Spring Valley Partnering Meeting
August 23, 2016
Spring Valley Project Federal Property Conference Room

Name	**Organization/Address**	
Sherri Anderson-Hudgins	USACE - Huntsville	
Thomas Bachovchin	ERT	**X**
Brenda Barber	USACE - Baltimore	**X**
Todd Beckwith	USACE - Baltimore	
Janelle Boncal	Parsons	
Bethany Bridgham	American University	
Sean Buckley	Parsons	**X**
Paul Chrostowski	CPF Associates, American University Consultant	
Tom Colozza	USACE - Baltimore	
Jennifer Conklin	DOEE	
Kathy Davies	EPA – Region III	
Dr. Peter deFur (represented by Jessica Greene)	Environmental Stewardship Concepts/RAB TAPP Consultant	**X**
Diane Douglas	DOEE	
Bill Eaton	URS	
Chris Gardner	USACE – Corporate Communications Office	
Alma Gates	RAB Member – Horace Mann Representative	
Elise Goggin	TetraTech	
Steven Hirsh	EPA –Region III	**X**
Holly Hostetler	ERT	**X**
Dawn Iovan	EPA – Region III	
Carrie Johnston	ERT – Community Outreach Team	
Dr. Herb Nelson	ESTCP	
Dan Noble	USACE - Baltimore	**X**
Cliff Opdyke	USACE - Baltimore	

Randall Patrick	Parsons	**X**
Amy Rosenstein	ERT – Risk Assessor, Independent Consultant	
Lattie Smart	ERT - Community Outreach Team	
James Stuby	ERT – Geophysicist	
Jim Sweeney	DOEE	**X**
Tenkasi Viswanathan	USACE – Washington Aqueduct	
Cheryl Webster	USACE - Baltimore	
Ethan Weikel	USACE - Baltimore	
Nan Wells	ANC 3D Commissioner	
Maya Werner	ERT	
Kellie Williams	USACE - Huntsville	
Bruce Whisenant	USACE - Huntsville	**X**
Rebecca Yahiel	ERT – Community Outreach Team	**X**
Alex Zahl	USACE - Baltimore	**X**

Summary of 23 August 2016 Spring Valley Partnering Meeting

Consensus Decisions

- None

23 August 2016 Action Items

- EPA Region III would make an effort to acquire the necessary concurrence signature on the DD by the end of September.
- ERT will send EPA Region III and DOEE the Response to Comments (RTCs) document.
- The Partners agreed to visit the sites of the Pilot Project properties directly after the Partnering meeting adjourned.

Tuesday 23 August 2016

Check-in

The Partners conducted their normal check-in procedure.

A. 4825 Glenbrook Road Remedial Action

The goal of this segment of the meeting was to review the status of the remedial action at 4825 Glenbrook Road.

1. Demobilization

At the time of the last Partnering meeting, Parsons had just finished taking the confirmation samples. Between the last Partnering meeting and this meeting, the focus of activities has been demobilization of high probability operations. Parsons completed the decontamination of all equipment including the heavy

equipment. All of the equipment was screened for contamination. A benefit of a recent heat wave was that the plastic tarps covering all of the equipment created enough heat to reach the temperature needed for the Depot Area Air Monitoring System (DAAMS) headspace monitoring. All equipment cleared the monitoring process.

Once decontamination and screening was complete, Parsons quickly began tearing down all of the support structures, including the former dress out tent, and personnel decontamination station (PDS). Parsons also began to remove air lines, lights, and other infrastructure from inside the tent.

An all-terrain crane mobilized after the Independence Day holiday.

Parsons began taking down the Engineering Control Structure (ECS). Effort was made to ensure the fabric structure was folded, dried, and stored in a manner that would prevent mildew as much as possible for long term storage. Parsons peeled back the sections after they were unlaced and took down the metal frames. Deconstruction of the ECS was completed on July 25, 2016.

Parsons rebuilt a pad for the crane closer to the top of the back hill on the property. Once the crane was set on the new pad, Parsons was able to use the crane to remove the Miniature Chemical Agent Monitoring System (MINICAMS) expandable shed, Chemical Agent Filtration System (CAFS), and the silencers.

