

SPRING VALLEY

Partnership Meeting

PURPOSE OF MEETING: Partnering Meeting

LOCATION: Phone Conference

DATE: June 19, 2002

TIME: 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

This phone conference was held to discuss potential interim measures for properties identified by DC Health as needing inclusion in the planned Time Critical Removal Action for residential properties to begin in July 2002.

Risk to Property Owners

Mr. Frank Vavra, EPA Region III, noted his effort to get short-term risk evaluation from a Region III toxicologist. His support personnel informed him that if a child went out and played in the same location everyday for two weeks and ate the assumed amount of soil used by EPA in the risk assessment process, arsenic concentrations would need to be approximately 7,000 ppm for arsenic poisoning to be a concern.

TCRA Selection Process

Exposure point concentration calculation using 95% upper confidence limit was identified as the approach used and the EPA-accepted approach.

Mr. Richard Albright, DC Health, noted his discontent in not being actively included in the actual selection of the TCRA properties. He expressed his belief that the EPC, while being a good selection mechanism, should not be the only approach to consider.

Rich noted that property specific considerations, such as garden locations and other factors, should be included in determining which properties are addressed when. He added his belief that current sampling may miss higher contamination in the immediate vicinity.

Rich also expressed his interest in having the additional properties he identified added to the TCRA list.

MAJ Mike Peloquin, US Army Corps of Engineers, indicated that Corps is committed to continuing removal activities, starting a second batch of properties after the first seven properties are completed. It was acknowledged that this would likely take the form of a second TCRA, if the non-time critical removal action (NTCRA) process were not ready for initiating field activities when the first seven properties are completed.

Rich asked if risk assessments had been conducted on the properties. Mike noted that it was agreed to cleanup to the 20 ppm and that, as a result, individual risk assessments were deemed unnecessary by the Partnership.

Selection of Additional Properties

The Partnership discussed the challenge of using other factors in selecting the next properties to be remediated.

The Corps does not believe that individually high grids warrant placement on the TCRA list, particularly at the cost of other properties with higher EPCs. With regard to this specific point, Frank V. expressed a similar concern and that this would not likely be acceptable to the community if such alteration of approach took place.

Frank V. did acknowledge that some action had to be taken to address potential site-specific exposure concerns associated with particularly high grids and to alleviate some community fear of such grids.

Mike noted for the Partnership that planning must be conducted except for an emergency removal action and that this was not an option since the levels do not dictate such action and it would imply these properties are more important than the TCRA 7, which would not be true.

As a hypothetical consideration, Frank V. noted that if interim action was taken only with grids at 150 ppm or higher, that this would not be many grids and would address the community concern. The need to identify how many grids would be involved in such a scenario was noted.

With regard to the property with the highest individual grid, the EPC was recalculated excluding the unusable portion of the property at the request of Rich and the property owner. The EPC changed from 6 to 12.

Rich inquired that how many properties were planned for FY 03 could influence the interim actions needed. Mike indicated approximately 10 – 15 are scheduled for remediation in FY 03, noting that these properties would have a high number of grids to be removed.

AU Removal

Rich noted concern about the AU removal with lower grids than individual properties within the community.

Mike noted that DC Government requested that the Corps move on to address the associated athletic field.

Other Issues

Rich noted that the Partnership needs to explore air sampling and localized geophysical work to address these individual, elevated grid locations.

Rich expressed concern about judge ruling and possible capricious nature of prioritization.

Next Steps

1. The Partnership agreed that more discussion was necessary to delineate what options are available (i.e. flower boxes, fencing, sod, etc) to address such specific properties until they are remediated. It was also agreed that each property owner would have to want such an action and that this would vary from owner to owner.
2. The Partnership agreed to hold a phone conference on Monday 24 June to carry this issue forward.
3. The Partnership agreed that they would schedule site visits to these particular properties of concern.
4. The Partnership agreed to work together to explore what other selection criteria could be considered in the prioritization process.
5. The Corps agreed to improve data distribution to Partnership, noting the availability of PAO to get the Partners materials needed or requested.

Attendees

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization/Address</u>	<u>Phone/Fax Number (e-mail address)</u>
Major Mike Peloquin	CENAB	410/962-0157 michael.peloquin.maj@nab02.usace.army.mil
Rich Albright	DCEHA	202-535-2283 ralbright@dchealth.com
Frank Vavra	USEPA	215-814-3221 Vavra.frank@epamail.epa.gov
Ed Hughes	CENAB	410/962-6784 Edward.T.Hughes@usace.army.mil
Frank Bochnowicz	CENAB	410-962-6734 Frank.Bochnowicz@nab02.usace.army.mil
Drew Rak	CENAB	410-962-5642 Andrew.Rak@usace.army.mil
Ted Henry	CENAB Contractor	410-962-7522 Theodore.J.Henry@usace.army.mil
Gary Schilling	CENAB	410-962-2210 Gary.T.Schilling@usace.army.mil