on hold due to disagreements within the ATSDR on how the document should be written. The DC Department of Health is currently putting pressure on ATSDR to complete the document. EPA added that ATSDR is reorganizing their agency's internal structure, and intends to finalize the health consultation before the associated agency team dissolves.

USACE confirmed that this document is being prepared by Laura Frazier and a new project manager, Greg Newton.

#### **E. 4825 Glenbrook Road Work Plan**

**The goal of this segment of the meeting was to discuss the accelerated schedule guiding the decision-making process and the upcoming remedial action for the 4825 Glenbrook Road site.**

USACE-Baltimore and Parsons provided an update on the draft Site-Specific 4825 Glenbrook Road Draft Remedial Design and Remedial Action Work Plan.

**The draft work plan details presented below are pre-decisional and have not been formally approved by USACE or DDOE and EPA to date. The draft work plan is not available for public review at this time. Draft work plan details were provided during the meeting for the purpose of**

**discussing the draft approach with the Partners.** Draft work plan updates were previously presented at the April/May 2012 Partnering meetings. Updated information on the proposed Engineering Control Structure (ECS) design, site layout, and site preparations is presented below.

**Engineering Control Structure (ECS) Design:** A tent with a chemical agent filtration system (CAFS) is tentatively planned to be used during high probability excavations. This is recommended because it controls the Maximum Credible Event (MCE), does not require site evacuation should the MCE occur, and accommodates site constraints. As described at the May 2012 Partnering meeting, the tent with a CAFS was successfully used during the 2009-2010 high-probability test pit excavations at the site, during which closed laboratory glassware containers containing chemical agent and agent breakdown products were recovered.

The tent will be a larger version of the steel-framed PVC-covered tent that was successfully used during Lot 18 excavations, with proposed dimensions of 82.5 feet long and 68 feet wide (approximately 2.5 times larger than the Lot 18 tent). The tent is supported by I-beams and is accessed via doors.

**Draft Tent ECS Site Layout:** Originally, two tent locations were proposed to fully encompass all high probability areas during the remedial effort. The layout presented several technical disadvantages which would have slowed progress under the tents. These disadvantages were resolved by proposing a total of three tent locations, which provides a more spacious and more effective layout for completing the remedial effort. The overlap between tent locations will be greater, and more efficient excavation is anticipated.

The entire structure can be lifted off the ground via crane to reposition it elsewhere at the property. The first tent layout covers most of the front yard, including areas that were previously excavated and backfilled, along with the front portion of the house foundation footprint. The second tent layout covers most of the house foundation footprint. The third tent layout covers the back portion of the house foundation footprint along with the high-probability area of soil in the back yard. The overall layout provides sufficient overlap between the three tent locations so that all high-probability areas of soil can be excavated without being hindered by space constraints.

**Draft ECS Support Equipment Layout:** Although the tent and the personnel decontamination stations will be repositioned during the remedial effort, the ECS support equipment will remain in place. This includes the CAFS and other filtration systems, which will sit on the equipment pad in the back yard area, and the backup generator and distribution panel, which will be situated in the closest AU campus parking lot.

Two major challenges were encountered when establishing the ECS support equipment pad.

- **The ECS support equipment footprint is larger than the footprint used during previous excavations.** The existing flat back yard area was expanded to accommodate the larger filtration capacity (comprised of 3 CAFS), which is required for the upcoming remedial effort due to the significantly larger tent size and the potential excavation depth. Additionally, the MiniCAMS and DAAMs monitoring equipment must be located closer to the CAFS and the excavation areas, thus a total of 5 support equipment pieces will be situated on the equipment pad and the remaining equipment (the backup generator and the distribution panel) will be located at the secured staging area on the closest AU campus parking lot.
- **Soil excavation is required underneath the ECS when it is situated adjacent to the equipment pad area. Due to the slope in the backyard, appropriate plans must be in place to maintain a 1:1 slope adjacent to the ECS.** Two grading and soil retention options were evaluated for this purpose.
  - **Sloping** is proposed to maintain landscape slope and soil stability, using a 1:1 slope on two sides of the backyard (adjacent to the northern property line and the AU parking lot).