The focus of last week was to prepare the site for low probability operations. Parsons placed jute mats, extra hay bales, silt fence, and stabilizing slopes in an effort to cover the exposed soil to ensure the soil remains intact until the restoration phase. The area in front of the crane will be covered with geotech, gravel, and then mats to create a staging area for roll-offs.

Question from USACE – Did the silencers go up to Edgewood Chemical Biological Center (ECBC)?

Parsons confirmed this.

USACE-Baltimore noted that USACE-Huntsville pointed out that USACE and Parsons need to make sure to clean up the property issue concerning the ECS, because USACE bought it with project money. Technically USACE owns it, and so will have to transition that property to ECBC officially. S. Anderson-Hudgins was in agreement that there was no need for USACE to keep the ECS, but wants USACE to complete the paperwork. USACE does not have the ECS on a property list yet because USACE is still in contracts mode.

USACE was not sure if Parsons put the ECS on a property list or not, but Parsons did not purchase the structure.

Parsons confirmed this; the ECS was constructed on site.

Parsons explained they are tracking the ECS with a record of invoice and construction specifications. Parsons can create a record of the ECS if necessary.

USACE-Baltimore and USACE-Huntsville discussed the possibility that the necessary paperwork for transitioning the ECS to ECBC may be merely a memo for the record. USACE may consult a property management person.

Parsons noted that 2 of the 3 CAFS were different sizes, so the silencers were designed specifically for each CAF unit.

USACE and Parsons agreed that the CAFS and silencers work very well.

2. Backyard Slope Confirmation samples

Parsons did not see any signs of AUES-related debris or contamination encountered in the backyard. No significant debris was found in the second tent location in the area around the retaining wall. No debris was found in any of the test pits Parsons excavated on the backyard slope. No debris was encountered during the significant excavation and grading activities to get the slope, water line, sewer line, and to build

the CAFS. Parsons is proposing to not take soil samples in the backyard slope area. Parsons will reevaluate this decision if significant debris is found during low probability Area A excavation. Parsons still needs to remove a retaining wall, excavate to a straight wall as much as possible, and then slope it back. Parsons has found one 75mm in a heat sealed test tube. Other items have been found in singles or two together, but there is no sign of another disposal pit.

USACE inquired if Parsons still takes samples along the separation line?

Parsons confirmed this. These are the characterization samples. Parsons will still take grid samples here, confirmation samples in Area A, and the wall sample.

EPA Region III suggested taking the grid and confirmation samples before making a decision about the other samples. Instead of doing away with these samples, just postpone the decision. This could be one of those issues that keeps coming up in the future, and may be something to consider. EPA Region III suggested obtaining the samples from Area A. If nothing is found at that location, then EPA Region III would agree there would be no need to go further back in the property for more samples.

DOEE agreed with EPA Region III. DOEE noted that this is the area where the workers from West Virginia repeatedly said that there is debris behind the retaining wall.

Parsons agreed.

3. Low Probability

Parsons plans to begin low probability work starting with Area A in mid-September. Work will begin at 4801 Glenbrook Road and move towards 4835 Glenbrook Road. Parsons will remove all of the retaining wall footer, complete the soil excavation, and take the confirmation samples. In late October, the crews are scheduled to begin exposing the sewer main at the former driveway entrance. In addition, there is a sewer main next to the brick stairs that runs down the center of the driveway that Parsons will bypass. In mid-November, Parsons will begin excavating Area B from the driveway towards the residence. There is a lateral that comes off of 4835 Glenbrook Road that Parsons will have to connect to flex hose in order to move the lateral out of the way so Parsons can excavate the remainder of Area B. This work is planned to begin in late November and continue through the end of March. Parsons plans to send a camera up the sewer main because there is no evidence of anything upstream of the lateral. There is nothing for a sanitary sewer to service upstream. The maps from American University (AU) do not show the sewer main.

In response to a question from EPA Region III, Parsons explained that the pipe is a 4 inch plastic pipe.

Parsons, USACE and EPA Region III discussed the possible purpose for the 4 inch pipe. The pipe may have been installed when both 4825 Glenbrook Road and 4835 Glenbrook Road were built to drain a landscape feature. It is unlikely the purpose of the pipe is to drain something from AU campus. There is an existing sewer main that serves the AU campus that goes through 4825 Glenbrook Road.

