

**SPRING VALLEY
Partnering Meeting
Fort Meade, EPA Science Building**

MEETING MINUTES

PURPOSE OF MEETING: Partnering Meeting

LOCATION: Fort Meade, EPA Science Building

DATE: February 27, 2001

TIME: 10:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Action items are *underlined and italicized*.

OU3 Non-Time Critical Removal Action, Risk Assessment, Test Pits

Major Plaisted summarized the status of this work.

4825 Glenbrook: Front yard done. Waiting for confirmation sample results. The Right of Entry expires February 28, 2001.

Test Pit Investigation at 4825 Glenbrook is tentatively set to start the week of 3/19/01.

The property owner will do the restoration of 4825 Glenbrook with funding from CENAB. The restoration of 4801 will be done by CENAB. The landscape architect for the Korean residents is completing the design.

The draft Risk Assessment (RA) for 4835 Glenbrook was distributed. Within EPA's acceptable risk range of 10^{-4} to 10^{-6} . The RA concludes that hot spot removal will not need to be done. American University (AU) wanted to know more about this process. Major Plaisted explained how the removal levels have previously been determined. *The draft-final report will be submitted to DC Health, American University, and EPA by March 9, 2001.* Once draft-final RA is delivered, will wait on feedback from EPA and AU on how to proceed. *Comments are due back to Parsons by March 16, 2001.*

There was a brief discussion of phytoremediation (planting a special type of fern that 'absorbs' high levels of arsenic).

Terry Slonecker (EPIC): Review of 52nd Court and POI 16 Areas

This presentation focused on the 52nd Court and POI 16 Areas and concluded that there were many more ground scars or disturbed earth areas than previously indicated. Should these be considered new POIs? Mr. Slonecker indicated there were no obvious ones. CENAB will review the issue further. Mr. Slonecker thought he could differentiate between stressed vegetation and ground scars. Parsons will assist Mr. Slonecker's deliverable by providing information from the 2000 aerial photography.

Major Plaisted suggested EPA, DC Health, and CENAB should take a look at the latest EPIC information to see if there is a need for additional geophysical surveys in the areas identified by Mr. Slonecker along Massachusetts Avenue. It was suggested that geophysics be done where there are ground scars, but no POIs (since these have been tested).

Mr. Harbold (EPA) presented the list of things residents have asked for. CENAB questioned whether this was a formal list from all residents or one person's idea of what is needed.

Mr. Harbold suggested that the residents be informed of the new ground scar information presented by Mr. Slonecker, but others questioned whether this will cause more problems if done as a half-measure, i.e., the residents could get the wrong idea about the ground scars if they had no other information to put this in context. Mr. Harbold also suggested that when sampling properties, residents should be given maps with info (scars, cut/fill {finalized}) because residents want to know what was put on their property (sprayed, fired, dumped). Mike Rogers (CENAB) pointed out that when a resident requests information, they are directed to the many previous reports (zone reports, lot reports) that generally contain all the old historical information for their area.

Mr. Slonecker volunteered to add the property lines into the ArcView database. Major Plaisted mentioned that with 1200 properties, this was a considerable effort. Mr. Slonecker added that his report was a draft and that these scars might not mean chemical agents impacts. Mr. Slonecker will produce a report by the end of the month that includes whether these scars could be stressed vegetation. Mr. Slonecker's overall report will be done by the end of March.

The review of ground scars at POI 16 brought up the issue of how to provide this information to the residents. It was suggested that an historical POI report be compiled by CENAB. Mark Baker, CENAB historian will need to get involved. Major Plaisted and Mr. Harbold agreed that it was necessary to show all information to residents to let them know whether there is a problem or not.

DC Health suggested that maybe they should just get a general idea of historic testing. Major Plaisted mentioned that Zone reports were distributed to every resident, but many people have left, so new people don't know the site history. These reports detailed what POIs are on their property, what was tested (geophysical and environmental sampling). A question was raised on the structure of the report: divide by POI or zone? It was decided that zone boundaries are arbitrary, so should probably do it by POI. CENAB will review the level of effort (cost) for this type of report.

DC Health and EPA would like to categorize all ground scars and/or stressed vegetation to determine whether or not any action (e.g., geophysical survey, sampling, intrusive investigation, etc.) has been accomplished at these areas as identified by the photo interpretation. If no action has been taken what should be taken if anything for each area identified? The EPA will take the lead on the photo interpretation.

Brian mentioned the next public meeting was March 14, 2001.

Principals need to get together to review 52nd court area and historic documentation (Schedule for early April). Brian said CENAB will need at least 4-5 weeks (also to give time to Mark Baker to do research), and that DC Health, EPA, and one person from Parsons should attend.

The question was asked if a Community Representative needs to attend the Partnering Meetings? It was decided in the future that the Chair or Co-Chair of the RAB might attend the Partnering Meetings.

OU-4 Follow-on Sampling and Sampling Options

Major Plaisted/Parsons reviewed the results of the OU-4 residential follow-on sampling action (not all the results had been received as of the meeting date). Based on arsenic levels, EPA requested three additional borings at the 4900 Quebec property at the 1-2 foot depth (CENAB agreed). 20 foot grid sampling was recommended by Major Plaisted for 4871 Glenbrook Road, based on the quadrant sampling results. In response to a question, Major Plaisted explained the basic procedure following grid sampling for a given property: once the sampling is completed a Risk Assessment will be completed for each property, followed by a Feasibility Study, and then a ROD.