This technique was previously used at the property and will limit the size of the equipment pad area. The 1:1 sloping ratio was determined by a structural engineer.

- **Soldier Piles and Lagging** is proposed to maintain slope and stability in two areas where space is limited and thus the required slope cannot be obtained. These areas are located near the back yard retaining wall and along one side of the backyard adjacent to the southern property line (including an area closer to the front yard where deep excavation is anticipated). The 1:1 sloping is not feasible in these areas because it will severely limit the space available for ECS support equipment. Installation of soldier piles would consist of vertical piles (I-beams) separated by horizontal lagging (boards), and a hole would be augered into bedrock followed by anchoring the base of the I-beam with concrete. Driving (pounding) the I-beam into bedrock is not anticipated.

**Tentative Document Schedule:** An accelerated document review schedule is underway for the following work plan documents. (Details of planned review time frames were provided at the January 2012 Partnering meeting.)

- The Demolition Plan was finalized in February 2012. This document was incorporated into the Site-Specific Work Plan so that both documents can be reviewed concurrently.
- The draft final Chemical Safety Submission (CSS) Annex for Remedial Action is currently under review, with finalization anticipated in late July 2012 pending approval of the revised probability assessment.
- The draft Site-Specific Work Plan for Remedial Design and Remedial Action is currently under revision by USACE to incorporate additional Partner comments, with the draft final anticipated in August 2012 and finalization anticipated in September 2012.

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

Preliminary site mobilization activities, such as public space and building permit applications, are underway. House demolition is anticipated to begin in early Fall 2012, followed by initial low-probability efforts in Winter 2012 (including test pits and trenches, utility rerouting, and site preparations for high-probability efforts). High-probability soil removal will tentatively begin in Winter 2012, with completion anticipated in Summer 2013. The remaining low-probability soil removal actions (excavation areas A/B) will be conducted in Fall 2013, followed by site restoration in Winter 2013. The remediated property will be returned to AU as early as Winter 2013.

**Public Outreach Schedule:** An informational community meeting will be held tonight (July 17, 2012). This community-wide meeting will present the general approach for the upcoming demolition process and work plan details for the 4825 Glenbrook Road site cleanup process.

#### **Discussion – Pre-Decisional Details of the Draft Remedial Design and Remedial Action Work Plan**

In response to AU's inquiry, USACE and P. deFur replied that the tent ECS height is approximately 25 feet at the central peak and approximately 14 feet at the sloped sides. The Partners noted that the proposed tent ECS diagram dimensions are in millimeters. Parsons agreed to convert these values to feet for inclusion in the work plan, as requested.

Parsons noted that significant cribbing will be required to support the third tent layout's left side I-beam, due to the significant elevation difference between the basement slab and the back yard area (approximately 8 to 10 feet).

In response to AU's inquiry, Parsons replied that the first two tent locations may each be completed in a couple of days because they require very little cribbing to support the I-beams, which have an elevation difference of 2 feet. USACE-Huntsville noted that a minimum of one week should be planned

for each tent move because the filtration system must be disconnected and smoke tested each time the tent is repositioned. The cribbing placement must be exact, and this process may take between 3 days and 10 days depending on the amount of cribbing that is required. USACE-Baltimore added that a minimum of two weeks should be reserved for the second tent location. A combined timeframe of at least one month will be spent on repositioning the tent during the cleanup effort.

AU asked whether a cherry picker will be used to reposition the tent, and where this support equipment will be situated at the site. USACE explained that the exact type of crane will depend on site access constraints. The crane will probably be situated in the street due to the large size of the tent, requiring temporary Glenbrook Road closure, and the tent's weight is not an issue of concern. Power lines at the site are buried underground and will not interfere with the crane's movement. USACE added that although the proposed crane location was revised, the details of the crane lift plan should remain similar.