In response to a question from USACE-Huntsville, Parsons explained that the steps will be removed as part of the bypass for the sewer. The wall will be left in place. Parsons may have to add temporary backfill soil to maintain slopes and in the small area drop in a shoring box for the remainder.

In response to a question from EPA Region III, Parsons explained that even though the steps will be removed, the property is all sloped now, providing access to the upper deck. There is still a sharp drop, but once Parsons completes Area A, they will slope the drop back.

In response to a question from USACE, Parsons explained that ACI is under contract to run a camera up the sewer main. The challenge is that there does not seem to be a manhole in the street. Parsons will meet with ACI to see if they have ideas for accessing the sewer main. Parsons would prefer to access the sewer main without exposing and tapping into the pipe.

4. Schedule

Activities at 4825 Glenbrook Road are on schedule. Parsons plans to resume low probability in mid-September and complete low probability by March 2017. Parsons expects to complete restoration in the summer of 2017. There are about 25 to 30 days of contingency built in to that schedule.

B. Groundwater Remedial Investigation (RI)

The purpose of this segment of the meeting was to review the status of the Groundwater RI report.

USACE gave a brief review of the Groundwater RI report. USACE-Baltimore is close to finalizing the Groundwater RI. USACE has received approval from EPA Region III and DOEE. There might be one small issue that USACE may want to review with EPA Region III and DOEE. USACE wants to make sure the Army's Environmental and Munitions Center of Expertise (EM/CX) does not have a problem with the way USACE stated the risks for the future scenario. There is some possibility USACE could interpret that the risks were within the acceptable range. USACE wants to check with EM/CX to make sure that EM/CX is satisfied with the conclusions so that USACE may move on to the Groundwater Feasibility Study (FS). USACE has reviewed the Groundwater FS and comments have been addressed. T. Beckwith is preparing to submit the Groundwater FS to EM/CX, and the draft final document will be available to the regulators sometime this fall once EM/CX completes their review.

DOEE noted that an internal issue developed concerning comments on the Groundwater RI and the Site-Wide Proposed Plan (PP). The water quality division of DOEE submitted some comments on risk assessment. DOEE made an effort to explain to the water quality division of DOEE that several years ago, DOEE said they would defer to EPA as far as risk assessment goes, and should not be commenting on risk assessment. USACE-Baltimore was concerned about the comments DOEE made about the Eco-risk Assessment. However, about a week before the comments were due on the Site-Wide PP, DOEE received more comments on risk assessments. The comments stated that the water quality division felt that USACE needed to do more sampling, and needed to put in more groundwater wells. On the advice of supervisory staff for DOEE and on the advice of the legal staff for DOEE, DOEE did not submit the comments received.

USACE-Baltimore asked if the comments related to the Site-Wide PP as well?

DOEE confirmed this. DOEE received the comments three days before the last day of the public comment period for the Site-Wide PP on 28 July. DOEE explained to the water quality division that EPA may have comments to submit, but that DOEE should not be submitting comments. As far as DOEE is concerned, submitting comments would disrupt the whole process. The legal department for DOEE also said comments that had to do with Eco-risk probably should not have been submitted on the Groundwater RI, so DOEE told USACE-Baltimore to disregard those comments.

C. Pilot Project

The goal of this segment of the meeting was to provide an update on Pilot Project.

1. Summary

There are now 3 properties participating in the Pilot Project, instead of the 4 properties previously designated. USACE had been in communication with the fourth homeowner, but there was an issue with a potential contract on the property. USACE gave the homeowner opportunities to work out the issue, but the homeowner deferred and said he wanted to hold off and talk to the contract owner. USACE waited to hear back from the contract owner to resolve the issue for a 2 week period. The contract owner had a permit issue on renovations and did not respond, so USACE elected to move forward with the remaining 3 properties. The remaining properties will provide plenty of data for the Pilot Project. The three properties are located on the 4700 Block of Quebec Street and Woodway Lane.

In response to a question from EPA Region III, USACE explained that the fourth homeowner was not one of the property owners that asked to be prioritized for remediation.