Major Plaisted reviewed the sampling options for addressing the rest of the 661 acre Spring Valley boundary. Plans 1 and 2 were variations on the current sampling work being performed. Plan 3 included quadrant-type sampling of a 200 ft buffer zone around the POIs with documented CWM testing. Plan 4 included quadrant sampling the entire 661 acres (approximately 1600 homes/half-acre lots).

Mr. Harbold said Plan 3 was a good start but felt all 1600 should be addressed. He suggested a lesser level of sampling to cover these areas, involving only two surface samples (front and back yards) and no subsurface samples. Mike Rogers questioned whether EPA will commit to supporting this since CENAB was following EPA guidance with the quadrant approach. Tom Bachovchin questioned whether this approach was defensible or produced enough data to make risk assessment conclusions. It was also questioned whether "sooner" was a better rationale than "more complete" for follow on sampling. DC Health stated they would prefer that all of the 1600 properties be sampled using the standard quadrant method (Plan 4).

The Plan 4 discussion focused on obtaining all of the Rights-Of-Entry (ROEs). Mr. Harbold suggested that an easy way might be to simply have the residents sign up for sampling at the community meeting, but CENAB suggested that only a relatively small percentage of people

might be at these meetings and many will be missed. Mr Stephens suggested that an Area Neighborhood Commission (ANC) get involved to get the word to all residents involved.

AU personnel asked if additional samples will be taken outside the AUES boundary lines. CENAB stated that only if the contamination was indicating a pattern where the contamination might cross the property boundaries. AU personnel expressed an interest in ensuring that the northern parts of the campus be tested so that AU has assurances that the entire campus has been tested.

Major Plaisted will present these options at the upcoming community meeting. Parsons was tasked with costing the option with the decreased sampling scope (two surface samples, no subsurface samples for 1600 homes/lots).

Parsons strongly recommended that one lab will be used for all the additional follow-on sampling.

CDC Time Critical Removal Action

Soil samples have been taken with a 4 –6 week turn around time due to the constituents being analyzed. Once the soil results have been received and evaluated by the USACE, DC Health, EPA, and AU, the soil will be excavated (tentatively schedule for the end of May after the students have left for the summer).

SDA

Mike Winningham presented the data on the SDA characterization samples. Based on the arsenic and lead levels, over-excavation was recommended. Based on a question from EPA, Parsons will review the comparison standards and derive a construction worker standard for lead and mercury.

AU was asked to provide the timing for placing the large Baker Tank back on the parking area overlooking the SDA for the purposes of containing the stream water per the previous excavation procedures.

Need to obtain the last three ROEs prior to starting the culvert cleaning.

Geophysics

Bob Selfridge, Huntsville COE lead geophysicist joined the meeting by phone and summarized the proposed additional geophysical investigations for Spring Valley. Mr. Selfridge said the contract action draft statement of work will be finalized by Friday March 2. The new prove out area had not been selected yet but could be in the area of the AU soccer fields and possibly near the radio tower. Mr. Selfridge said he will be using the EM 31 and 61, the GEM-3, and the man-portable MTADS. The commercial MTADS will be used at the prove out and if certain problems were resolved, it could be used for the investigation. The radio tower will not be

turned off, therefore instruments will need to be tested near the radio tower. The objective is pits/trenches.

Mr. Selfridge explained that the EM 61 can locate a drum at 3 meters, but this depth decreases to ~ 4 feet for a 105 mm or 2.5 feet for a 75 mm item. The EM 31 can see a drum at 6 meters. For smaller, shallower objects, Mr. Selfridge recommended the EM 61. Mr. Selfridge indicated that GPR is ineffective in high clay soils. Mr. Shuster indicated that the USGS could conduct a GPR survey at the prove-out.

CENAB and EPA need to send Bob Selfridge the four AU areas needing to be geophysically surveyed.

ARB is scheduled for March 2, 2001 in Huntsville.

Sedgwick Trench Area

Major Plaisted briefly described the scope of the Sedgwick Trench investigation. It was decided to add the full scan parameters (including the AUES List) to the bottom of the trench samples. It was decided that making the leap over quadrant sampling to grid sampling set a bad precedent for sampling actions, and that quadrant sampling will be done on the Sedgwick properties. Parsons will have the draft Work Plan for that investigation submitted by March 2, 2001. Cases of multiple myeloma and aplastic anemia were discussed, but it was not clear exactly which house was reported to have which case.

Ken Shuster of EPA suggested using the Gore Sorber soil gas technology to get a better idea of volatile contamination. Parsons explained that the Encore sampling device was now being used for all volatile sampling and that this was the best method for obtaining good data. However, Major Plaisted said that CENAB will look into the soil gas suggestion. Ken suggested that the best way to find the trench bottom was to look at the six feet below the 1918 level depth because the old photos indicate the trench was generally six feet deep.

The meeting concluded at approximately 4:30 pm. The next Partnering meeting will be March 28, 2001, same time and place.