AU noted that temporary closure of Glenbrook Road is a sensitive issue that may cause schedule conflicts for President Kerwin. Parsons replied that road closure will be limited to time frames when the tent is being repositioned. This is necessary because the crane will be positioned on the street and the tent itself will likely be located near the street.

AU mentioned that President Kerwin is interested in the visual appearance of the tent, and confirmed that he is familiar with the tent used during Public Safety Building high-probability excavations. USACE added that a color swatch for the tent is anticipated, with a sand color instead of the shade of blue previously used at the PSB.

In response to P. deFur's inquiries as to why the entire site cannot be covered by one tent, USACE explained that this type of tent can be constructed with large proportions for aircraft hangars, solid waste management operations with huge tent access doors, and other large-scale uses. However, the proposed tent size is ideal for the 4825 Glenbrook Road site for three reasons. One, a larger structure would require a much larger filtration capacity and significantly more real estate for positioning engineering controls, neither of which are available for the 4825 Glenbrook Road site. Two, USACE already owns tent structural components that were purchased for the Lot 18 tent, which ensures prudent use of government funding instead of purchasing larger sized components. Three, positioning and angling a larger structure would be difficult due to highly sloped site terrain, potentially resulting in the structure base being several feet off the ground in lower-elevation areas along Glenbrook Road. The proposed tent size as detailed in the draft work plan is the most feasible layout configuration. P. deFur mentioned that this information is also useful for other environmental projects where stakeholders ask why the entire site cannot be covered with a tent.

AU expressed appreciation for providing clarification on these questions so that they can convey this information to the AU administration.

In response to AU's inquiries, USACE confirmed that the first tent layout will encompass the front half of the basement, will be supported by speed shoring, and will fully seal off the below-grade portion of the tent footprint. The tent floor will sit on top of the basement floor slab, and the tent material skirt will be weighted with sandbags to provide negative pressure. The elevation difference between the slab and the street is approximately 2 feet. During tent repositioning, the CAFS duct will remain in place and the flexible corrugated hoses can be shortened as needed.

In response to P. deFur's inquiry regarding the third tent layout, Parsons confirmed that the I-beam cribbing will be situated in the flat back yard area beyond the retaining wall.

In response to AU's inquiry, USACE clarified that the cascade system marked on the ECS site layout diagram represents the location of the system that recharges the Level B breathing air tanks.

AU inquired about noise generated during installation of soldier piles. Parsons explained that there are two installation methods for soldier piles. Significant noise and vibrations are caused by pounding the piles into the ground, and this method will not be used. The alternative proposed method is to use an

auger that is designed to eliminate most noise and vibrations. The soldier pile contractor will define the size of the auger required for this site, and will complete the engineering designs and the installation process.

Parsons clarified that the cross-section of sloping for the ECBC equipment layout represents the third tent location, which shows the location of the existing back yard retaining wall and the back yard basement wall of the house.

### **Discussion – Pre-Decisional Details for Removal of the Back Yard Retaining Wall**

In response to inquiries from USACE and EPA, Parsons confirmed that most of the retaining wall will be removed during high-probability excavations underneath the tent, including the curved portion of the retaining wall and the western portion of the footer. The remaining eastern portion of the footer will be visible at the excavation limit. This will be followed by low-probability removal of the remaining small section of the footer underneath the I-beam.

Parsons clarified that the retaining wall will be split hydraulically into 4 to 6 foot sections and pulled out.

In response to EPA's inquiry, USACE and Parsons explained that the relative positions of the third tent layout and the back yard retaining wall were planned based on previously-completed investigation efforts just behind the retaining wall. These include at least 2 test pits investigated close to the retaining wall in 2001-2002 and numerous soil borings. The footer is included within the tent footprint because it lies within the high-probability area of soil and the above-ground retaining wall portion will have already been removed. Parsons emphasized that even though the low-probability portion of the footer also lies within the tent, it is situated underneath the I-beam and cannot be removed underneath the tent without compromising the tent structure.