The Community Outreach team and the ERT team worked very closely with the Pilot Project homeowners on restoration plan specifics. ERT removed certain plants that will be replaced. USACE agreed to transplant a number of plants that were somewhat controversial. Fine Earth Landscape, Inc. transported the transplants to their nursery and will maintain those plants until such time when the plants can be returned to the properties. Each of the homeowners came to agreements with USACE concerning removals and restoration.

The Pilot Project survey phase began last week. The Time-domain Electromagnetic Multi-sensor Tower Array Detection System (TEMTADS) was brought in and completed a dynamic survey on all three properties. The exact data is being reviewed to make sure that all data needed has been collected. The TEMTADS will be brought back to the properties to finish up any data gaps from the dynamic survey. The Instrument Verification Strip (IVS) has been installed with all of the targets in place. The IVS is used every morning and every afternoon. The Man Portable Vector (MPV) began testing last week and has completed the majority of one property. There have been minor glitches which have been resolved. The surveyors were using a Real Time Kinematic (RTK) Global Positioning System (GPS) and had to revert to a laser Robotic Total Station (RTS) system because of tracking issues.

In response to a question from EPA Region III, USACE confirmed that the surveyors were out at the properties today. The MPV is at the properties today, but the TEMTADS is not. The 3 properties are close enough to each other that there was some concern about signal interference. The 2 technologies project an electromagnetic signal into the ground, which may cause interference. The surveyors believe the effective range is approximately 100 meters, and these properties are closer together than 100 meters. As a precaution, only one device is used at a time.

During the heavy rains last week, a large tree fell on one of the properties. The homeowner hired a contractor that will bring in metal scaffolding and a dumpster to repair the house. USACE has worked with the homeowner to finish the dynamic and cued surveys with both instruments on the property to avoid interference from the metal scaffolding and dumpster.

EPA Region III asked what the difference is between the cued and dynamic surveys with the MPV.

USACE explained that the cued and dynamic surveys for the MPV are the same as for the TEMTADS. The dynamic survey detects all anomalies first, and then the analysts determine which targets to add to the cued survey. The cued survey then scans the chosen targets from every angle to identify those anomalies. USACE believes the two technologies have different processors but the same essential electromagnetic process. USACE has completed the dynamic surveys with the TEMTADS on the other properties, and will begin dynamic surveys with the MPV on the other properties when the cued survey at first property is complete.

2. Discussion of the Blind Seed Plan

ERT noted that 4-5 blind seeds have been installed on each of the 3 properties. The survey teams do not know the locations of the blind seeds.

In response to a question from EPA Region III, ERT explained that the teams should not be able to discern where the blind seeds are located. When the seeds were installed the landscape was well patched, and should be invisible to the surveyors.

USACE added that there are a lot of places where plant removal and transplanting occurred, leaving additional patched landscape.

Some of the blind seeds were pulled from the Federal Property Geophysical Proveout (GPO) grid.

In response to a question from EPA Region III, USACE and ERT explained that the depths of the blind seeds are determined by an IVS memo, which indicates the appropriate target depth, orientation, coordinates

and positional data. A plywood and Styrofoam structure is used to measure in the blind seeds to achieve the correct depth.

USACE provided a simulated Liven's, 4.2 inch mortar, and Mark 4 Booster to add to the TEMTADS and MPV libraries.

USACE noted that the simulated items came from Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG). USACE believes the Livens was a steel mock-up, designed exactly as a Livens with a burster tube. USACE invited an ordnance specialist to come out to the site to inspect the mock-up to make sure it was correct. The analysts used the simulated items to screen into the Advance Classification (AC) library for both the TEMTADS and the MPV, because those items were not in the AC library and were fairly unique. The MK-IV booster/fuze from a 75 mm is the smallest target of interest.

EPA Region III asked if the surveys include the grass strip by the curb.

ERT confirmed this. USACE added that one of the challenges of the surveys was to make sure to get a clear signal from the curb area without any cars. The survey teams try to scan those areas first thing in the morning in order to achieve a clear signal.

EPA Region III commented that acquiring the target list for the cued survey should not take long.