EPA expressed concern regarding the potential for encountering munitions within and adjacent to the footer concrete. During house construction, the excavated areas surrounding retaining walls would have provided a convenient location to bury any munitions that were encountered at that time. DDOE mentioned that according to worker transcripts, clean backfill was placed behind the retaining wall but the source (on-site or off-site) was unknown. To date, no munitions have been encountered during test pit investigations behind the backyard retaining wall, but the possibility of buried munition items behind the wall is still a concern.

The Partners briefly discussed similar previous findings at the site. Munition items were stacked along the retaining wall along the southern property line, and a couple of items had to be jack-hammered out of the concrete.

EPA noted that munitions are less likely to be found within the brick retaining wall, which seems to be low-probability and could potentially be knocked down. USACE clarified that low-probability soil is located behind the brick retaining wall, and open-air soil removal must be completed for the purpose of tent repositioning.

USACE confirmed that if a munition item is found during low-probability removal (including the remaining portion of the retaining wall footer), the remedial effort will be temporarily suspended and the item's contents will be fully assessed and discussed by the project team. If the item contains explosive or chemical fill, then the current engineering controls (including the MCE and MFD) will be re-evaluated.

The Partners briefly noted that geophysical data collection along the back yard retaining wall would not reveal useful information due to the amount of rebar in concrete.

USACE mentioned that the third tent location could be shifted 10 feet toward the back yard so that it encompasses the entire footer. However, this would further limit the space available for the ECS support equipment pad, and soldier piles may be required throughout the entire backyard. A total of 4 tent layouts may be necessary in this situation. USACE and Parsons added that plenty of overlap is currently built in to the tent configuration, with approximately 6 to 7 feet of buffer based on the as-built construction

diagrams for the adjacent property to the north. Similar construction distances are assumed for the 4825 Glenbrook Road site, but as-built diagrams are not available for confirmation. It may be better to assume a buffer of 10 feet to ensure that the back of the footer can be removed.

USACE asked whether the soldier piles will be left in place or demolished and restored to existing site conditions. Parsons replied that the top portion of the soldier piles can be cut and removed followed by soil grading, based on information provided by a structural engineer. USACE noted that the back yard soldier piles adjacent to the southern property line may be left in place as a long-term solution for soil settlement issues, as requested by the Koreans. AU will seek input from the university administration on this issue, as requested by USACE.

In response to USACE's inquiries, Parsons confirmed that the front portion of the basement footprint will be excavated under the first tent location, followed by temporary backfill and geofabric separating the clean backfill from the remaining basement soil. Parsons agreed that this temporary backfill will serve as part of the foundation for the second tent location.

In response to P. deFur's inquiry, USACE clarified that the low-probability excavations are divided into two separate efforts to ensure that remedial activities are completed in the optimal sequence. The trench associated with sewer line rerouting, as well as the newly-proposed test pits between the 4825 Glenbrook Road property fence and the Kreeger Music Roadway, must be investigated before the high-probability equipment and trailers are placed on-site. Additionally, sloping and trenching behind the back yard retaining wall are site preparation activities that must be completed prior to the high-probability excavations. The remaining low-probability test pits and remaining arsenic soil removal adjacent to the driveway will be completed following the high-probability excavations.

#### **Discussion – Draft Final Work Plan Comment Responses**

USACE noted that formal responses to AU comments on the draft work plan are in preparation and are anticipated within the next two weeks. P. Chrostowski replied that if he receives USACE's formal comment responses prior to August 3, 2012, he will be available to initially review the responses and then advise B. Bridgham and President Kerwin. USACE replied that the air monitoring modeling issue may not be resolved by August 3, but all other formal comment responses should be available.

Regarding the demolition plan, AU clarified that they already provided concurrence for USACE comment responses on the draft final demolition plan. [The demolition plan was finalized in February 2012.]

USACE mentioned that the draft work plan comment responses include discussion of air monitoring models generated with EPA ALOHA, D2PC, and D2SV. A formal response will be provided by Michael Myirski of the Army Chemical Materiel Agency (USACMA), who previously presented a briefing on these models at the February 2007 Partnering meeting.

USACE clarified that the EPA ALOHA model output parameters were included with the comment response. The input parameters were not included. AU agreed to provide the EPA ALOHA model input parameters to USACE-Huntsville who will forward them to Mr. Myirski, as requested.

#### **Next Steps**

Parsons will convert the ECS diagram dimensions from millimeters to feet in the Remedial Design and Remedial Action Work Plan for 4825 Glenbrook Road, as requested by the Partners.

AU will seek input from the university administration on whether they would like soldier piles to be left in place during 4825 Glenbrook Road site restoration, as requested by USACE.

AU will provide the EPA ALOHA model input parameters to USACE-Huntsville who will forward them to Michael Myirski of USACMA, as requested. [These parameters were requested by M. Myirski for the purpose of preparing a formal response to draft work plan comment responses for 4825 Glenbrook Road.]

## **F. 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.**

Partner discussion of two additional topics is summarized below.

### **Discussion – Site-Wide MEC HA**

USACE mentioned that they recently discussed Site-Wide RI preparations with ERT, who is writing the document. The organizational structure of the Munitions and Explosives of Concern Hazard Assessment (MEC HA) will be briefed at an upcoming Partnering meeting, using a similar presentation format as previous briefings on the structure of the Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA).

In response to EPA's inquiry, USACE replied that Kevin Coats (formerly of EPA and currently with the USACE-Huntsville Environmental and Munitions Center of Expertise (EM CX)) has not been briefed on current Spring Valley FUDS efforts.

EPA mentioned that when K. Coats worked for their agency, one of his comments regarding the Spring Valley FUDS was that the MEC HA was not designed to address chemical munitions risks. USACE explained that the current focus is the conventional munitions aspect of the document. USACE acknowledged that there are many qualitative challenges associated with chemical munitions that must be addressed because the MEC HA was not designed for evaluating risks at a CWM site.

EPA expressed interest in obtaining input from K. Coats on the chemical munitions aspect of the MEC HA due to his familiarity with the topic. Otherwise, EPA will have to find other outside input from someone familiar with the MEC HA design. USACE-Huntsville offered to request input from K. Coats during review of the MEC HA by the EM CX directorate, and EPA agreed.

### **Discussion – Public Outreach**

DDOE noted that the DC Mayor's Office was contacted regarding the community meeting from a community member. The community member voiced several concerns including the extent of investigation at the 4825 Glenbrook Road site (specifically investigation and cleanup of groundwater, saprolite, contamination and burials extending onto adjacent properties, and the area beyond 10 feet behind the back yard retaining wall). Other concerns included the investigation of the Sergeant Maurer burial pit via limited test pitting without the use of ground penetrating radar (GPR).

The Partners briefly responded to the statements:

- The location for the Sergeant Maurer burial pit as determined by Terry Slonecker with an accuracy of 30 feet, encompasses most of the 4825 Glenbrook Road back yard as well as the area between the property fence and the Kreeger Music Roadway on the AU campus. This is the exact location where new low-probability test pits will be investigated during the upcoming remedial effort.
- During upcoming excavations at the 4825 Glenbrook Road property, confirmation floor samples will be scraped and collected from undisturbed saprolite whenever possible, and additional samples will be collected if contaminant levels exceed screening criteria. EPA noted that sufficient soil can always be scraped from exposed saprolite for analysis purposes, because small amounts of soil are sloughed off of mechanical excavation equipment and the shoes of personnel who walk directly on the excavation floor. P. deFur added that saprolite can be chipped and pulverized, but the resulting sample represents stone rather than soil. The Partners noted that numerous metals are naturally present in bedrock.

### **Next Steps**

USACE-Huntsville will request input from Kevin Coats (formerly of EPA and familiar with the MEC HA design) during review of the Site-Wide MEC HA by the EM CX directorate, as requested by EPA.