USACE agreed and explained that the USACE Baltimore geophysicist will be working with the analysts on Thursday, August 25 in an effort to begin the cued survey on Friday, August 26.

3. Discussion of Signal Interference for the TEMTADS and MPV

EPA Region III noted that the analysts could go back to the original geophysical survey to locate anomalies.

USACE confirmed this, noting that the TEMTADS and MPV are experiencing some interference effects. The geophysicists are examining what negative interference effects might be removed or minimized through a couple different processes.

In response to a question from EPA Region III, USACE explained that interference may be caused by a combination of things. There is a lot of metal associated with electricity going into the house, and there is a radio tower by the Woodway properties which is causing some problems. The instruments can only get within 40 cm of house walls because of interference effects. Each property has a different level of interference.

EPA Region III commented that the percentage of the properties that the surveys were able to achieve should be in the Pilot Project report. Obstacles such as trees or bushes have affected the percentage.

USACE confirmed those percentages will be a part of the Pilot Project report.

ERT noted that the lowest percentage of the 3 properties was 85% coverage.

EPA Region III answered that 85% is good, but then that percentage may be affected by things such as the scaffolding or radio tower.

USACE explained that background noise is everywhere, and is a factor that is part of the evaluation. As far as the cued survey list on the property with the scaffolding goes, USACE will be excavating all anomalies anyway. The cued survey list just gives information about how accurate the cued list is. If a small portion of the cued list is missed, all of the anomalies will still be excavated. USACE is anticipating that when it is time for the remediation of the other 93 properties, USACE will not have to excavate all of the anomalies, only those anomalies that the device used indicates have a possibility of being munition items.

USACE does not consider the cued list around the scaffolding to be a deal breaker. There are 3 solid properties participating in the Pilot Project. USACE was unable to get cued data from one of the instruments on a small portion of one of the properties. USACE will still move forward with the Pilot

Project. Since there is some schedule flexibility, USACE will attempt to get the cued data at the one property before the contractors bring in the scaffolding. If USACE is unable to get the cued data from that one portion of the property, there is still plenty of data from the remainder of the property and the other two properties to complete the Pilot Project.

ERT noted they are confident that the cued survey will be completed at this property before the scaffolding is installed.

EPA Region III added that USACE will also excavate those anomalies that cannot be classified.

USACE confirmed this.

EPA Region III commented that the dynamic data may be able to identify the cued items at this time.

USACE noted that in the last week the weather has been more conducive to the surveys. The processor for the TEMTADS had trouble at times in the late afternoon when the temperature was very hot.

EPA Region III asked if the TEMTADS has a small backpack now. The backpack was large in the past, and EPA Region III believed the manufacturer was working on miniaturizing the backpack.

USACE explained that he did not know what the old backpack looked like, but the current one is not huge.

4. Discussion of Preliminary Data

USACE-Huntsville asked if preliminary data was delivered on those 3 properties, and if there have been any indications of specific munitions.

USACE explained that some figures have come in from Naval Research Laboratory (NRL) and Vancouver, but at this early stage of the project USACE has not reviewed the data yet. USACE believes there have been some objects found.

ERT added that there are approximately 50 items found at one property. ERT was not sure what that means at this stage of the project. The initial data has shown a number of objects, but many of them may be known objects that were left behind on certain properties from the old A, B, C, or D classification.

USACE-Huntsville commented that with the discrimination technology, one should have a clear picture of the items and be able to identify a Livens or a 75mm, for example.

ERT confirmed this, noting that the cued survey has not been conducted yet. Regardless of what the cued survey indicates, all items will be excavated.

USACE added that during the Pilot Study each property should have 3 or 4 things that should clearly show as a Stokes or 75mm, etc (due to the blind seeds).

ERT confirmed this, that there will be 4 or 5 blind seeds on each property, in addition to whatever was left from the old classification days when presumably innocuous metal debris were not excavated.

USACE noted that the Pilot Project will serve as an accuracy test of the old A, B, C, D classification system as well.

5. Discussion of Site Visit for the Partners

USACE invited the partners to visit the Pilot Project properties after the partnering meeting adjourned.

D. Site-Wide Proposed Plan (PP)

USACE briefly reviewed the end of the public comment period for the Site-Wide PP.