## **G. Partner's Parking Lot**

**The goal of this segment of the meeting was to review and update the Parking Lot list.**

The "Partners Parking Lot" is an informal list designed to assist the Partners in tracking ideas, collaborations, research and tasks. The list is not a formal document specifying actions that must be taken.

The list was reviewed. Discussion of other Parking Lot topics is summarized below.

### **Discussion – Parking Lot Topics**

- USACE mentioned that bedrock geological observations in open Washington Aqueduct conduits may be feasible once per year during annual maintenance. This effort would be difficult to schedule and is unlikely to provide useful information pertaining to the groundwater investigation, as it focuses on the nature of bedrock in the Dalecarlia Woods vicinity. (This parking lot topic was originally suggested by DDOE's hydrogeologist at the January 2011 Partnering meeting, and was deemed closed at the July 2012 Partnering meeting.)
- DDOE mentioned that they consulted with their legal counsel regarding their agency's final attempt to assist with obtaining property access to the inaccessible Fordham Road property. In summary, the Brownfields Revitalization Act establishes a smaller version of the Superfund program that reflects the federal government's authority under CERCLA.
- DDOE noted that they spoke with DC General Services regarding residential property encroachment onto the DC right-of-way, east of and adjacent to the Dalecarlia parkway. Addressing this issue will be a significant effort for DC agencies, but it may not impact the Spring Valley project. (Details of small geophysical survey data gaps due to residential property encroachment were provided at the April 2012 Partnering meeting.) USACE briefly summarized the Partners' conclusions that the Dalecarlia Woods geophysical survey area was sufficiently characterized and the inaccessible areas are not a pressing issue. Potential future investigation of the residential encroachment areas could be discussed during final site-wide remedy planning.
- Regarding the proposed supplemental soil sampling at selected AOIs, USACE clarified that arsenic was excluded from the analytical parameters list because arsenic sampling (and soil removal as required) was already completed at these residential properties. This decision was noted in the final site-wide evaluation document and will be included in the site-wide RI report.
- In response to EPA's inquiry, USACE clarified that although the Partners have already discussed courses of action for almost all AOIs, discussion of AOI 17 and completion of some AOI Consensus Memos are pending.
- In response to USACE's inquiry, DDOE replied that they have not been contacted by DC water regarding installation of replacement water pipes in Spring Valley. A. Gates confirmed that DC Water has begun this effort on Foxhall Road by digging the entire intersection of interest. USACE mentioned that this might be directional drilling. DDOE noted that based on DC Water's original schedule, drilling on Glenbrook Road was planned for May 2012.

## **H. Agenda Building**

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for Thursday, September 6, 2012. [This meeting was changed to Wednesday, September 5, 2012 per Partner schedules and feedback.] Upcoming meetings will be scheduled at the September meeting.

### **Discussion – Future Meeting Schedule**

USACE emphasized the importance of holding a late August or early September Partnering meeting for the purpose of discussing the 4825 Glenbrook Road Remedial Design and Remedial Action work plan, instead of postponing the next meeting until late September 2012.

EPA noted that their risk assessor is tentatively available to discuss their agency's review of the arsenic toxicity level at the September 2012 RAB meeting, based on the response received during today's meeting.

USACE-Huntsville will check whether Michael Myirski of the U.S. Army Chemical Materiel Agency (USACMA) is available to present information on different types of modeling at the September 2012 Partnering meeting. The usefulness of this presentation depends on whether Paul Chrostowski, AU Consultant, is available to attend.

The Partners mentioned that FY 2012 ends on September 30, 2012. USACE-Huntsville does not anticipate receiving FY2013 funding for project travel until late October 2012.

The Partners briefly discussed holding future Partnering meetings on Tuesday afternoon prior to the evening RAB meetings. Although this combined schedule would create a lengthy work day for meeting attendees, it would be advantageous for those who regularly travel long distances to Spring Valley meetings.

In response to EPA's inquiry, Community Outreach and USACE replied that future RAB meetings may be scheduled bi-monthly, depending on remedial effort progress at the 4825 Glenbrook Road site and other topics of interest to the RAB.

#### **I. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 PM.