USACE received 8 public comments. Comments from 5 stakeholders indicated they wanted to be in the first group of properties remediated. One homeowner, whose property is partially in the 50 meter buffer zone, feels that his property should be left out of the buffer zone entirely. The response from USACE will be that while USACE understands that the decision is a judgement call, USACE will decline to shorten the

buffer zone at his property. The comments from this homeowner were the most involved, and included appendices citing all of the maps in the report.

In response to a question from EPA Region III, ERT confirmed that the property belonging to the homeowner disputing the buffer zone has not had a geophysical investigation.

The other two public comments stated they felt more investigation should be conducted at 4835 Glenbrook Road.

The number of property owners that have indicated they want their property to be remediated in the first group has reached about 15 or 16 people.

EPA Region III suggested that those 15 or 16 people should be in the first group.

USACE agreed.

The whole group of about 100 properties will be notified that priority may be given to those that express their concern.

EPA Region III suggested that the next group of people to respond would be in the second half, after the first people that have already sent in their response.

In response to a question from EPA Region III, USACE explained that only one person asked for an extension of the public comment period. That person was the homeowner that disputed the buffer zone.

ERT noted that the homeowner wanted to find out the MEC HA score for his property in the buffer zone, and claimed it had not been available. The score was available online and at the Tenley-Friendship Neighborhood Library.

EPA Region III suggested checking with the legal department before declining an extension.

USACE confirmed this, adding that the initial public comment period was extended from 30 to 45 days.

E. Site-Wide Decision Document (DD)

The Decision Document (DD) is being reviewed USACE Environmental and Munitions Center of Expertise (EM/CX), and should be available to the Partners by September 8, 2016.

There are two major changes to the DD:

1. USACE inserted language about 5 year reviews for the cleanups and soil removals. The surface soil cleanup will be at the level of Unlimited Use/Unrestricted Exposure (UUUE). While there may be objections from EM/CX, the guidance clearly states that 5 year reviews must be included in the language.

2. USACE added clarification to the definition of an 'accessible area.' In the PP, a privately owned property is subject to definition of accessibility by the property owner. USACE will discuss what is accessible or not with the property owner and act to reduce the amount of area affected. USACE did not put anything in the DD concerning survey coverage percentages required at each property.

EPA Region III noted that language would be written in the Remedial Design (RD).

USACE confirmed this, adding that the accessibility section is really an acknowledgment of one other party (the homeowner) before the Remedial Action (RA) is taken.

EPA Region III will try to acquire the necessary concurrence signature on the DD by the end of September.

In response to a question by USACE, EPA Region III explained that the signer would be either the Acting Director or the New Director.

DOEE noted that he did not see any problem getting it done either way.

ERT will send EPA Region III and DOEE the Response to Comments (RTCs) document.

F. Institutional Analysis (IA)

USACE briefly reviewed the IA document.

DOEE sent in their concurrence.

EPA Region III noted that signing a concurrence should not be a problem as long as there are no issues, and the IA does not commit EPA Region III to anything.

USACE explained that the IA document will be an addendum to the FS, but not the RI.

G. Open Issues and New Data

One munitions debris item was found at the 3700 block of Fordham Road property; where there were 56 individual anomalies were investigated. The homeowner has accepted the assurance letter. USACE finalized the Anomaly Investigation report, which included pictures of the investigated Point of Interest (POI) 2. Copies of the pictures were also sent to the homeowner. The assurance letter was added to the addendum of the 2015 Site-Wide RI report. The exact title of the RI POI 2 is the same, so when an online search is conducted, both reports should be found.

In response to a question from EPA Region III, USACE explained that money was given to the homeowner at Fordham Road because the homeowner's arborist told the homeowner that USACE damaged a large tree on the property. The homeowner offered to be responsible to take the tree down (and be reimbursed by USACE). There is a large tree replacing the damaged tree on the property now.

H. Future Agenda Items

1. Groundwater FS.

2. 4825 Glenbrook Road.

3. The Pilot Project.

4. Site-Wide DD.

I. Agenda Building

The next meeting was scheduled for Thursday October 27, 2016.

J. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:10.